# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 1.1 Project History and Approach 2
- 1.2 Vision, Goals, and Objectives 3
- 1.3 Key Findings 4
  - 1.3.1 Facility Conditions 4
  - 1.3.2 Space Needs and Gap Analysis 4
- 1.4 Recommendations 5
- 1.5 Estimates of Probable Cost 7

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.1 Process Overview 10
- 2.2 Future Updates to the Facilities Master Plan 12

## 3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- 3.1 Larimer County Facilities Planning History 14
- 3.2 Facility Conditions Assessments Summary 15

## 4.0 VISION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES
- 4.1 Criminal Justice Visioning Session Outcomes 18
- 4.2 Administration and Operations Visioning Session Outcomes 20
5.0 **ANALYSIS**

5.1 Larimer County Demographics  
5.2 Criminal Justice Facilities  
5.2.1 Benchmarks and Trends  
5.2.2 Design Guidelines and Standards  
5.2.3 Space Needs Requirements and Gap Analysis  
5.3 Administration and Operations Facilities  
5.3.1 Benchmarks and Trends  
5.3.2 Space Needs Requirements and Gap Analysis

6.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 Criminal Justice Facilities  
6.2 Administration and Operations Facilities  
6.3 Phasing Plan and Estimates of Probable Cost

**APPENDICES (under separate cover)**

- Appendix 1  Survey Response Summaries  
- Appendix 2  Detailed Space Needs Program  
- Appendix 3  Definitions for Levels of Remodel  
- Appendix 4  Cost Estimate Detail  
- Appendix 5  200 W Oak Street Stack Plans by Timeframe  
- Appendix 6  200 W Oak Street Block Plans - Proposed Occupancy Test Fits  
- Appendix 7  Colorado Department of Labor Population Shift Maps  
- Appendix 8  Facilities Department Schedule for Master Plan Updates  
- Appendix 9  Larimer County Space Standards Guidelines  
- Appendix 10  Leased Property Terms
The consultants would like to thank all of the Larimer County staff, Elected Officials and Commissioners for their input into the master planning process. The time commitment to make this a successful plan was significant, and critical to the process.
1.1 Project History and Approach

Larimer County occupies approximately 1.4 M square feet (sf) of space in multiple locations across the county. The last countywide master plan was completed in 2006. Since that time, county population has continued to increase, more recently at a greater rate than the Colorado state average growth rate. Correspondingly, county staff and service capacity have had to grow. As a result, many county facilities have reached or surpassed capacity. At the same time, some of the county-owned buildings are in only fair or poor condition and must be upgraded or potentially replaced.

These factors drove the solicitation to produce a new, comprehensive Larimer County Facilities Master Plan. The plan presented here is the culmination of that effort.

The goal of this plan is to provide a roadmap and living document for facility decisions over the next 20 years.

The Larimer County Facilities Master Plan process began in March of 2017. This comprehensive scope included all key county functions with significant participation from each department throughout the process including Criminal Justice functions, Administration functions and Operations functions.

Over the course of the project critical activities included:

- Existing conditions assessments of the majority of County-owned facilities
- A joint visioning session with key participants
- Survey completion by all divisions and departments providing quantitative and qualitative space requirements data
- Interviews and walkthroughs of occupied space with all divisions and departments
- Development of a Space Needs Program, by division or department, detailing current and projected seat count and space requirements
- Two Alternatives Development Workshops with Criminal Justice representatives, and two with Administration/Operations representatives
- Development of estimates of probable cost for final options, including projected construction escalation
- Review meetings at key milestones with the County Advisory Team
- Review meetings with each of the County Commissioners upon completion of the Criminal Justice Findings and Recommendations, and completion of the Administration/Operations Findings and Recommendations
- Presentation of final recommendations in a public work session on March 19, 2018
1.2 Vision, Goals, and Objectives

Following the project kick-off, a Visioning Session was held with the Advisory Team and other key stakeholders to review key drivers for the project, identify the County’s critical issues, discuss preferred directions for the County— including potential shifts in County service delivery and/or operational models such as one-stop shop models for Human Services—and define the criteria for project success.

During the Visioning Session, participants were asked to define what this Master Plan should provide upon completion. Key statements from that goal-setting exercise are summarized below.

Following the first Alternatives Development Workshop, critical specific objectives were defined, providing criteria for further refinement of options and solutions. These are summarized below.

**GOALS**

- An understanding of how to best serve the County
- Recommendations that result in available, effective customer service
- More consistent and improved space and design standards
- An understanding of the feasibility of creating a new stand-alone EOC, morgue and landfill
- Solutions for improving safety for employees
- A vision for replacing the Vine Street building
- Solutions that provide flexibility and adaptability
- A better understanding of best practices and lessons learned both internally and externally
- Recommendations for technology infrastructure upgrades that support future technology directions
- Transferrable plan that county staff will update regularly to ensure on-going needs are met

**OBJECTIVES**

- Vacate Vine Street and create new campus for Fleet, Road & Bridge, Weeds, Facilities Shop—reuse or sell Vine Street property
- Consolidate Human Services and construct new space to accommodate growth at either Blue Spruce or a new location
- Reuse or sell Blue Spruce campus, consider remodel options if reusing
- Create a new facility for “Internal Services” leaving customer facing functions at 200 West Oak within existing building footprint/envelope
- Vacate Midpoint leased space over time
- Reduce the total number of site locations for County services system wide
1.3 Key Findings

1.3.1 Facility Conditions

Assessment of general architectural and interior conditions, and building mechanical and electrical systems found that, as illustrated in Figure 1.3.1, most of the county-owned facilities are in good condition. Exceptions are the Fleet and Road & Bridge facility at Vine Street, the two buildings at the Blue Spruce campus, the Jail and Community Corrections facilities, which are in poor condition. These facilities have critical issues that need to be addressed, or in the case of Vine Street and at least one of the Blue Spruce buildings, need to be vacated and replaced.

Component replacement information and overall conditions were factored into decisions regarding whether to keep, remodel or dispose of facilities. This information also informed the cost estimates for any facilities that will be maintained over the 20-year planning timeframe.

1.3.2 Space Needs and Gap Analysis

All of the data collected from each of the departments was used to create a “Space Needs Program” outlining currently-occupied square footage (SF) and location, current seat count, “right-sized” SF required, and projected seat count and SF required.

This then provided a comparison between what is occupied today, what space deficits or surpluses exist currently which once addressed provides a required SF to meet today’s need (“rightsizing”), and what is needed in the future timeframes at 5, 10, 15 and 20 years.

A Gap Analysis defines the delta between space available by department and by building and what is required currently and into the future. Figure 1.3.2 describes Larimer County’s criminal justice functions gap analysis by building, and Figure 1.3.3 describes the administrative and operations functions gap analysis by building.

As shown for Criminal Justice Facilities:

- The Jail will need to grow to more than twice its current size based on bed capacity projections
- The Justice Center will need to grow to more than twice its current size based on courtroom requirement projections
- Alternative Sentencing and Community Corrections need to expand by almost 80% in the next 20 years if those programs continue to grow as projected
- Expansion of the Sheriff’s Administration Building is required to accommodate projected staff growth

As shown for County Administration/Operations Facilities:

- 200 West Oak occupants will outgrow the building by 42,900 NSF (approximately 30%) in 20 years
- Occupants of the Blue Spruce buildings will require almost 50% more space than is available in 20 years
- Fleet/Road and Bridge facilities will need to add almost 45,000 NSF in the next five years to address 20-year requirements
- Occupants of owned and leased space at Midpoint will be short over 32,000 NSF in 20 years (39%)

note: Figures are calculated in Net Square Feet (NSF); Gross Square Feet (GSF) have been provided for calculations and cost estimates of proposed new construction.
1.4 Recommendations

Multiple alternatives were developed, explored and reviewed with the project stakeholders to arrive at the recommendations outlined here. Pros and cons of each were discussed, and options were refined based on departmental input so that consensus was achieved on the defined directions. Information regarding the options explored but rejected or modified is contained in the body of this document. Final recommendations reflect the preferred options that best meet the goals and objectives originally defined at the outset of this project.

It is important to note that master plan recommendations set direction and provide space needs criteria and requirements, but do not provide facility design. Concepts presented here validate the feasibility of recommended solutions. A full, detailed programming and design effort will be required for each individual project proposed.

Criminal Justice Facilities Recommendations

There are multiple facilities that make up the Criminal Justice portion of the master plan. These consist of the County Jail, the Justice Center, Community Corrections and Alternative Sentencing buildings, Probation, and AIIM space. The majority of this space is at the Midpoint Campus, except the Justice Center which is in downtown Fort Collins. Satellite Courts and Probation are also located in Loveland. The focus of the master plan is on the Fort Collins-based space needs. However, where peripherally impacted by assumptions about Loveland facilities, this has been addressed.

**JAIL RECOMMENDATIONS**

- In the first five years, construct ten (10) new housing pods, adding 480 new beds. Reuse 342 of the existing beds by completing minimal upgrades of both occupied and vacated existing units. Remodel existing support areas for long-term use and construct a portion of the long-term support spaces needed for future full build-out. Expand Sheriff’s Administration space and connect this to the new portions of the jail.
- Fill remaining available existing and new beds for the next 10 years. At year 15, construct the remaining support space and additional seven housing pods (336 beds), as well as three core/shell pods for future fit-out to meet 20-year requirements. Relocate inmates to new units and demolish most of the existing jail (except the newest units and remodeled core support space).
- By 20 years, jail capacity will be 1,116 vs. 600+ daily population today (over capacity).

**JUSTICE CENTER RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Expand the existing Justice Center to the South of the existing building (pending negotiations with the City for acquisition and use of the city-owned property on which this expansion would sit). This expansion would be a five-floor structure, matching the height and width of the current Justice Center.
- Complete the expansion in two phases, constructing all floors and the full footprint, but fitting out only the basement and the lower two and a half floors in the first phase. The second phase would fit out the remaining half of the third floor, a fourth floor, and a half floor on the fifth level. Phase I would accommodate 10-year needs and Phase II would meet 20-year requirements.
- Maintain two courtrooms in Loveland.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES**

- In conjunction with the plans for the remainder of the County functions, it is recommended that the entire Midpoint Campus be dedicated to Criminal Justice functions. By the 20-year timeframe, the goal is to have terminated all leases and only maintain ownership of 2555 Midpoint, which will house Probation (including 20-year growth) and the current AIIM space. Any AIIM growth will occur in the Loveland location.
- Construct a more robust Emergency Operations Center for the County in the remaining space at 2555 Midpoint or another suitable site to house Emergency Management staff as well.
- Expand Community Corrections and Alternative Sentencing to accommodate population growth and expanded women’s facilities as funding allows, and as the County’s commitment to these services is further defined for the future.
ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS

• Leave current occupants of 200 West Oak in place for the next 10 years, accommodating minor growth through capturing underutilized space and adjusting space standards to increase occupancy in the building
• At ten years, construct a new Administration building for Internal Services (Finance, IT, Facilities, Human Resources, Elections from Midpoint) at either Blue Spruce or a new location
• Remodel and reconfigure 200 West Oak Street to accommodate growth for the remaining customer-facing functions
• Consolidate all of Human Services and Health & Environment within the next five years at either Blue Spruce or a new location. Move Extension from Blue Spruce to the Ranch. This vacates a substantial amount of leased and owned space at the Midpoint Campus for backfill by others and eventually allows leases to be terminated.

OPERATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

• Construct a new Fleet facility in a new location to house Fleet Services, Road & Bridge, the Facilities Shop, and Weeds functions. This vacates substantial space at the Midpoint Campus for backfill by others and allows eventual lease terminations.
• Complete expansion of Fleet satellite locations throughout the county
• Make improvements to existing Solid Waste facilities and construct a new materials recycling facility

County Administration and Operations Recommendations

Virtually all other County functions were included in the Master Plan under the heading of either County Administration or Operations. This includes functions housed at 200 West Oak, Vine Street, and in the Blue Spruce buildings as well as leased space in downtown and Midpoint locations. The functions housed at the new Loveland facility were accounted for only if either staff will be moving from Fort Collins to Loveland or vice versa. The Fairgrounds was looked at only in terms of facility conditions as site and facility planning was already being completed for the complex by another consultant.

Implementation Phasing

Key projects were aligned within five year increments of the twenty year timeframe as exact years for implementation will be based on funding not only for construction but also for design on the front end. Estimates of probable cost were based on escalation at 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year timeframes. A 6% escalation factor was used for years 1-5 and a 3% factor for all remaining years. A summary of key projects in each five year window is shown below. A more detailed phasing plan has been included in the body of this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY PROJECTS</th>
<th>1-5 YEARS</th>
<th>5-10 YEARS</th>
<th>10-15 YEARS</th>
<th>15-20 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Fleet Building</td>
<td>Relocate Facilities Shop, R&amp;B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH I - Jail Expansion/Remodel</td>
<td>Comm.Corr./Alt Sent. Expansion</td>
<td>PH II - Jail Expansion</td>
<td>Fit out Jail Core/Shell Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH I - Justice Center Expansion/Remodel</td>
<td>Fit out Justice Center Core/Shell Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill Midpoint with Human Svcs &amp; Probation</td>
<td>Begin releasing Midpoint leased space</td>
<td>Release final lease at Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move Extension to Ranch</td>
<td>New HHS Building at Blue Spruce (By Year 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Internal Services Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfigure/Rightsize W Oak St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Recycling Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search &amp; Rescue Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>-Vacate/Sell Vine Street</td>
<td>-Redevelop Vine Street</td>
<td>-Use Vine Site for Internal Svcs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Vacate/Sell Blue Spruce Bldgs</td>
<td>-Acquire new site for H&amp;E and HS</td>
<td>-Redevelop Blue Spruce for Internal Svcs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Co-locate Internal Svcs with new H&amp;E and HS site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Estimates of Probable Cost

Estimates of Probable Cost were developed based on two primary sets of information. The first was findings from the existing conditions assessments indicating timeframes for critical component replacement for County owned facilities. The second was sets of assumptions regarding level of remodel, and SF of expansion or new construction in each planning timeframe needed to implement the recommendations.

A summary of the cost implications for the recommendations is provided in Table 1.5.1. Details are further explained in the body of this document with additional backup provided in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 YEARS</th>
<th>10 YEARS</th>
<th>15 YEARS</th>
<th>20 YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total County Admin/Ops</td>
<td>$153,171,000</td>
<td>$45,594,000</td>
<td>$4,162,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$202,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Criminal Justice</td>
<td>$239,034,000</td>
<td>$59,581,000</td>
<td>$46,742,000</td>
<td>$35,792,000</td>
<td>$381,149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$392,205,000</td>
<td>$105,175,000</td>
<td>$50,904,000</td>
<td>$35,792,000</td>
<td>$584,076,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5.1 - Cost Estimates
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2.1 Process Overview

Larimer County contracted with RNL, now Stantec, a planning and design firm based in Denver, to develop a Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan for all primary County functions, with the goal of developing a roadmap and living document for facility decisions over the next twenty years. The planning process had multiple phases: data collection and discovery; facility assessments; analysis; alternatives development; and development of final recommendations with estimates of probable cost.

Visioning

At the onset of the project, representatives from each user group participated in a “Visioning Session” to review key drivers for the project, identify the County’s critical issues, discuss preferred directions for the County - including potential shifts in County service delivery and/or operational models - and define the criteria for project success. One session was held for all Criminal Justice related functions, and a second for all other County functions in the study. These sessions were intended to set directions, establish overarching goals for the project and provide an opportunity for stakeholders from different parts of the organization to share their thoughts with one another.
Data Collection

Data collection was conducted for all primary County functions, which included the following:

- Alternative Sentencing
- Alternatives to Incarceration for Individuals with Mental Health Needs
- Assessor
- Board of County Commissioners
- Clerk and Recorder
- Community Corrections
- Community Development
- Coroner
- County Attorney
- County Manager
- Courts
- District Attorney
- Economic Development
- Emergency Management
- Engineering
- Extension
- Facilities
- Finance
- Fleet
- Jail
- Health and Environment
- Human Resources
- Human Services
- Information Technology
- Probation Office
- Public Trustee
- The Ranch
- Road and Bridge
- Sheriff
- Solid Waste
- Treasurer
- Veterans Services
- Weeds
- Workforce Center

A survey tool was used to collect preliminary data from the individual user groups regarding space needs, operations, critical adjacencies, growth projections and other key data. Information provided in the survey was then used as a starting point for user group interviews with each function and tours of the space occupied by each. Relevant background information was also collected including previous planning studies, in progress planning efforts (e.g. the master plan for the Ranch), leased space terms, etc.

Facility Assessments

Facility assessments were conducted by a team of architects, mechanical and electrical engineers and IT consultants. Most of the County-owned facilities were assessed for general conditions to identify current conditions, as well as short and long-term upgrades and improvements required. This information was used in the development of options where reuse of existing facilities was a consideration, and for the development of cost estimates. Each building was given an overall rating of “poor”, “fair”, “good” or “excellent” based on conditions of specific building and site features assessed.

Analysis

Analysis of the data collected at the front end of the project touched several areas including the following:

- Demographics of the employee population within the County
- County population growth trends
- Seat count projection based on historical growth and County provided projections
- Benchmarking of SF/seat between user groups and between the County and other peer institutions
- Compilation of industry best practices and workplace trends applicable to the County
- Compilation of industry best practices and workplace trends applicable to the County
- Calculation of current, required, and projected space needs based on all of the above
- Analysis of critical adjacencies and areas where these could be improved
- Gap analysis by user group, building and campus calculating the delta between available space and required space over time

Alternatives Development

Using the data analysis as a framework, various alternatives to meet 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year requirements were explored. Two sets of workshops were conducted each for Criminal Justice related functions and all other County functions in which these alternatives were explored and fine-tuned. Consensus was reached on primary directions for each by the end of the second workshop.

Final Recommendations/Estimates of Probable Cost

Directions established through the workshops were finalized, and narrowed to the least possible number of scenarios that are feasible, favored, and beneficial to the County. As this is a long-term master plan, variables will need to be carried forward to provide the County with choices that can be made at future junctures based on available funding, real estate, and actual vs. projected rate of growth for County functions. A phased implementation plan and estimates of probable cost were developed for the final options to reflect priorities and critical path, and factor in approximate cost escalation. This document is a living document that will need to be updated periodically to modify directions and options as needed.

Definitions

Throughout this document there are terms that are frequently used. These are outlined below with a brief definition.

Assignable SF (ASF): Typically, the actual footprint of a space assigned to a specific use or user (e.g. a workstation)

Useable or Net SF (USF/NSF): ASF plus secondary circulation around it (e.g. aisles between workstations)

Rentable SF (RSF): USF/NSF plus a factor that accounts for primary building circulation, lobbies, shared spaces if in a leased or multi-tenant space

Gross SF (GSF): RSF or NSF plus a factor that accounts for shafts (mech/elevators/stairs), building systems space, exterior walls

Notes: 1) The primary terms used in this document are Net SF and Gross SF
2) Unique to the Justice Center and Jail, standard planning blocks or “sets” were used to establish SF requirements. These blocks include a percentage of building gross but are referred to as NSF since additional grossing factors were added to arrive at total building GSF.
2.2 Future Updates to the Facilities Master Plan

This Facilities Master Plan is intended to be a “living document” that will be used as a planning tool in future years by the Larimer County Facilities Department. The database developed to capture current and future space needs requirements has been set up to be easy to update. The Facilities Department will be collecting updates to seat count projections from each user group every two to three years (see Appendix) for a milestone Gantt chart showing the planned update schedule. These updates can be plugged into the database, automatically updating future projections. The proposed directions and trigger points defined in this document can then be updated and modified accordingly.

It is important to note that the specific moves internal to County buildings, and between locations, that have been outlined in this plan are preliminary, developed to test the feasibility of keeping certain functions within the buildings, consolidating certain functions over time, accommodating growth over time etc. These moves and relocations as well as timing of moves, will need to be revisited as actual vs. projected growth is tracked.

Each of the components of this plan will require further fine-tuned analysis, detailed space needs programming and design efforts to move from master plan to implementation. Specific implementation schedules can then be developed for exact design through construction timeframes.
3.1 Larimer County Facilities Planning History

Larimer County last developed a county-wide Strategic Facilities Master Plan in September, 2006, and a Criminal Justice Needs Assessment Study in June, 2003. These documents provided historical data that, while outdated, was useful background information. Since that time there have been several department- or division-specific plans that were reviewed and used to inform this plan. These include:

1. Larimer County Department of Human Services Master Plan – June 2016
2. Fairgrounds Preliminary Facilities Assessment – August, 2016
3. Fleet, Road and Bridge, Natural Resources Land Stewardship Facility Inventory and Evaluation – October 2016
5. Sheriff’s Office Detention Center Pre-Architectural Program and Site Master Plan – December, 2016
7. Colorado Department of Labor Mapping of County Population, 2017
8. CJAC 2016 Jail Review Report
3.2 Facility Conditions Assessments Summary

Between May 16th, 2017, and July 13th, 2017, a team consisting of an architect, mechanical and electrical engineers and information technology consultants were involved with site visits and meetings to assess the current physical and system conditions at twenty-eight County-owned facilities. Key leadership from Larimer County Facilities and/or the individual building staff provided the assessment team with feedback from a Pre-Assessment Questionnaire about each building or facility. After reviewing each questionnaire, the assessment team visited each building or facility and conducted a field evaluation. Building conditions were rated overall as “poor”, “fair”, “good”, or “excellent” with backup detail outlined in a separate report for each. Definitions of these rankings are as follows:

- **Poor** - something needs replacement
- **Fair** - something needs repair/attention
- **Good** - the element or system is acceptable
- **Excellent** - the element or system is new or has no issues

Of the twenty-eight buildings assessed, two (2) were found to be in Poor condition, four (4) in Poor-to-Fair condition, one (1) in Fair condition, nineteen (19) in Good condition, and two (2) in Excellent condition. The assessments provided sufficient detail to provide estimates of probable cost for component replacement items in the 20-year planning timeframe, as well as to inform estimates for any remodel options for the existing buildings.

- 12 facilities were built before 1990, the remainder have been constructed between 2000 and today
- Many buildings have dated furniture systems, break rooms and/or collaboration and meeting spaces
- There is a spectrum of space use efficiencies from highly efficient/crowded to inefficient/surplus space use

### Larimer County Existing Building Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 W Oak Dr</td>
<td>Courthouse Office</td>
<td>153,637</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Larim Dr</td>
<td>Justice Center</td>
<td>151,994</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 E Vine St</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307 Midpoint Dr</td>
<td>Alternative Sentencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2405 Midpoint Dr</td>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>175,445</td>
<td>1983/1992/1999</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2555 Midpoint Dr</td>
<td>Sheriff Admin</td>
<td>46,405</td>
<td>1981/2000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515 Blue Spruce</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>30,603</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 Blue Spruce</td>
<td>Health &amp; Environment</td>
<td>32,103</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542 Carpenter Road</td>
<td>Fleet Creek</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Office</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Shop</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Gate House 1</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Gate House 2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Recycle Center</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 15</td>
<td>LANDFILL Household Haz Waste</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807 CR 19</td>
<td>LANDFILL Education Bldg.</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4190 W CR 38E</td>
<td>Horsemanth Info Center</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4190 W CR 38E</td>
<td>Horsemanth Mortar Shop</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3280 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds Exhibition Center</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds Events Center</td>
<td>203,080</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds Indoor Arena</td>
<td>69,824</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds W Livestock</td>
<td>43,122</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds E Livestock</td>
<td>42,046</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5450 Arena Circle</td>
<td>Fairgrounds Mgmt Bldg.</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410 Arena Circle</td>
<td>orent Building</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full set of Assessment Reports has been provided under separate cover from this document.
Larimer County comprises 3,634 square miles. The two largest cities within the county are Loveland and Fort Collins, which is the county seat. While all of the major properties within the county were considered through the course of this master plan, the major property sites are concentrated in the Fort Collins area, as illustrated here. These five sites include:

- A - Blue Spruce, containing two buildings and an undeveloped parcel to the north
- B - Vine Street, primarily housing fleet facilities
- C - Downtown, the location of the main administrative building as well as the Courthouse
- D and E - Midpoint Campus, housing the Jail and other related criminal justice functions as well as four leased buildings housing a variety of services
4.1 Criminal Justice Visioning Session Outcomes

In July, 2017, a Visioning Session was conducted with representatives of the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee (CJAC) for the purpose of sharing preliminary study findings and engaging the committee members in identifying both current obstacles and deficits in the Criminal Justice facilities for the county and potential considerations to improve upon or eliminate those deficits.

Exercise A: Current and Future Descriptors

The initial exercise asked participants to offer descriptive words or phrases that communicated their assessment of existing County Justice related facilities, followed by words/phrases that described how they would envision these facilities in the future.

Existing Facilities Descriptors
- Lost and confused
- Technology deficient
- Chaotic public space
- Insufficient public space
- Insufficient staff space
- Lack of security
- Lack of appearance of security
- Inaccessible
- Crowded

Desired Future Facilities Descriptors
- Adequate space
- Combined
- Room for growth
- Room for ancillary services
- Elegant

Exercise B: Current Obstacles and Potential Solutions

The second exercise asked participants to provide answers to the following questions. The responses were then tallied and are shown below.
Exercise C: Preliminary Scenario Concepts

The final exercise included presenting the participants with a series of possible scenario concepts to “take the temperature” on various overall directions for the criminal justice facilities. Each of these was scored on a scale of negative to neutral to positive. Scores were collected in aggregate from each stakeholder area of operations: Court functions, Jail functions, Sheriff’s Department, Probation, District Attorney, and other (as there were other agencies represented as part of the CJAC group).

The following is a summary of the scenario questions posed and the resulting voting tally.

**Question 1:** To what extent would your area of operations benefit from a combined justice complex located in downtown Ft. Collins, if that were possible?

Responses were primarily neutral on this question with some positive responses, and no negative responses. A recurring topic discussed was the difficulty of parking in the downtown area and access issues for some staff.

**Question 2:** To what extent would your area of operations benefit from a combined justice complex located outside the downtown area?

Responses were primarily neutral on this question with a fairly even split of a few votes in the negative or positive ends of the scale. One concern expressed was ease of access by the public could be hampered by lack of public transportation.

**Question 3:** Should consolidation of Emergency Operations be pursued?

The majority of the responses were positive, with a few neutral votes. While consolidation was favored in terms of Emergency Management and an EOC, the Sheriff’s office expressed a desire to maintain a backup EOC within their facility.

**Question 4:** What impact would a new Mental (Behavioral) Health Center have on your area of operations or services delivered?

All responses to this question were positive. Behavioral health has emerged as a major issue impacting the entire criminal justice system. There is broad support for a new facility to serve this need. This is, however, outside the scope of this master plan.
A Visioning Session was held in July 2017, with key representatives from each of the County user groups in Administration and Operations (non-CJ functions). The purpose of the session was to arrive at consensus about “criteria for success” of the project overall and what the master plan should achieve, as well as define the collective vision for the future of County facilities.

During this session attendees participated in a series of exercises. These are described and the outcomes are illustrated in Figure 4.2.1. The voting outcomes provided a touchstone throughout the planning process, ensuring that recommendations would align with the group’s overarching vision, goals and objectives.

Exercise A: County Administration and Operations
An initial exercise asked participants to describe what the master plan deliverable should achieve. Statements and key words provided by the group are highlighted below:

- The Plan Should Provide:
  - An understanding of how to best serve the County
  - Transparent about recommendations and the reasons behind them for both the County organizations and the public
  - Recommendations that result in available, effective space and design
  - More consistent and improved space and design
  - A plan that achieves more consolidation, improving operations standards and collaboration
  - An understanding of the feasibility of creating a new standalone EOC, morgue and landfill options
  - Solutions for improving safety for employees
  - A global, county-wide plan that considers short and long-term perspectives
  - Solutions that provide flexibility and adaptability
  - A process that stakeholders feel confident in resulting in
  - A better understanding of best practices and lessons learned both internally and externally
  - A plan that recognizes what’s already being done well
  - Recommendations for technology infrastructure and areas that need improvements
  - Upgrades that support future technology directions

- The Plan Should Be:
  - High Priority
  - An updateable plan
  - A plan that reflects where we have come from and where we will go in the future
  - A plan that recognizes what we have done well
  - A plan that consolidates facilities, providing more efficient
  - A plan that provides a clear roadmap of what, when and at what cost
  - A plan that considers the feasibility of creating a new standalone EOC, morgue and landfill options
  - A plan that provides flexibility and adaptability
  - A plan that stakeholders feel confident in resulting in
  - A plan that recognizes what’s already being done well
  - A plan that considers the feasibility of creating a new standalone EOC, morgue and landfill options

Exercise B: What Are Priority Goals for County Facilities?
In this exercise, participants were divided into groups and were asked to brainstorm goals for County facilities in several categories: Service Delivery, Operations, Technology, Employee Workplace and Culture, County Image in the Community, and Sustainability. The five groups then reported on the goals they had defined. As individuals, each participant then voted, using a dot voting system, on the items in each of these categories that they felt were most important. The outcome of this voting exercise is summarized in Figure 4.2.1.

Voting results indicate some clear front runners in terms of priorities. Customer convenience and access received the most votes of any factor. Employee access and quality of workplace received the next largest number of votes. There was a fairly even distribution of total votes, indicating that most participants felt that the goals defined were critical. The two categories that received the highest number of votes were “critical and important” and “important but not critical.”

Figure 4.2.1 - Visioning Session Outcomes
5.1 Larimer County Demographics

Larimer County Demographics

Larimer County is located in North Central Colorado (see Figure 5.1.1) and incorporates three primary cities, Fort Collins, Loveland and Estes Park. The most recent estimate from the U.S. Census Bureau places the 2016 population for the County at 339,993. It has experienced significant and rapid growth over the last ten years, having grown by 13.5% from the 2010 census to the 2016 estimate. As of 2014, it was the sixth fastest growing County in the state1.

The Colorado Department of Local Affairs has projected the following for Larimer County population for 2020 through 2035. These figures are used for additional demographics analysis for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 Census Estimate</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>339,993</td>
<td>366,154</td>
<td>398,784</td>
<td>429,637</td>
<td>458,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the demographic makeup of incoming residents is less representative of the overall Colorado population growth as much of the growth is either younger or older. “Slightly more than half of the ... people who relocated to the County in the five-year period (from 2009-2014) were ages 18-29. Sixty-six percent of the new residents with incomes earned less than $25,000... Larimer County tends to draw cash-strapped young adults”2. The State Demographer projected that the 65+ age group will more than double from 2010 to 2030 in Colorado3. “Larimer County is seeing the effects of a “silver tsunami” as more residents reach retirement age. Ranks of the county’s 65-and-older crowd jumped 25.7 percent from 2010 to 2014, according to U.S. Census Bureau data.”4

These demographic trends are all having an impact on the demand for services and resources provided by the County. While not all county functions are providing services directly to the population, support functions will grow as direct providers grow. As a result, staffing and space needs will grow as the population grows across the board, impacting some functions more than others.

---

1 Coloradoan.com, “California, Texas feed Larimer population growth”, May 12, 2015
2 Coloradoan.com, “California, Texas feed Larimer population growth”, May 12, 2015
3 "State Demographer: Population shifts will alter workforce makeup”, BizWest, September 30, 2014
4 "Larimer County sees spike in seniors 65 and older”, Coloradoan.com, July 2015
**County Employee Demographics**

Another important set of demographics is the make-up of County employees. Many governmental organizations are facing an aging of their employee population and, much like the private sector, need to consider how to attract and retain both sooner-to-retire staff and younger generation staff.

Figures 5.1.3 and 5.1.6 show that 48% of Larimer County’s employee population is 45 years old or older; 27% is under 30. The average age is 45. This Figure 5.1.4 shows that employee tenure with the County has historically been between nine and ten years which, while not unusual for public sector jobs, will likely change as the workforce becomes younger. The importance of this is that future planning and design must consider how the younger workforce is influencing the way work gets done. The public sector is learning lessons from the private sector in this regard, employing more alternative workplace strategies that support different workstyle preferences, greater use of technology, mobility tools, increased collaboration and teaming while also reducing SF/person, office-to-workstation ratios and environmental footprint.

**Employee Growth and County Population Growth**

User group surveys in the first phase of this planning effort indicated that the most often cited reason for projected growth by the departments is population growth, as shown in Figure 5.1.5. Though not all groups are directly impacted by population growth, it is worthwhile to look at the correlation. To that end, an analysis is provided below of County population growth rates compared with Department driven and County trend driven staffing projections. Seat count was then also calculated using the same rate of growth as projected population to see how that compares with the other two planning assumptions.

As shown in Table 5.1.1, if seat count growth were projected based only on the rate of population growth, the projected numbers would be smaller than either of the other methods used to project (division- and department-based trend data result in a 20-year seat count projection that is 3% higher). This is in part because, rather than a straight-line projection used to project seat count and space needs for this study, the rate of population growth is shown to decrease over time.

The projections based on Larimer County Historic trends are 10% higher than the division- and department-based projections, which were used to formulate the data used in the final recommendations of this master plan.

It should be noted that the figures in Table 5.1.1 are exclusive to Administrative functions and do not include Criminal Justice or Operations staffing.

### Table 5.1.1 - Growth Analysis for Administrative Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-Yr</th>
<th>10-Yr</th>
<th>15-Yr</th>
<th>20-Yr</th>
<th>Total Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Pop Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>332,832</td>
<td>356,314</td>
<td>398,784</td>
<td>429,637</td>
<td>458,776</td>
<td>125,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Yr % Growth</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Count</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Yr Seat Growth</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Seats to Pop</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| County Projections   |         |      |       |       |       |                |
| Seat Count           | 949     | 1,039 | 1,136 | 1,246 | 1,364 | 415            |
| % Yr Seat Growth     | 9.5%    | 9.5%  | 9.5%  | 9.5%  | 41.7% |                |
| Ratio of Seats to Pop| 351     | 352   | 350   | 345   | 336   |                |

| Growth at Same Rate as Pop. Growth |         |      |       |       |       |                |
| Seat Count               | 949     | 1,044 | 1,137 | 1,244 | 1,308 | 359            |
| % Yr Seat Growth         | 9.5%    | 9.5%  | 9.5%  | 9.5%  | 43.7% |                |
| Ratio of Seats to Pop    | 351     | 351   | 351   | 351   | 351   |                |
5.2 Criminal Justice Facilities

5.2.1 Benchmarks and Trends

Throughout the past several decades, significant new approaches have been brought to bear in the planning and design of detention facilities. They had their beginning in the recognition that the overwhelming number of existing facilities were entirely outdated and unable to meet contemporary needs, and that the conditions that they presented were widely non-compliant with security, health and safety needs. As a result new standards emerged and new concepts for facility management and operations evolved. Among these trends, the following are prominent:

- The unobtrusive integration of security requirements to create facilities that have a “good neighbor” image in their surroundings.
- “Direct Supervision” in facility management, where staff have an active presence within the prisoner housing unit, observing, directing, and identifying issues before they become events.
- The “normalizing” of the corrections environment, supporting program initiatives that seek to improve the ability for the offender to function successfully in the community.
- Provision of a range of prisoner housing configurations, including individual room sleeping to double assignment, as well as dormitory group housing and special housing for close supervision with prisoner assignments made on an individual needs basis.
- Distributing program spaces in close proximity to housing to increase access for all components of the population and reduce the burden of staff escorted movements.

Trends in Judicial Facility Design

The strong tradition of the Courthouse as a prominent landmark in the community and symbol of our justice system continues. In addition to accommodating a broad range of services and functions, the Courthouse provides the place where disputes are litigated and sanctions determined for violations under the rule of law. The Courthouse is the expression of the importance which the justice system holds within our communities. This attribute holds its longstanding position in the development of contemporary facilities. Included among the new features that have trended in recent years, in the face of emerging need, are the following:

- The provision of a single point of public entry, with ample space for security screening equipment and procedures, as well as sufficient weather protected queuing space for the public.
- Separation of internal circulations for the public, judicial personnel, and in-custody individuals.
- Providing a range of meeting areas outside the courtroom for mediation, dispute resolution and problem solving.
- Providing sufficient attorney-client interview rooms and separated witness/victim waiting areas.
- Integration of technologies needed for courtroom equipment by its various participants, with the flexibility to accommodate new technologies as they emerge.
- Accommodation of the public to do individual research, including self-help and ease of case file access.
- Provision of a number of larger courtrooms to accommodate high profile proceedings.
- Provision of separated and secure parking for judicial personnel.
5.2.2 Design Guidelines and Standards

Design Guidelines and Standards in Correctional Facilities

There has been an enormous amount of activity in the past 40+ years with respect to guidelines and standards for detention and correctional facilities. The developments have included federally sponsored academic research into conditions of confinement, standards development by professional organizations such as the American Corrections Association with its Standards for Accreditation for Adult Local Detention Facilities, and mandated state (all standards in jurisdictions throughout the country. Recurring themes in these guidelines and standards vary somewhat in their emphasis and specifics, but the following features are typically found:

- Individual detention rooms should have a minimum of 70 square feet.
- Dayroom space, directly accessed from sleeping rooms, should have a minimum of 35 square feet per housing unit occupant.
- Showers in the ratio of one shower per eight prisoners.
- Natural light and view in individual sleeping rooms.
- Access to indoor and outdoor physical exercise opportunities.
- Temperature and humidity control within specified normal ranges.
- Ventilation with standardized air changes per minute.

Supplemental to published guidelines and standards, the courts have affirmed through court orders in conditions of confinement litigation that the above features, as well as sanitation and other conditions, be met in jurisdictions throughout the country.

All planning and programming recommendations prepared for Larimer County and reflected in this document recognize these guidelines and standards.

Design Guidelines and Standards in Judicial Facilities

Contemporary Guidelines for Judicial facilities have been promulgated by a variety of sources, including academia, professional membership organizations and government agencies. Work conducted at the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture was pivotal in the field, and was followed by publications from the National Center for State Courts. In general, because the processes and functions that are housed within facilities in different systems and at different points in the system are varied, guidelines prevail as references rather than standards. Space needs also tend to be defined in terms of the specific number of participants and specific clustering of functions rather than individual spaces.

- “Court sets” most frequently consist of Courtroom, Judicial offices, Jury deliberation rooms, Judicial support services, Attorney conference/witness waiting, and prisoner holding.
- Courtrooms vary in size based upon use, including larger high profile proceedings, jury trial vs. non-jury proceedings, civil versus criminal proceedings, initial appearance versus trial, multi-party litigation versus single party adversaries, and other distinctions unique to the particular circumstances.
- Space planning needs to provide for separated movements of the public, judicial personnel and prisoners.
- Compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) is required for all categories of Courtroom participants, public, judicial personnel, witnesses, litigant parties, jury, prisoners, attorneys, and any other facility users.
- Courtroom acoustics need to allow clear communications between participants in the litigation well, diminish sound interference from the spectator gallery, and be sensitive to the need for private conversations at the bench.

These and other guidelines and standards for Judicial facilities have been recognized in the planning and programming recommendations prepared for Larimer County and reflected in this document.
5.2.3 Space Needs Requirements and Gap Analysis

Jail Needs

The assessment of Criminal Justice facilities space needs takes into account the trends identified as well as recent and projected population growth for Larimer County. This has significant bearing on the projection of Larimer County jail capacity requirements. To understand the specifics for Larimer County, a close dialogue has been maintained with county personnel, particularly in the identification and collection of data describing jail admissions, categories of detained populations, lengths of stay and other important system information. Data was also obtained from the Colorado State Demographer’s Office regarding general population projections for the county.

It is also important to understand the innovative work that has been done in Larimer County to reduce the need for jail bedspace during the past twelve years.

Larimer County has embraced the development of community-based corrections, seeking to maximize the potentials for offender re-integration into the community and maintaining and supporting community ties. An exceptional range of programs has been developed, allowing placement of offenders where it is most appropriate for their needs, as with considerations for community safety. It has been, and continues to be, an effective systemic response involving the full range of law enforcement, prosecutorial, judicial and correctional agency participants, making Larimer County an example for other counties to emulate.

The following is a summary of jail population history and the initiatives put in place to address population increase. Because these initiatives have a direct impact on the reduction of jail capacity needs, they are recognized in the projections that follow.

- Between 1987 and 2003 the jail yearly ADP (Average Daily Population) increased by 21 inmates.
- Between 2003 and 2005 the jail yearly ADP increased by 33 inmates.
- In 2002 Larimer County hired a consultant to look at the crowding issues. Their findings resulted in:
  - A projection that if Alternative Sentencing was expanded in 2003 or 2004 then the jail would not need to be expanded until 2007.
  - An alternative was to develop other programs that would assist in lowering the jail population.
  - A ballot issue in 2006 for jail expansion failed.
- In 2005 a Criminal Justice Advisory Committee was established to look at ways to reduce the jail crowding issue. It is generally accepted that the jail overcrowding issue is not just the Sheriff’s problem, but a systemic issue and requiring all members to assist in solving the problem.
- Prior to 2006 the average percentage of pretrial inmates in the jail was nearly 60% which was the national average in 2014.
- In 2006 an initiative was implemented to reduce the number of Parolees in the jail on technical violations. Now most parolees move to Washington County unless they have new charges.
- Since 2007 the County rarely incarcerates probation technical violators as other sanctions are used.
- In 2007 Call Notification Program was initiated to reduce Failure to Appear (FTA) warrants.
  - The Court Clerk’s Office calls individuals who have received a misdemeanor summons or traffic offense summons and reminds them to appear in court the following week. FTA’s for these individuals were as high as 27%, but with the program it was reduced to around 15%. This is funded by booking fees from the Sheriff’s Office.
- Between 2005 and 2013 the jail yearly ADP dropped by 66 inmates.
- The incarceration rate in 2005 was 186 per 100,000; for 2013 it was 141.

Figure 5.2.5 - Jail Complex, Aerial View
Programs developed or enhanced to assist in reducing the jail population; an approach to capture several different classifications of individuals with a very wide range of needs:

- **2004** - began early release of lower level offenders with good behavior at 75% of sentence.
- **2005 and 2006** - Pretrial Services added FTE’s resulted in reduced the percentage of pretrial inmates to 47.5% in 2013. (At this level or lower since 2007). Over 5,100 individuals have been screened at booking for pretrial release over the last 12 months with the number of individuals under supervision daily at 1200 to 1400.
- **2005 -2006** - Creation of the Alternatives to Incarceration for Individuals with Mental Health Needs (AIM). This reduced the jail bed days used by people with severe mental health issues by 3,500 jail bed days per year.
- **2006 – 2007** - Expansion of Larimer County Community Corrections to assist in moving diversion offenders out of the jail. This eliminated the wait time for those diverted from DOC to Community Corrections.
- **2007** - Mental Health Intervention Pretrial was initiated, which allows for 12 to 14 individuals who are released pretrial to receive services for their mental health issues. Services are coordinated for another 25 to 30 to receive other outpatient services.
- **2008** - Community Dual Diagnosis Treatment started with 12 individuals. By 2014 the capacity was up to 30. This was developed in conjunction with the Community Mental Health Provider (Touchstone), Health District of Larimer County, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Partnership. The program provides treatment housing and employment for individuals with MH and SA issues who are also high users of the criminal justice, emergency medical response and hospitals. [funded by Touchstone (Medicaid and SB97 dollars), Health District and Housing Authority vouchers].
- **2009 and in 2013** - Modifications to the Courts Judicial Administrative Order for bonding to allow more arrestees to post bond or be released on a PR or CO-PR bond Commissioners were directed by the court (Bond Commissioners are sworn court clerks).
- **2010** - Court began being notified if an individual could not make a set bond within 3 days of the bond being set to the case could be moved up if possible.
- **2010 -2011** - Planned and implemented DUI court to reduce the length of time 25 individuals spend in jail and receive treatment for their addiction.
- **2012 – 2013** - The Mental Health and Substance Abuse Committee along with the Health District sponsored additional CIT training for law enforcement officers.
- **2012** - Expansion of ASD (Alternative Sentence Department) to 164 Work Release beds and 160 Work Enders and space for Community Service, Electronic Home Detention and Pretrial Services. Current Work Release average daily population (ADP) for 2014 is 128. Work Enders program has seen lower numbers due to changes in the DUI laws so a portion of the area will be used for additional WR beds in the future.
- **2013** - The implementation of Strategies for Self Improvement and Change incorporated into Work Release. This is a three phased substance treatment program and only the first phase is provided in WR. However, 80% are who start in WR finish phases 2 and 3 in the community, which keeps them in compliance with sentences without being housed by the County.
- **2014** - Implementation of the Pretrial PRAXIS to determine if individuals who show up for court present the risk of committing new crimes if released pretrial. The objective is to get those who do not need to be in jail out on community supervision.
- **2014** - Establishment of the Wellness Court (Mental Health Court), which was designed to handle 35 individuals with a high needs mental health diagnosis. Central assessments by Touchstone and AIM/Wellness Court staff determine co-occurring issues and make a decision on which program they need to go to, including AIM, Wellness Court, Drug Court or traditional court track.
- **2014** - Expansion of Intensive Residential Treatment Program within Community Corrections to include those on Parole and Probation. This program is in lieu of being placed in jail or prison for violations. (24 new slots opened).
- **2014** - Expansion of the Short Term Residential Treatment program to allow Probation to send individuals to this program rather than jail or prison. (12 male beds.)
- **2014** - A portion of the money used for the Touchstone contract with the county was diverted to a case manager position assigned to the jail. This position assists those with mental health issues with outpatient services, employment and housing. Since 2014, 216 individuals have been assisted with services.
- **2014** - Other ASD programs aimed at keeping people out of the criminal justice system without over programming individuals that have been added. These include:
  - Men’s Relapse Prevention (weekly)
  - Women’s Relapse Prevention (weekly)
  - Alcoholics Anonymous (weekly)
  - Besides SSIC the is a SSIC Support Group (weekly)
  - Snap ED: Nutrition, Exercise and Education (weekly)
  - Human Services: overview Presentations (2 times a month)
  - Front Range Community College: Presentations on benefits of CC and going back to school for 2 year certificate, license or degree (monthly)

### Analysis

- **2004** - began early release of lower level offenders with good behavior at 75% of sentence.
- **2005 and 2006** - Pretrial Services added FTE’s resulted in reduced the percentage of pretrial inmates to 47.5% in 2013. (At this level or lower since 2007). Over 5,100 individuals have been screened at booking for pretrial release over the last 12 months with the number of individuals under supervision daily at 1200 to 1400.
- **2005 -2006** - Creation of the Alternatives to Incarceration for Individuals with Mental Health Needs (AIM). This reduced the jail bed days used by people with severe mental health issues by 3,500 jail bed days per year.
- **2006 – 2007** - Expansion of Larimer County Community Corrections to assist in moving diversion offenders out of the jail. This eliminated the wait time for those diverted from DOC to Community Corrections.
- **2007** - Mental Health Intervention Pretrial was initiated, which allows for 12 to 14 individuals who are released pretrial to receive services for their mental health issues. Services are coordinated for another 25 to 30 to receive other outpatient services.
- **2008** - Community Dual Diagnosis Treatment started with 12 individuals. By 2014 the capacity was up to 30. This was developed in conjunction with the Community Mental Health Provider (Touchstone), Health District of Larimer County, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Partnership. The program provides treatment housing and employment for individuals with MH and SA issues who are also high users of the criminal justice, emergency medical response and hospitals. [funded by Touchstone (Medicaid and SB97 dollars), Health District and Housing Authority vouchers].
- **2009 and in 2013** - Modifications to the Courts Judicial Administrative Order for bonding to allow more arrestees to post bond or be released on a PR or CO-PR bond Commissioners were directed by the court (Bond Commissioners are sworn court clerks).
- **2010** - Court began being notified if an individual could not make a set bond within 3 days of the bond being set to the case could be moved up if possible.
- **2010 -2011** - Planned and implemented DUI court to reduce the length of time 25 individuals spend in jail and receive treatment for their addiction.
- **2012 – 2013** - The Mental Health and Substance Abuse Committee along with the Health District sponsored additional CIT training for law enforcement officers.
- **2012** - Expansion of ASD (Alternative Sentence Department) to 164 Work Release beds and 160 Work Enders and space for Community Service, Electronic Home Detention and Pretrial Services. Current Work Release average daily population (ADP) for 2014 is 128. Work Enders program has seen lower numbers due to changes in the DUI laws so a portion of the area will be used for additional WR beds in the future.
- **2013** - The implementation of Strategies for Self Improvement and Change incorporated into Work Release. This is a three phased substance treatment program and only the first phase is provided in WR. However, 80% are who start in WR finish phases 2 and 3 in the community, which keeps them in compliance with sentences without being housed by the County.
- **2014** - Implementation of the Pretrial PRAXIS to determine if individuals who show up for court present the risk of committing new crimes if released pretrial. The objective is to get those who do not need to be in jail out on community supervision.
- **2014** - Establishment of the Wellness Court (Mental Health Court), which was designed to handle 35 individuals with a high needs mental health diagnosis. Central assessments by Touchstone and AIM/Wellness Court staff determine co-occurring issues and make a decision on which program they need to go to, including AIM, Wellness Court, Drug Court or traditional court track.
- **2014** - Expansion of Intensive Residential Treatment Program within Community Corrections to include those on Parole and Probation. This program is in lieu of being placed in jail or prison for violations. (24 new slots opened).
- **2014** - Expansion of the Short Term Residential Treatment program to allow Probation to send individuals to this program rather than jail or prison. (12 male beds.)
- **2014** - A portion of the money used for the Touchstone contract with the county was diverted to a case manager position assigned to the jail. This position assists those with mental health issues with outpatient services, employment and housing. Since 2014, 216 individuals have been assisted with services.
- **2014** - Other ASD programs aimed at keeping people out of the criminal justice system without over programming individuals that have been added. These include:
  - Men’s Relapse Prevention (weekly)
  - Women’s Relapse Prevention (weekly)
  - Alcoholics Anonymous (weekly)
  - Besides SSIC the is a SSIC Support Group (weekly)
  - Snap ED: Nutrition, Exercise and Education (weekly)
  - Human Services: overview Presentations (2 times a month)
  - Front Range Community College: Presentations on benefits of CC and going back to school for 2 year certificate, license or degree (monthly)
Forecast of Jail Capacity Requirements, 2017 - 2040

Forecasting is a process of providing an estimate of the future based on the best available information. Statistical techniques are used in creating forecasts, and excellent data has been provided by Larimer County describing the jail population over time. This data has been used in conjunction with official population projections for Larimer County developed by the State of Colorado. Accordingly, the projection of needed bedspace for the Larimer County Jail is based upon continued current practices in the local justice system, coupled with projected population increase through 2040. This projection would be impacted by unexpected events that could occur. The facility planning recommendations provide flexibility for the accommodation of changing bedspace needs in the future.

The magnitude of overcrowding is now requiring that Larimer County consider adding jail beds. According to the forecast in this document, at least 128 more beds are currently needed (in 2017) and the demand for bed space is expected to continue growing.

The at-risk population of homeless persons will continue to grow. The rationale for this assumption is based on the growth pattern in Figure 5.2.7, which indicates that the population of homeless persons will continue to grow. The County will continue to grow.

Other contributors to jail growth in the last two years include a 100% increase in felony drug cases. In addition, the Colorado Department of Corrections has increased the diversion of some categories of offenders who would have previously gone to prison. These offenders have been diverted to Larimer County Community Corrections (LCCC), which is also at capacity. As a result, the excess offenders, which can range in number from about 50 to 65, must wait in County jail for LCCC bed openings.

Although in the last 12 years, the County has implemented a wide range of alternatives to incarceration, such a pretrial release program, specialty courts, treatment programs, and local jail diversion programs, the demand for jail beds has outstripped the county’s ability to control inmate growth.

### Table: Forecast of Jail Capacity Requirements, 2017 - 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jail Bed Requirements</th>
<th>Forecasted Bed Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All forecasts for the future are based on assumptions. Multiple assumptions can be made about future growth. However, as the number of assumptions increases, the possibility of major variations also increases. Thus, trying to refine the precision of a forecast by adding numerous considerations and “what if’s” about changes in law enforcement activities, laws, court operations, and possible new programs is a self-limiting endeavor.

The anticipated growth shown in Figure 5.2.6 is substantial and relatively steep. Not detectable in the graph, because of the distortion caused by its small scale, is that the growth rate is slowing slightly from 2017 to 2040.

In creating the forecast of Larimer County Jail bed space needs, six assumptions were made:

1. The County will continue to grow.
2. The at-risk population of homeless persons will continue to grow. The rationale for this assumption is based on the growth pattern in Figure 5.2.7.
3. As the population grows so will the tax base for supporting various services, such as law enforcement.
4. Local calls from the public for law enforcement service will proportionally increase in relation to projected county growth rate.
5. The growth rate of the jail population will be linked to county population growth.
6. No unexpected events will occur that will drastically increase the demand for jail beds.

The longer a forecast extends into the future, the greater the possibility that unexpected events and variations in the environment will occur. Thus, a five- or ten-year forecast is more likely to be reliable than a twenty-year forecast. For this reason, jail design should always be configured to allow for expansion if and when major unexpected events occur that elevate the demand for jail beds.
The jail capacity forecast up to 2040 is shown in Figure 5.2.8. Importantly, the forecast is an approximation of needed capacity. It is based on the number of inmates, not how housing spaces are designed. Jails are not built to accommodate odd numbers of inmates. For example, main housing units, such as male minimum and male medium housing, are usually configured in 48-bed increments, with even number variations to either side. For this reason, a forecast that would involve the need for 40 more male medium beds does not represent the bed count that will actually be built – a 48-bed increment of male medium beds would be built.

The forecast is more than just the projection of inmate population growth. The calculation includes three additional considerations:

1. Providing sufficient housing on peak days when the inmate count is high.
2. Accommodating movement of inmates within the facility, such as to move inmates from medium classification beds into medical unit beds, when they become sick. This flexibility to move inmates within the facility is known as the “Management Factor.” It is also called the “Classification Factor,” depending on which jail planner you are speaking to. An explanation of how the projections are calculated is presented in Section 5.
3. Addition of a “Homeless Factor” to take into account the increasing growth of the homeless population in Larimer County and its impact on the jail.

Immediately noticeable in Figure 5.2.8 is the large gap between the current jail capacity (623) and the needed capacity (751) estimated for 2017. Sometimes the public interprets “current capacity” incorrectly. In that misperception, it is assumed that all 623 all beds would be filled before needing to transport inmates to out-of-county jails. For example, if there were empty beds in a female pod, then excess males in other areas could be placed in the female pod – which is an untenable idea. For this reason, it is irrational to assume that all 623 beds could be filled at any one time.

As might be expected, the growth pattern in Figure 5.2.8 is similar to the growth pattern of the adult county population. The forecast numbers are presented again in Table 5.2.1.

In summary, the following are key findings regarding jail adequacy:

- Based upon recognized jail management practices for prisoner housing assignments, the Larimer County Jail is estimated to have a 19% deficiency in current number of beds (613 beds vs. 751 beds).
- Based upon national norms in jail space allowances, the Larimer County Jail has an approximate 27% space shortage to support the current occupancy at 613 beds and approximate 40% space shortage to support the 2017 need for 751 beds.
- Jail bedspace projections suggest an approximate 4,500sf per year need for space increase, beyond the 2017 need, over the next 20 years to meet the 2,037 year projection.

Jail space programming is primarily tied to the volume of activity, in this case driven by the number of prisoners that need to be housed. Accordingly, the bedspace projections developed for Larimer County are incorporated in determining the amount of space needed at the five, ten, fifteen and twenty year intervals. Similar to the development of “court set” modules for the judicial space programming, space programming for the jail includes the development of “housing modules”. Each housing module includes prisoner housing at 48 bed capacity, and required day space, showers, interview/program support space, outdoor exercise and internal grossing. Recognized space standards for the different functions that are involved have been incorporated. The number of housing modules needed at the five, ten, fifteen and twenty year projections increments are tied to the jail bedspace need projections that have been developed. Finally, Sheriff Administration space projections are based upon SF/person growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Forecasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2.1 - Forecast of Capacity Requirements from 2017 to 2040 (Based on Number of Inmates)
Judicial Space Needs Projections

Parallel to the assessment of Jail space needs, attention has also been focused upon the Courts. Space needs for the Courts are directly linked to the authorization of personnel by the Unified State Court System. That authorization, in turn, is based upon available appropriations as voted by the state legislature and the evaluation by the Colorado Courts as to which jurisdiction has the greatest need. A basic feature of unified state court systems, throughout the country, is that the state provides funding for court operations and the local unit of government has the responsibility to provide the space to accommodate them.

At present, the Justice Center in Ft. Collins is authorized by the state to have one additional court and associated personnel subject to the availability of space to house the related operations.

Currently, the 8th Judicial District and its Larimer County Justice Center in Ft. Collins is 20% understaffed. In addition, space that is needed for its originally programmed functions has been reallocated to serve multiple purposes. And none of the existing spaces can be reallocated to accommodate the presently authorized additional court.

In addition, there is the potential that the two courts housed in Loveland may be relocated to Ft. Collins. This presents a three court space deficiency at the Judicial Center. However, timing will likely drive the decision to continue to house two courtroom sin Loveland.

Figure 5.2.9 displays Court case filings by case category between 2006 and 2016. Most significantly, while it shows a fairly uniform volume from year to year in civil, domestic relations, protective proceedings, probate-other, and mental health cases, criminal case filings reflect a greatly increased level of filings since 2014. This is significant for court space needs because it implicates a need for jury deliberation space, prisoner staging and holding areas, increased jury assembly space, attorney conferencing space and many other court support areas.

Staffing projections prepared by the Research and Data Unit of the Court Services Division of the Colorado State Court System are shown in Figure 5.2.10. They reflect need for an additional two courts in 5 years, three more in 10 years, and three more in 20 years. Taking into account a current deficiency of 3 courts in Ft. Collins, these needs add up to a total of eleven additional courts over 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Courtrooms</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Courtrooms Needed Today*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Courtrooms to Meet 20-Year Need</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COURTROOMS REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COURTROOMS REQUIRED IF LOVELAND COURTROOMS REMAIN</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes 2 courtrooms currently located in Loveland

Table 5.2.2 - Larimer County Courtroom Requirements
Some of the Justice facility components have current and projected space needs that are driven by the unique requirements of their operational requirements. Unlike other occupancies, such as administrative offices, their space needs are not solely the result of the number of staff positions, instead, they include special purpose spaces that accommodate very unique functions and a range of non-staff participants.

Accordingly, the analysis of space needs for the Larimer County Justice Center has been developed within the following guidelines:

- Court space, on a current and projected basis, is correlated to the number of courts that are approved for this jurisdiction by the state court system. This number, in turn, is directly related to the number of case filings and population growth in the service area. Space programming response to these circumstances involves the programming of “court sets”, each of which includes the judge’s chambers, court support personnel work space, conference space, courtroom, public gallery, attorney interview, witness waiting, secure holding, etc. For staff not included in the “court sets”, staff projections were based on data received from the Research and Data Unit of Court Services using the Colorado Judicial Branch’s Caseload Projection Methodology. This data reflects an approximate 12% growth overall in each five year projections increment. This percentage is used in projections of Justice departmental staff, unless otherwise noted, where growth is not directly generated by any particular “set” or “unit”.
- Other Criminal Justice departmental areas are similarly calculated. The Alternative Sentencing Department does not anticipate growing; and staff projections for administrative and non-residential activities are calculated at a 6% growth rate. Community Corrections does require growth in the number of beds, and Dorm "units" of space are reflected accordingly. Staff projections are correlated to these units. Non-residential program staff are projected on a 12% growth.
- District Attorney and Probation positions, similar to the Courts, are likewise approved and related to court case volume by the state. Programming incorporates recognized space standards for the various units involved as well as the information acquired through interviews with court personnel and inspection of existing facility spaces. Space projections are based upon SF/person growth.
- Five-, ten-, and twenty-year staffing need projections for Larimer County District and County benches were calculated using the Colorado Judicial Branch’s Caseload Projection Methodology. The methodology utilizes both regression and population ratios to estimate future filing levels.

Overall, the model is predicting modest growth in Larimer County trial court staffing need over the next twenty years. Based on the projection analysis, the areas anticipated to experience the greatest amount of growth in the next twenty years in Larimer County are Criminal (felony in particular), Civil (for both District and County), Domestic Relations and problem solving courts.

### Larimer County Staffing Projections Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FY17 Need</th>
<th>5-Year Projected Need</th>
<th>10-Year Projected Need</th>
<th>20-Year Projected Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Judicial Officer²</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>22.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Judicial Officer</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Trial Court Staff</td>
<td>35.49</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>45.87</td>
<td>55.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Trial Court Staff</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>28.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trial Court Staff³</td>
<td>59.16</td>
<td>66.52</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>84.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²FY17 Need is based on actual filings from April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016.
³The Colorado Judicial Branch's Caseload Projection Methodology was used to estimate the projected staffing need for Larimer County. Historical filings from 2005-2015 were extracted from the courts' case management system and population estimates were obtained from the Department of Local Affairs website.
⁴Chief Judge Addit is included.
⁵Staff Need does not include the law clerk and court reporter staff associated with each judgeship. Additionally, family court facilitator, self-represented litigant coordinator, problem solving court coordinator and protective proceedings monitor staff are not included in these projections.

Court Set

Figure 5.2.10 - Staffing Projections for Larimer County

Figure 5.2.11 - Example Court Set Diagram
### Space Needs Requirements

A summary of current, required and projected seat count and square footage by department/division is provided in Table 5.2.3. Details for each of these is provided in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION/DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Seat Count Equivalent</th>
<th>Seat Count Overall</th>
<th>Delta, 20-year</th>
<th>SF per seat</th>
<th>Gap Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1-year</td>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>10-year</td>
<td>15-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>860.0</td>
<td>1,074.1</td>
<td>1,240.3</td>
<td>1,294.0</td>
<td>1,405.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures for 201 La Porte do not include existing or projected parking or building common, however, the square footage has been included in cost estimates and phasing plans.

Table 5.2.3 - Criminal Justice Space Needs Projections
Criminal Justice functions require approximately 254,600 NSF additional space in 20 years. Approximately half of that is for the Jail. The Justice Center needs to increase by more than twice its current size in the same 20-year timeframe.

A gap analysis is used as a primary tool to identify what space needs issues need to be resolved when developing master plan options. This data tells us where growth will occur - by function and by location - and in what timeframe so that the plan can respond to both short- and long-term space needs accordingly. Figures 5.2.12 and 5.2.13 indicate projected increases in space required and total gap between current and 20-year space needs projections by function and by location.
5.3 Administrative and Operations Facilities

5.3.1 Benchmarks and Trends

Workplace Trends

Over the last 10 to 15 years, there have been significant shifts in what defines a “workplace” and in how people work within those environments. The early adopters of alternative workplace strategies were primarily private corporations while public sector employers continued with more traditional approaches to workplace design, organizational structure, and ways of working. In more recent years, the public sector has begun to evolve, more closely mirroring trends taking hold on the private side. Some of the key drivers of this include:

- A desire to improve space use efficiencies
- A need to attract and retain younger generation employees
- A recognition that many functions are becoming more mobile by preference or necessity supported by new technologies
- A need to reduce real estate and operating costs
- A desire to create a more flexible/agile workplace
- A responsibility to provide a healthy workplace for improved employee wellness

Various solutions can address the above trends, ranging from a simple densification of workspace by using smaller standards to a fully mobile workforce where no one has assigned space. Those that are the most successful take into consideration the specific culture of each organization, openness to change, desired and anticipated directions and vision for the future, and available budget.

The spectrum of approaches being applied in both public and private workplaces includes:

- Reassessing space standards in relationship to job function and space utilization recognizing that:
  - people on average are away from their desk 50+% of the time
  - flat screens are the norm and take up less worksurface space
  - paper storage is being reduced by electronic file storage
  - people are more mobile and may not be in the workplace every day
  - in general people meet in small collaboration spaces rather than larger conference rooms
  - real estate costs can be reduced by more efficient space use
- Shifting more of the total square footage from personal workspace (“me space”) to shared collaboration and amenity space (“we space”)
- Providing a choice of work settings to address different work style preferences which keeps employees engaged, appeals to younger generations, and recognizes that working at your personal desk may not always be the optimal and/or preferred work setting for work activities

While much attention has been given to the workplace preferences of millennial and Gen-Z generations, it is important to recognize that there are universal priorities too, as demonstrated in a recent comprehensive survey conducted by Capital One which asked 2,300 office based employees across a wide spectrum of organization types in five major cities (San Francisco, New York, Chicago, Dallas and Washington D.C.) what their priorities were for workplace design elements. Key findings were that, regardless of generation, job title and other variables, the most important element is natural light, followed by artwork and creative imagery, having configurable furniture and spaces, and having collaborative space.¹

Operations Trends

For County government, an important part of determining space needs is understanding how the services it provides are delivered to the public, its customers. Examples of this for Larimer County range from the reception area in the County Commissioners suite to the intake counter for Human Services. Two things rise to the top for priorities in facilities master planning related to this: making sure that services are geographically located to best serve the specific customer base; and enabling face to face contact when it does occur to be streamlined, effective and positive for both employees and customers. Larimer County has embraced a number of best practices into its service delivery but some of its facility designs have not kept up. The following are some examples where this has occurred:

- In the Courts Administration Building (200 West Oak), the primary building circulation on the first floor was not initially designed to be waiting space for Clerk and Recorder but after some procedural changes, it is now handling waiting customers effectively.
- On upper floors however, the initial design of reception areas was based on each suite having its own receptionist and this is no longer the staffing or operational model for most departments. In general, a single receptionist per floor could be sufficient. On those floors where there is more public traffic some departments continue to need their own customer service waiting and/or service counter (e.g. Community Development).
- The suite layout of the Oak Street building greatly reduces the flexibility to increase space use efficiencies in the building. Newer government buildings may have less hard wall divisions between departments in the “back of house” employee only spaces, even if the public side shows clear entrances or counters for each function. This increases the flexibility to change boundaries between functions as staffing levels grow and shrink. This suite configuration at Oak Street has resulted in some departments having surplus space as staffing has decreased because it is too costly and/or disruptive to remove suite walls.
- The Human Services Department is in multiple locations which goes against most best practice models of consolidating services into more of a “one-stop shop” model at a single location. Larimer County has adopted some of this model in that there are single points of entry and intake in each building. This could be further streamlined if all of the Department were in a single building.
- Larimer Human Services has also experimented with some alternative workplace strategies that are being employed in other government entities where less personal workspace is given to staff who spend the majority of their time in the field. While some organizations successfully have less than a 1:1 ratio of seats to people in this category, Larimer County has found that allowing each person their own assigned workspace is the preferred model but that those workspace footprints can be smaller.

- In general, Larimer County is not moving in the direction of instituting teleworking to the extent that it will impact space needs significantly in the near to mid-future. However, it will be considered as a longer-term strategy as space utilization is reassessed over time.
- There are departments and divisions that have large fluctuations in the number of visitors they receive either seasonally, or based on economic conditions including Elections, Assessor, Public Trustee, and Human Services which creates underutilized space during non-peak times. Many organizations are challenged with trying to increase space utilization. One solution is to make more spaces shared and multi-purpose. Some consideration can be given to how to make spaces that are high use only part of the time into usable space for others during the low demand periods.
Benchmarks

There are multiple sources for benchmarking data, much of which is more readily available for the private sector than for the public-sector workplace. Benchmarks specific to counties are not readily available, however, benchmarks for government space provides a relevant comparison, providing a means of comparison for Larimer County. Benchmarking from multiple sources must be considered with an understanding that definitions of space and metrics can be slightly different from study to study. A sampling of relevant benchmarks has been provided below. It should be noted that while in the past there was a consistent difference from public to private sector (public sector SF/seat has historically been higher), that gap is rapidly closing. The General Services Administration (GSA) has been aggressively lowering the SF/seat for federal government office space over the last decade, leading the charge in this direction.

- Over all Federal agencies, the target goals are 130-200 SF/person\(^1\)
- State benchmarks sampled from Colorado, Iowa, Oregon, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington range from 155-204 USF or SF/seat\(^2\)
- Private sector averages are generally 150-280 USF/seat\(^3\), with 67% of office space in the U.S. at 225 RSF/person or less\(^4\)

Workstation and office standards are getting smaller, resulting in these more efficient SF/person numbers. A decade ago a 64 ASF workstation was considered small. 80 ASF+ was more the norm. As desktop technology has gotten smaller, and people spend more time in collaborative settings, alternative workspaces and/or outside of the office, personal workspace has become only one of many places to work and it is shrinking. Many organizations have standardized on anywhere from 48-64 ASF workstations. Offices have gone from 150-200 ASF to 100-120 ASF for most positions and there are far fewer of them as the ratio of workstations to offices has gone from 60/40 to 80/20 in many current workplaces. This is illustrated in Figure 5.3.11.

“Huddle Rooms” are the preferred collaboration space in most work settings. As personal workspace shrinks and densifies, the need to provide small meeting spaces and increase the number of these becomes critical. A recent survey found that the most popular on-site “distributed work setting” was huddle or project rooms with 70% of respondents. The number of collaboration seats has been shown to increase in demand as personal workspace gets smaller and workplaces work in a more collaborative fashion. A case study analysis showed that a ratio of one meeting seat for every four assigned seats was optimal\(^4\).

In addition, “Focus Rooms” are essential in these environments to provide people with a more private and quiet setting to go to when their personal workspace is too distracting or not private enough for a personal conversation or conference call, etc.

Examples of these collaborative spaces are shown in Figures 5.3.6 - 5.3.8.

---

1 “Feds to feel the squeeze as cubicles and offices shrink”, Federal News Radio, July 31, 2014
2 “Portfolio Workplace and Space Optimization Study for the State of Oregon”, JLL, 2014
3 www://jll.com
4 “HOK Collaborates With IFMA on Workplace Strategy Research Report”, 5/30/17
Larimer County Standards

Larimer County has developed a comprehensive set of space standards with defined criteria and guidelines as to which job functions get which standards. Individual workspace standards are shown in Table 5.3.1. While most departments and divisions generally adhere to these standards, there are a number of areas where exceptions are made. This can be due to a lack of space, reducing square footage allocations, or an excess of space resulting in larger footprints than standard, and/or existing conditions that have not been modified to fit the standards (e.g., an existing private office that is “grandfathered in” rather than move walls to fit the standard).

The standards have been developed to be modular to increase flexibility. For example, the two primary office sizes are 120 and 240 so that two smaller offices can be combined to create a larger one and vice versa. There are, however, still eight different sized personal workspace footprints, which makes space planning less flexible than those organizations that have a more universal size. In addition, informal observation indicates that the most frequently used workstation size is approximately 64-80 sf. Relative to trends and benchmarks, this is larger than average. Industry best practices have shown that an approximate 56-64 sf workstation can work well for most job functions with variations in components within that footprint to serve differing work mode requirements. To that end, programming efforts for this master plan included analysis of the potential impact of converting to a more universal standard of 64 SF, and making circulation space more efficient. This analysis is illustrated in Figures 5.3.9 - 5.3.10.

Test Fits

Two suites within the Courts Administration Building (200 West Oak) were “test fit” to see what impact condensing floor plans would have on seating capacity. This analysis helps to extrapolate to what extent densities and therefore capacities in County buildings could be increased with a change in standards and configuration efficiencies. This analysis will apply more to downtown buildings than Midpoint, Blue Spruce, or Public Works facilities. This exercise demonstrates that reconfiguration may provide one strategy to accommodate growth.

Based on this analysis, a conservative estimate of potential increased seat capacity at the Oak Street building would be 25% with no other changes to the building configuration. As alternatives are developed this may be a consideration.

In addition, there may be some ability to capture surplus lobby space on some of the floors in the building to be office or support space. While this is not factored into the gap analysis, or utilization plans for the 200 West Oak Building, it has the potential to add approximately 2,000 NSF to the usable space in the building.

Test-Fit A

Engineering currently requires 30 seats but has 42, most of which are 9’x9’ workstations. By today’s standards, this is generous. The SF/seat in this suite is currently 242 (244 based on seats required). If no other changes were made to hard-walled spaces (such as offices and conference rooms), and the current amount of file and meeting space was maintained, an additional ten seats could be provided by going to a workstation footprint of 8’x8’ and by tightening circulation space. This is a 19% increase, reducing the SF/seat from 242 to 196. It should be noted that the recommendation for this department is 225 SF/seat based on a need for additional meeting space, a reduction from 244 as described above.

Test-Fit B

The Assessor’s Office currently requires 39 seats but has 52. These are predominately 7’x9’, with some 7’x12’. The circulation space in the suite is extensive. In this case, current standards would be kept much the same but a more efficient layout could provide an additional nineteen workstations - an increase of 27%. The current SF/seat is 230. Through reconfiguring, this could be reduced to 169 SF/seat depending upon the number of informal seating and meeting areas retained. It should be noted that the recommendation for this department is 242 SF/seat, a reduction from 307 as described above.
5.3.2 Space Needs Requirements and Gap Analysis

Seat Count

Over the last 15 years, Larimer County staffing numbers have grown 1.83% annually. This number was used for planning assumptions regarding growth in this analysis. For planning purposes, “Seat Equivalent” is used rather than FTE. This reflects the fact that, in general, within the County, part-time employees, interns, and temps each require a seat. This is a more accurate way to calculate space needs versus using FTE which can skew SF/person and personnel workspace requirements to be lower than what is actually required.

For most functions, seat equivalent was calculated in two ways: current (existing, regardless of unfilled but approved positions) and required (what is needed today, which may differ from what is currently available/in place). Five-year projections and 10-, 15- and 20-year projections follow. For Department Projections, the current, required and 5-year projections were provided by the departments. Projections beyond 5 years were calculated using the 1.83% per year factor. County Trend shows what seat count projections would be if the 1.83% factor were applied for all years beyond current. In some cases, these lines track with one another but there are some departments where these number differ significantly, such as in Community Development, the Coroner, Finance, and others. This may be because the Division or Department anticipates filling positions in the upcoming year, or because staffing is projected to spike due to a population increase or other trend. Explanations for these cases are provided in the individual division or department summaries. Projected seat count may be impacted by any trend. Explanations for these cases are provided in the individual division or department summaries. Projected seat count may be impacted by any trend. Explanations for these cases are provided in the individual division or department summaries.

Space Needs Requirements

A summary of current, required and projected seat count and square footage by department/division is provided in Tables 5.3.2 - 5.3.4 on the following pages. Details for each of these is provided in the Appendix.

SF/Seat

SF/seat was calculated in two ways. The first looks at this metric only in terms of departmental space, not including “Building Common” space. The second look at SF/seat for each building, including both departmental space and Building Common. There is a wide variation in SF/seat depending upon the department. This is because some departments have substantial amounts of “public” space within their departments that is not employee workspace but is critical to departmental operations. For functions that have large, non-office spaces such as warehouse space, vehicle storage, etc., the SF/seat is calculated only for office-related space.

A target SF/seat has not been set for Larimer County, however existing space utilization and space projections suggest that there is a range that is realistic for the County. Of the predominately office based departments, currently 9 out of 21 Departments/locations have a SF/seat under 200, 14 are under 250. The remainder typically have a requirement that is driving a higher SF/seat and/or have lost staff but maintained the originally designated space within their suite. If the County wants to be more in line with public sector benchmarks, a reasonable target would be an average, over all Departments, of 225. This would necessitate converting to slightly smaller standards as discussed in the Benchmarks and Standards sections. Otherwise, the average SF/seat based on current requirements, which is 267, is slightly higher than a reasonable cap at 250.

Administration Functions

The average SF/seat is currently 267. By rightsizing, the average SF/seat and assuming densification in a few office suites, this can be reduced to 248. The range from department to department is currently from a low of 114 to a high of 429 (the three exceptions are Coroner and Public Trustee that are higher than that and Emergency Management that is lower). The proposed range is from 126 to 427 (with only Public Trustee higher at 565).

Operations Functions

The average SF/seat for these functions is harder to calculate as staff and large operations spaces are often integrated. The data shows that there is a shortage of staff space that requires an increase in SF/seat for these functions. The average where it can be measured is currently 103 with a projected need of 140 SF/seat.

For criminal justice functions were based on data provided by the state Court Services, Jail Administrator and departmental personnel, rather than using historic growth percentages.

1 In some cases, a department or division provided growth projections based on internal forecasting data that superseded the standard 1.83% planning assumption. These exceptions are noted in the detailed assessments provided in the Appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Functions</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Clerk &amp; Recorder</th>
<th>C&amp;R - Elections</th>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>Coroner</th>
<th>County Attorney</th>
<th>County Manager &amp; BOC</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Emergency Management</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>H&amp;L Blue Spruce</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Health &amp; Environmental Protection</th>
<th>User Group Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current squadron Equivalent (NSE) SF per seat* Gap Analysis</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Facilities Master Plan - Larimer County, Colorado

### User Group Projections (Continued)

#### Department Functions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>1-year</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>10-year</th>
<th>15-year</th>
<th>20-year</th>
<th>% Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>On/Off Premises</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On/Off Premises</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On/Off Premises</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>1501 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55,210</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Common Projections

#### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>10-year</th>
<th>15-year</th>
<th>20-year</th>
<th>% Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Midpoint Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Midpoint Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gap Analysis

- n/a: Not applicable
- 46%: Proposed
- 35%: Required
- 30%: 15-year
- 25%: 10-year
- 20%: 5-year
- 15%: Proposed
- 10%: Required
- 5%: 15-year
- 2%: 5-year
- 0%: 15-year

**Table 5.3.2 (Continued) - Projections by User Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>10-year</th>
<th>15-year</th>
<th>20-year</th>
<th>% Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255 Midpoint Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 Blue Spruce Dr.</td>
<td>Meeting/Storage/Waiting</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>6,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.3.3 - Building Common Projections**
The three included in the cost estimates are the Laramie River, Loveland and Waverley satellites. These have been included in the cost estimates because three are already in the design phase of implementation.

2555 Midpoint Dr. (46-400 GSF)
2649 E. Mulberry St. #6
1730 E. Prospect
1701 Midpoint Dr.
1525 Blue Spruce (12-100 GSF)
58.0 60.0 62.3 72.3 92.0 125% 4,450 12,959 12,959 12,959 12,959 12,959 2,988.3 5,381 7,874 10,367 12,860 15,353 7,143 6,632 5,381 4,370 3,359 2,348 3% 0 0 4,450 12,959 12,959 12,959 12,959 12,959

Satellite Facilities*

1501 Blue Spruce (30,000 GSF)
36.0 17.0 20.0 23.0 26.0 43% 6,040 12,080 12,080 12,080 12,080 12,080 3,012.3 6,024 9,036 12,048 15,060 18,072 907 1,814 2,721 3,628 4,535 5,442 20% 0 0 6,040 12,080 12,080 12,080 12,080 12,080

BY BUILDING

Table 5.3.4 - Projections by Building

note: Space needs have been quantified for all six Road & Bridge satellite locations, however only three have been included in the cost estimates because three are already in the design phase of implementation. The three included in the cost estimates are the Laramie River, Loveland and Waverley satellites.
As stated previously, a gap analysis is used as a primary tool to identify what space needs issues need to be resolved when developing master plan options. This data tells us which departments are growing and in what timeframe so that the plan can respond to both short- and long-term space needs accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seat Count Equivalent</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>10-year</th>
<th>15-year</th>
<th>20-year</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Div/Dept</td>
<td>1,156.0</td>
<td>1,224.1</td>
<td>1,339.0</td>
<td>1,463.1</td>
<td>1,600.3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Trend</td>
<td>1,156.0</td>
<td>1,265.7</td>
<td>1,385.8</td>
<td>1,517.4</td>
<td>1,661.4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Footage (NSF) SF per seat</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Div/Dept</td>
<td>443,586</td>
<td>463,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Trend</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>491,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration Functions
These preliminary figures, based on data provided by each individual department or division, indicate that there will be space deficits as follows in the planning timeframe. Some of the near-term growth or decrease stems from “rightsizing” current deficits or surplus space. The remainder is a result of seat count growth (#’s include building common).

- **5 Years:** Approximately 25,460 NSF
- **10 Years:** Approximately 46,220 NSF
- **15 Years:** Approximately 68,280 NSF
- **20 Years:** Approximately 92,240 NSF, approximately 39%

Operations Functions
Similarly, the preliminary figures for Operations functions using Department based data indicate that there will be space deficits as follows in the planning timeframe.

- **5 Years:** Approximately 79,880 NSF
- **10 Years:** Approximately 81,350 NSF
- **15 Years:** Approximately 83,360 NSF
- **20 Years:** Approximately 85,470 NSF, approximately 83%

These gaps were also analysed by high-level functional groups, as shown in Figure 5.3.13. In the planning timeframe, by user group, the greatest amount of growth is occurring in operations in the first five (5) years, but by year 20 it is more evenly split between Operations and Administration, as shown in Figures 5.3.10 through 5.3.12.
**Gap Analysis By Building (including Building Common)**

Calculations were also analyzed by building for the gap between current and projected. These include “building common” space that is all inter-departmentally shared spaces such as conference rooms, reception/lobby areas, storage spaces etc. The current space was calculated using the best available drawings and/or the data available through facilities regarding total SF (where drawings were not available and/or space is leased vs. owned). These calculations are all on a net square footage basis. Growth requirements for existing occupants by building location, excluding operations facilities, are shown in Figure 5.3.14.

**200 West Oak Street**

The space shortfalls in this building differ depending upon which forecast method you look at. The Department based seat count shows a 20-year need for 571 seats vs. a need for 559 seats using County based data. Division- and department-based calculations show a shortfall in the building of approximately 42,900 NSF vs county-based calculations, which show a 38,720 NSF shortfall in the 20-year timeframe.

**Midpoint Campus**

The Midpoint campus includes five buildings housing non-Criminal Justice functions: Facilities, Human Services, Clinic, Elections and Road and Bridge (Probation is located within one of these buildings and is discussed in the Criminal Justice program analyses but included in this analysis).

Excluding Road and Bridge at 2643 Midpoint, these functions combined show a 20-year seat count growth of over 100 seats based on department-provided data. The anticipated 5-year space shortage is approximately 10,200 NSF based on department-provided data. The 20-year deficit combined is 32,000 NSF. Human Services represents the largest portion of this.

The Road and Bridge requirements for the 2643 Midpoint building show a 20-year gap of 10,000 NSF.

**Blue Spruce Campus**

The County functions residing in the two Blue Spruce buildings include Human Services, Extension and Health and Environment. In accordance with a campus master plan for The Ranch (produced under a separate contract outside of the scope of this project), Extension is expected to relocate to The Ranch in the 5-year timeframe. However, if occupants remained in the same location, combined, the 20-year seat growth for the existing departments is expected to be 94 seats using Department data, and 115 using County data. The five-year space deficit is projected to be approximately 9,300 NSF if using the department data. The 20-year space deficit is projected to be 28,000 NSF. The majority of this growth is split fairly evenly between Human Services and Health and Environment.

**Vine Street**

Fleet is the main occupant of this building with smaller outbuildings used by Weeds, Road and Bridge and Engineering. The seat count is anticipated to grow by 8. The space deficit in five years is projected to be 33,300 NSF and at 20 years the projected deficit is 35,130 NSF. This is due to space deficits primarily in the operations space vs. staff space where there are significant shortages currently. The by-building gap analysis looked at the Road & Bridge Midpoint building, Weeds facility and Vine Street combined. At 20 years, there is a deficit of 45,130 NSF.

**Fleet Satellite Maintenance Shops**

Road and Bridge has a minimal amount of satellite operations space today. The proposed space need assumes a significant upsizing of satellite facilities to include crew, operations and vehicle storage space at each location. Consequently, the gap analysis shows an increase from 32,000 NSF today (all satellites combined) to approximately 61,700 NSF in five years to meet the 20-year requirement, a gap of 29,700 NSF over 20 years.

*Figure 5.3.14 - Gap Analysis Comparison By Building*
Adjacencies

In addition to looking at space requirements, an analysis of critical adjacencies between County functions was also completed. This identified the most critical proximity requirements of each department or division, based on frequency of face-to-face contact and/or shared customers or shared spaces. Figure 5.3.15 represents the outcome of that analysis. While not all adjacency requirements can be met without some compromises, every effort was made in proposed solutions to meet the greatest number of these requirements.

Functions are grouped according to their most common or critical adjacencies, as defined by the departments and divisions.
RECOMMENDATIONS
### 6.1 Criminal Justice Facilities

**1. 2006 HOUSING CLUSTER**
- 48 cells/unit with option for single or double occupancy
  - **64,400** gsf with connecting circulation
  - **335** sf/prisoner @ single cell occupancy.
  - **168** sf/prisoner @ double cell occupancy.
  - **192** total population @ single occupancy.
  - **384** total population @ double occupancy.
  - **48** cells/housing module.
  - Dayroom standard of 35 sf/prisoner is met.
  - Standard for showers @ 1 per 8 prisoners is not met.
  - Blind areas at Housing Unit entrance.
  - Spread-out Housing Cluster configuration requires increased site coverage and increased connection circulation, travel distances and cost.

**2. 2006 ADJUSTED HOUSING CLUSTER**
- adjusted to 24 cells/unit and double occupancy
  - **49,100** gsf with connecting circulation
  - **256** sf/prisoner
  - **192** total population @ double occupancy.
  - **24** cells/housing module.
  - Control Center per Sheriff.
  - Dayroom standard of 35 sf/prisoner is met.
  - Standard for showers @ 1 per 8 prisoners is not met.
  - Blind areas at Housing Unit entrance.

**3. 2017 HOUSING CLUSTER**
- 24 cells/unit and double occupancy
  - **34,300** gsf with connecting circulation
  - **178** sf/prisoner
  - **192** total population @ double occupancy.
  - **24** cells/housing module.
  - Door control/monitoring at Central Control Center.
  - Dayroom standard of 35 sf/prisoner is met.
  - Standard for showers @ 1 per 8 prisoners is met.
  - No blind areas at Housing Unit entrance.
  - Compact Housing Cluster configuration allows reduced site coverage and reduced connection circulation, reduced travel distances and reduced cost.

---

Once space needs were defined and approved for Criminal Justice functions, the process of developing potential options for meeting the requirements began. A series of alternatives were tested prior to bringing a preliminary set of scenarios to the first of two alternatives development workshops. These initial workshops were held separately for Criminal Justice functions and for Administration/Operations functions.

### Jail Expansion Alternatives

A major objective in the Facilities Master Planning scope of work for Larimer County is to analyze the site requirements for needed facilities.

Because the functional requirements for jail facilities include meeting guidelines and standards for its various operational components, the size of a jail building “footprint” will be driven in large part by the sum of its parts. However, it will also be driven by the manner in which they are connected. The extent to which circulation space (corridors) is needed, and the distances involved in reaching destinations, directly impact not only building cost but staffing and operational cost.

Accordingly, consideration of the site area required to meet current and projected Larimer County Jail needs began by going inside the jail. And it has included the review and analysis of previous studies conducted for Larimer County.

Different jail module concepts were considered and compared with one developed in 2006, with the intention of creating a more optimal layout. They are illustrated in Figure 6.1.1.

The Housing Cluster in #1, at left, is from the 2006 study, and its attributes are summarized. In #2, its concept is adjusted to the Sheriff’s Department preference for 48 bed housing units, with corresponding changes in attributes. In #3, an alternative is proposed, for planning purposes, which delivers 48 beds in a more compact envelope. Its attributes are also listed.
The Jail Housing Module concept illustrated in the 3rd option, in dialogue with the Sheriff and Sheriff’s Office personnel, was furthered explored in terms of its potential to meet specific operational objectives. It is important to point out that the goal is not to develop detailed facility design at this stage, but rather to establish the basic organization of functional components, the structuring of movement patterns between them, and supervision strategies, in order to define space and site requirements overall.

Included in this analysis is the ability to have single staff observation of two housing units at night, reducing the staffing coverage from that needed during the day. Figure 6.1.4 indicates how this could be accomplished. It incorporates a mezzanine located post, with views to each of two housing units, and officer access available to the units on either side.

A basic feature in the proposed housing module concept is the decentralizing of certain program services close to the housing units. This reduces the amount of escorted movements and increases program access.

Another feature that is made possible with this particular Housing Module configuration is the ability to provide a range in housing unit types, making possible different housing assignment alternatives that respond to the individual needs of prisoners. Accordingly, within the basic module framework, a diversity of unit types can be delivered...from cell units with mezzanines, to cell units without mezzanines [single level], to dormitory units, either with or without mezzanines, at different increments of size.

These variations seek to be responsive to the varying population categories and functions within the confined population.

Features of the module illustrated in Figures 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 provide the following beneficial features:

- 48 beds on each side (96 beds per module)
- secure vestibule observation @ entry
- direct supervision management

Figure 6.1.2 - Housing Module Concept Study

Figure 6.1.3 - Housing Module Variation Options
Using the recommended module concept analysis, a building configuration was developed that could be completed in phases such that existing jail beds could continue to be used in the near term, with modifications to alleviate overcrowding and standards deficiencies issues. The proposed Phase I Jail expansion addresses the current shortage of beds, as well as providing capacity to meet the 20-year projection assuming continued use and major overhaul and updating of the existing Jail. Phase I new construction activity is located where it will not interfere with ongoing daily operations during construction. Upon its completion and occupancy, renovation of the existing facility can occur.

In the first phase, existing support spaces [outlined in green] will need to remain in use substantially in order to support the existing jail units still occupied. New support space will be built in two phases, as illustrated to the left. In the first phase, new space will include intake/booking, property, holding, infirmary, control center, kitchen expansion, laundry expansion, multi-purpose space and sallyport. De-centralized program space such as classrooms, visitation, video arraignment and other spaces will be part of both Phase I and Phase II support space additions.

Phase II Jail expansion meets the 20-year bedspace projection without reliance and overhaul/updating expenditures to the oldest portions of the existing Jail, provided that Phase II is undertaken directly upon the completion and occupancy of Phase I. As in Phase I, Phase II new construction activity is located where it will not interfere with ongoing daily operations during its construction. With the elimination of the old Jail, contemporary facility standards and guidelines can be met and operational efficiencies attained with the new construction. Should existing bed units continue to be in use until 20 years or beyond, Phase II provides capacity beyond 20-year projections. The dotted line footprints indicate there is growth space beyond Phase II if needed.

Once the new support space is constructed in Phase I, existing support space can be reconfigured and remodeled to transition to long-term use for kitchen, staff lockers, briefing, maintenance, visitation and storage.

The implementation scenario that is described on this page presents a staged sequence of events that delivers the needed jail beds. This delivery is based upon the projection of needed bedspace at 5-year, 10-year, 15-year and 20-year increments.

This scenario recognizes the obsolescence of the existing facility and the goal to deliver needed new beds in a manner that allows the earliest phased vacating of the existing facility, avoiding the expenses that would come with needed upgrades and systems replacements in continued 20-year occupancy.

Accordingly, there are two primary phases with two sub-phases, each timed at five-year increments. Each recognizes and responds to the jail population projections that are anticipated during this total time period, as presented in this report.
Justice Center Expansion Alternatives

Based on the space needs program developed and gap analyses presented in the previous section, multiple alternatives were developed for expanding the existing Justice Center to accommodate current and future requirements.

The site plan in Figure 6.1.7 shows the current Justice Center site and adjacent properties. In the pages that follow, the alternatives for meeting the current and projected needs of the Larimer County Justice system at the Justice Center site are presented.

During the Master Planning work sessions with the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, consideration was given to other locations for meeting the programmed functional and space needs. However, certain factors prevailed in leading to the recommendation to pursue the accommodation of these needs at the current site. They are:

- Locating space for current and projected needs at secondary or other locations would bring with it wayfinding difficulty and inconvenience for the public in accessing needed services.
- Operational efficiency is attained by co-locating the justice system service agencies and components at one location.
- It will be less costly to update and expand the existing Justice Center than to undertake replacement at another location.
- The Justice Center contributes to the vitality of downtown Ft. Collins and brings a presence and expression of its role in the Community at this highly focal location.

Two primary alternatives were developed. One utilizes property already owned by the County to the West of the existing facility. The second assumes that City-owned property to the south of the existing facility can be obtained. At the time of this document’s publication, the viability of obtaining that property is still being explored. Therefore, both options are presented here as realistic ways to meet County needs. There are pros and cons to each.

Following preliminary review of these two options, the South Option was developed further to propose a feasible phased implementation plan, allowing some courtrooms to be constructed as core/shell and fit out as judges come online for the County.

If the West Option is pursued, a similar phasing plan will need to be explored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>West Scheme</th>
<th>South Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains existing pedestrian walkway west of Justice Center</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains existing parking lot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizes existing structure for new entry/screening</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion maintains village green area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land acquisition required for expansion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Assembly located on first floor minimizing movement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom 1A reconfigured with additional support area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of offering Court Support locations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional judicial parking delivered</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The District Attorney’s 20 year need delivered on one floor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Court operations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(see information below)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommended as Preferable

West Scheme: There is a total of 8 floors of court operations. (1) courtroom on floors 1 & 2, (7) on floors 3 & 4, (6) on floor 5, (3) on floors 6 & 7 and (1) on floor 8

South Scheme: There is a total of 5 floors of court operations. (1) courtroom on floor 1, (4) on floor 2, (8) on floors 3-5

Note: Both schemes deliver 20 year requirements for the Courts. The following information focuses on areas of comparison between the two schemes.
**West Expansion Option**

- Justice Center expansion is located to the West on County-owned property.
- Potential for connected parking deck to the South with acquisition of property, or if developed by the City.
- Existing pedestrian North-South pedestrian walkway requires relocation.
- One entrance to the West parking lot is converted to Sheriff’s vehicle entrance. (West parking lot loses one entrance/exit).
- Existing Plaza level arcade is converted for new Public entrance with security screening.
- Building modifications made at the corner of La Porte Avenue and N. Mason Street to eliminate the need for doors and the appearance of a public entry.
- Expansion reduces the current size of the park green space of this city block, which would be further reduced if a parking deck is built.
- Eight-story building height surpasses 5-story existing Justice Center height.

**South Expansion Option**

- Justice Center expansion is located to the South on immediately adjacent property.
- Property acquisition from the City is required for this option.
- Potential connected parking deck to the West on County-owned property.
- Existing driveway on Mountain Avenue used for entrance to Sheriff’s Sallyport.
- One entrance to the West parking lot is converted to Parking deck entrance/exit if the deck potential is pursued.
- Existing Plaza level arcade is removed and a new Public entrance with security screening is constructed.
- Building modifications made at the corner of La Porte Avenue and N. Mason Street to eliminate the need for doors and the appearance of a public entry.
- Park green space is preserved.
- Five-story building height aligns with the existing Justice Center.
West Option

At THE FIRST FLOOR:

- Probation moves into the West expansion.
- Courtroom 1 F A’s support is reconfigured and staff relocated gaining additional waiting area and two (2) conference rooms.
- Courtroom # 1B is relocated.
- Clerk expands into existing probation and entry space.
- Additional Clerk/Self-help space is gained to the South.
- Common area (training lab and lounge) directly adjacent to public entrance.
- Existing sidewalks are shown in this and other plans as a matter of reference. It should be expected that there would be site development and landscaping design in a later phase. It is not a part of the present focus.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
AT THE BASEMENT:

- A new Sheriff's Sallyport and Holding area is created in the West expansion at a lower elevation than the existing Basement to allow use of larger transport vehicles, a lesser number of trips and more cost-effective operation.
- The existing Sallyport and Sheriff's access from N. Mason St. is retained for special prisoner transport needs.
- The existing Judicial parking access from La Porte Ave. is retained and continues in operation throughout expansion construction phases.
- Approximately seven (7) additional Judicial parking spaces are created in the Garage.
- The amount of additional Judicial parking attained is far less than needed to support the number of new Courtrooms required.
Recommendations

At the second floor:

- A new elevator [blue] is located adjacent to Jury Assembly to enable Juror candidate movements to Courts without mixing with the public.
- Jury Assembly, Judicial Administration and District Attorney move into the new West expansion.
- Restricted staff elevator [blue] and corridor [pink] is provided above Courtroom #2.
- Courtroom #2A remains.
- Courtroom #2B is re-located.
- District Attorney occupies remainder of the Second Floor.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
AT THE SECOND FLOOR - Parking Option:

- This plan illustrates the ability for the District Attorney staff to have a secure circulation path to the parking area if a parking deck is constructed by the County. These staff are frequently working at night.
At the Third Floor:

- Existing Courtrooms #3-#6 remain with support areas.
- New larger High Profile Courtroom #15 provided in expansion with support areas.
- New Courts #16 and #17 provided in expansion with support areas.
- New public counter provided at Courts #15-#17 for judicial staff interaction.

Figure 6.1.14 - Justice Center West Expansion Option, 3rd Floor

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
At the fourth floor:

- Existing Courtrooms #7-#10 remain with support areas.
- New Courts #18, #19 and #20 provided in expansion with support areas.
- New larger High Profile Courtroom #18 provided in expansion with support areas.
- New public counter provided at Courts #18-#20 for judicial staff interaction.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
AT THE FIFTH FLOOR:

- Court Support (problem-solving court, family court, civil returns and outside agency work areas), is located on this floor.
- Courtrooms #11–#14 remain.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
At the Sixth Floor:

- Concept provides for shelling in area for future Courts #23-#25

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
At the seventh floor:

- This concept requires a 7th and 8th floor if Loveland courts are relocated to Fort Collins.
- 10-20 year courts needs could be constructed as core/shell only to delay expenditures on fitting out “court sets” until they are needed.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.

Figure 6.1.18 - Justice Center West Expansion Option, 7th Floor
At the Eighth Floor:

- Concept provides for core and shell area for future Court #29, similar to 7th Floor.
- If the County Attorney were to move into the Justice Center, additional area would be constructed on this level.
- 6th, 7th and 8th floor profile would be above the existing 5-story Justice Center building height.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
South Option

At the first floor:

Phase I:
- Clerk and Self Help areas in existing facility expand
- Courtrooms 1A and 1B remain
- New Construction in Phase I includes new lobby and screening, new Probation office, Court Support areas, new Jury Assembly and Judicial Administration

Phase II:
- Includes expansion/remodel of Clerk/DA areas in the existing facility, modification of Courtroom 1A and elimination of current Courtroom 1B

Figure 6.1.20 - Justice Center South Expansion Option, 1st Floor
At the basement:

Phase I:
- Existing parking remains
- Corridor connector is remodeled
- New wing includes new Sallyport, holding area, judicial parking, mechanical and storage space

Phase II:
- Potential to add new parking and repurpose existing holding in the existing building basement areas
AT THE SECOND FLOOR:

Phase I:
• DA’s office expands for 10-year requirement
• Courtrooms 2A and 2B remain
• Core and shell space is constructed for future DA expansion and Courtrooms 17, 18, 19 and 20

Phase II:
• DA expands
• Core/shell courtrooms are completed

Figure 6.1.22 - Justice Center South Expansion Option, 2nd Floor
At THE SECOND FLOOR - Parking Option:

- This plan illustrates the ability for the District Attorney staff to have a secure circulation path to the parking area if a parking structure is constructed. These staff are frequently working at night.

Note: Courtrooms are numbered to indicate their quantity, and not by function.
AT THE THIRD FLOOR:

Phase I:
- Courtrooms 5, 6, 7 and 8 remain in existing building
- Two (2) new courtrooms (#21 and #22) are constructed
- Core and Shell construction of Courtrooms 23 and 24

Phase II:
- Core/shell courtrooms are completed

Figure 6.1.24 - Justice Center South Expansion Option, 3rd Floor
Phase I:
- Courtrooms 9, 10, 11 and 12 remain in existing building
- Core and shell construction of Courtrooms 25, 26 and 27 as well as relocated Courtroom 2

Phase II:
- Core/shell courtrooms are completed
Recommendations

AT THE FIFTH FLOOR:

Phase I:
- Courtrooms 13, 14, 15, and 16 remain in existing building
- Construct core and shell for new/relocated courtrooms 3 and 4

Phase II:
- Core/shell courtrooms are completed
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Other Criminal Justice Facilities

Larimer County is currently considering some financial and operational changes to its Community Corrections and Alternative Sentencing programs. For example, Community Corrections currently requires County subsidy dollars to operate, and may need to be reconsidered for budgetary reasons. If operations continue status quo, expansion will be required. Recommendations for these facilities assume a continued operation. New construction of women’s facilities will allow for expansion in the existing men’s facilities.

Recommendations are as follows:

1. Expand the Alternative Sentencing Department facilities at 2307 Midpoint Drive, opening a separate Women’s wing on the Midpoint campus, as illustrated in Figure 6.1.28. While other sites could be considered, the Midpoint location brings no site acquisition costs and has the benefit of food and laundry services already on-site. Additional administrative space needed to support ASD operations is recommended to be incorporated in this same expansion.

2. Supplement Community Corrections, 2255 Midpoint Drive, with a new Women’s Facility, as illustrated in Figure 6.1.28. It is recommended to be located at the Midpoint campus, as with the proposed ASD women’s unit, because this brings no site acquisition costs and has the benefit of food and laundry services already on-site.

3. Accommodate growth for AIM, located at 2555 Midpoint Drive, Fort Collins, as illustrated in Figure 6.1.29, to be supplemented by an office location in the Loveland area (currently slated for the Loveland Courts facility).

4. Consolidate most of Probation to 2555 Midpoint Drive. This ideally includes the probation office at 205 6th St., Loveland, which is recommended to be closed.

Recommendations

Final recommendations for Larimer County Criminal Justice facilities are as follows:

1. Connect Sheriff’s Administration Office, 2501 Midpoint Drive, and the Larimer County Jail for the operational benefits this would bring, together with the expansion of the jail and the infill of the space between them. The jail expansion is recommended to have two (2) phases as described in this report, with the first phase immediately needed. Phase II is recommended to follow in as short a time as fiscally feasible in recognition of the outdated conditions in the oldest part of the original jail construction and its inability to properly support jail needs in the years ahead.

2. Expand the Alternative Sentencing Department facilities at 2307 Midpoint Drive, as described in this report, opening a separate women’s wing on the Midpoint campus.

3. Supplement Community Corrections, 2255 Midpoint Drive, with a new Women’s Facility as described within this report.

4. Accommodate growth for AIM, located at 2555 Midpoint Drive, Fort Collins, to be supplemented by an office location in the Loveland area (currently slated for the Loveland Courts facility).

5. Expand the Justice Center, 201 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins per the South expansion option, as described in this report, as this option provides the greatest advantages.

6. Consolidate most of Probation to 2555 Midpoint Drive. This ideally includes the probation office at 205 6th St., Loveland, which is recommended to be closed.

7. Accommodate District Attorney growth at 201 LaPorte Ave., Fort Collins, within the expanded Justice Center as recommended within this report. Depending upon the possible future relocation of the two (2) existing Courts in Loveland, the District Attorney offices at 810 East 10th, Loveland are recommended to either remain in Loveland or be relocated with the courts in Fort Collins.
Alternatives Considered

Once space needs were defined and approved for all County functions, the process of developing potential alternatives to meet the requirements over time began. A series of alternatives was tested prior to bringing a preliminary set of scenarios to the first of two alternatives development workshops. These initial workshops were held separately for Criminal Justice functions vs. Administration/Operations functions.

Numerous preliminary options were developed and presented for feedback to the County representatives in the first of two workshops for County Administration and Operations functions. These were then narrowed down for further refinement. Options were explored by operational criteria (e.g. meeting adjacency or service delivery requirements) and by building locations, using the gap analysis data as one key driver. Some of the key considerations included the following questions derived from visioning, goals and objectives, facility conditions assessments and existing owned vs. leased County facility status:

- Is Vine Street viable for reuse either for Fleet facilities or some other use?
- Are the Blue Spruce Buildings of value long term given their poor condition?
- Can the Blue Spruce campus be repurposed?
- Can the County reduce its inventory of leased space, particularly at the Midpoint campus?
- What functions are most critical to remain at 200 West Oak as the building is outgrown?
- Should or can 200 West Oak be expanded?
- What is the best way to accomplish a consolidation of Health & Environment and Human Services?
- How and where can customer service delivery be improved as an outcome of moves and reconfigurations?
- How can flexibility for the County facilities overall be improved?

A final set of alternatives was presented to the same group of department representatives in a second workshop. These were collectively fine-tuned to result in a list of final recommendations that still has several potential variables that will be impacted by funding approval and timing, the ability to acquire land that meets criteria established, whether actual seat count growth rates mirror those that have been projected, and unforeseen circumstances. The spectrum of the eight initial options explored is outlined on the following pages and diagrammed in Figures 6.2.1 through 6.2.7.

OPTION 1: Human Services consolidates and grows at the Blue Spruce campus. Variables within this to keep Extension and/or Health and Environment at the site with Human Services or not, and to use existing buildings as well as new construction were explored.

OPTION 2: Human Services consolidates and grows at the Midpoint campus. Variables within this were explored to build a new County owned building, keep or vacate leased space. Options to backfill of Blue Spruce as a result of Human Services potentially relocated were also considered.

OPTION 3: Human Services consolidates and grows at new location requiring acquisition of new property. Variables to backfill or vacate some space at either or both Blue Spruce and Midpoint were explored.

OPTION 4: Leave Human Services split between Midpoint and Blue Spruce. New construction and relocations of other groups to accommodate growth of Human Services at one or both of those campuses were explored.

OPTION 5: Expand 200 West Oak to accommodate growth for all or most of the functions already housed in that building. Options were explored that included structured parking as well.

OPTION 6: Construct a new facility in an unspecified location to house “customer service” functions that are currently within 200 West Oak. These functions would include Assessor, Treasurer, Clerk and Recorder, Community Development, Engineering, Workforce Center, and Veterans Services.

OPTION 7: Keep Vine Street to house some of the central Fleet facilities only, without consolidating all of central Fleet functions.

OPTION 8: Consolidate central Fleet functions at a new site, likely requiring an acquisition, and repurpose Vine Street for other County functions or sell the property.

The workshop participants were asked to vote on these options and then break into teams to develop their own hybrid options and explain to the larger group the pros and cons of these.

The outcome of these discussion resulted in a modified set of directions and preferences that the consultant then validated for the second workshop. These included the following:

- Vacate Vine Street and create new Fleet facility for Fleet, Road & Bridge, Weeds, Facilities Shop – reuse or sell the property
- Consolidate Human Services and construct new space to accommodate growth at either Blue Spruce or a new location
- Reuse or sell Blue Spruce campus if reusing, remodel only one of the two buildings, and construct new on adjacent County-owned parcel if feasible
- Create a new facility for “Internal Services,” leaving customer facing functions at 200 West Oak within existing building footprint/envelope
- Vacate Midpoint leased space over time
- Reduce the total number of site locations for County services system wide

The workshop concluded with presentation of a modified version of the Board’s decision to recommendation for County Commission approval.
Recommendation 1

Because it was determined that it is not desirable to expand the current building footprint on site, the recommendation is to convert 200 West Oak Street to a County Services Building to house all of the departments and divisions that have regular interface with public customers. Create a new location for “Internal Services” - those departments and divisions that do not have regular interface with public customers - so that no expansion is required at West Oak Street for at least 15 years. When the County Services functions have expanded enough to fill the building, it will be beneficial to consider a new location for one or more departments or divisions, such as the Workforce Center.

A series of block and stack plans of 200 West Oak was created to illustrate the impact of these strategies on the building over time. Current and 20-year stack plans are provided in Figures 6.2.2 and 6.2.3. Additional information is provided in the Appendix.

Key Considerations

- 20-year requirements for customer service functions will fit
- Most groups can stay in their current locations with only select groups moving
- Short term (until Internal Services move out) implementing a “densification strategy” will be needed to avoid moving groups out temporarily

Variables

- Postponement beyond 10 years for an Internal Services Building would require some groups to move to temporary space
- OR require a possible move of the Workforce Center, Veterans Services and potentially Economic Development to a new long-term location

Critical Timing

- 1-5 years: densify the building using smaller standards and capturing underutilized space
- By 10 years: build a new Internal Services building and move those function out of 200 W. Oak Street; this results in contingency space in the building through 15 years; by 20 years the building will have a deficit
- By 20 years: consider moving Workforce Center
Recommendation 2

Construct a new Internal Services Building, allowing those departments and divisions that have regular interface with public customers to remain in 200 West Oak Street without requiring expansion to that building.

Site plan test fits were also created to test the ability for Vine Street (Figure 6.2.4) and the Blue Spruce Campus (Figures 6.2.5 and 6.2.6) to accommodate Internal Services and its parking requirements. At Vine Street:

- 73,700 GSF required for Internal Services
- 4-story building height limit per Vine Street site zoning
- 4-story building w/ 18,400 GSF footprint

If at another site, assuming a 4-story building with at-grade parking (instead of a parking structure), the same GSF would be required, equating to a need for a 2.3-acre site. The requirement would be slightly smaller with a taller building and slightly larger with a shorter building.

While not recommended, if funding constraints result in the selection of the Blue Spruce campus to house Internal Services, the two existing buildings could accommodate all of the necessary departments and divisions.

Key Considerations

- Moving Internal Services out of 200 W. Oak St. is the favored option so that those functions with the greatest public contact remain in the most publicly accessible, downtown location
- Both Vine St. and Blue Spruce sites can be considered but consolidation of County functions into fewer sites is a key goal

Variables

Internal Services can go one of two places:

- To Blue Spruce without Health & Human Services: either occupying both existing buildings after remodel OR in a new replacement building
- To Blue Spruce with Health & Human Services in a new facility
- To Vine Street in a new stand-alone facility with room on site for future growth if needed

Critical Timing

- 1-10 YRS: Densify and remain in W. Oak Street
- By 10 years: In order to release pressure at 200 W. Oak St., Internal Services need to move in to the new facility at 10 years
- 20+ years: Blue Spruce may not have growth space beyond 20 years if Health & Environment and Human Services are all at that campus
Recommendation 3

Consolidate Human Services and Health & Environment at a single location. Relocate Extension to The Ranch.

Site plan test fits were created to test the ability for the Blue Spruce Campus to accommodate Health & Environment and Human Services with or without Internal Services as shown in Figure 6.2.6. In the scenario, a new building is constructed in the open space adjacent to 1525 Blue Spruce (note: easement constraints in the open space have been observed). Human Services functions consolidate within the new building and Health and Environment grows in place and in the new building. 1501 Blue Spruce is then demolished. If it is determined that Internal Services should be located at this site, a new building is constructed in place of the demolished building to house these functions.

- 137,370 GSF new construction required for Health & Environment and Human Services with reuse of 1525 Blue Spruce building (175,720 total requirement)
- 3-story building height limit per zoning
- 3-story building w/ 45,790 GSF footprint

If Health & Environment and Human Services relocate to a new site, yet to be identified, it would require 3.3 acres (assuming a 3-story building) to allow for some growth beyond 20 years. The short-term strategy at Midpoint to buy time for funding and design of this facility includes moving a portion of the Human Services functions at Midpoint to the new Loveland facility, backfilling what is vacated with Human Service growth and some of the functions currently at 2555 Midpoint. This will allow Probation to grow into vacated space in that building for the long term.

Key Considerations
- HHS consolidation reduces the total number of County locations and centralizes services significantly for HHS clients
- Depending on the preferred variable, it may place HHS in a location more central to the County population as it shifts slightly southward
- It is essential that Human Services and Health & Environment remain co-located
- This allows Midpoint leased space to be released

Variables

Two options are feasible:
- Construct a new Human Services building at Blue Spruce side by side with Health & Environment housed in one of the existing buildings. This site may also support the Internal Services building
- Move HHS (with Extension if needed) to a new location requiring land acquisition and sell the Blue Spruce site if not used by Internal Services
- Move Extension to the Ranch

Critical Timing
- 1-5 YRS: With some shuffling of spaces and extension of leased space at the Midpoint Campus, Human Services can remain there until the 5 yr. timeframe
- BY 5 YRS: HHS functions will have outgrown available space at both Midpoint and Blue Spruce, requiring a new facility
- 20+ YRS: Growth space at the preferred site should be planned for beyond 20 years

Figure 6.2.6 - Blue Spruce Site Option for Health & Environment and Human Services
Recommendations
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Figure 6.2.7 - Midpoint Site Timeline

- **2555**: Owned
  - Probation - grow in place
  - AIIM - no growth
  - Human Services - partially relocate to 2601
  - Elections - no change
  - Facilities Shop - relocate to new Fleet facility

- **2573**: Leased
  - Human Services - no change until new facility is built

- **2601**: Leased
  - Wellness Clinic - relocated to 2555
  - Human Services - additional seats relocated from 2555

- **2619**: Leased
  - Clerk & Recorder (Elections) - no change

- **2643**: Leased
  - AIIM - no growth
  - Human Services - relocate to new facility
  - Wellness Clinic - relocated to 2555
  - Clerk & Recorder (Elections) - relocate to new Fleet facility

- **2555**
  - Probation - grow in place
  - AIIM - no growth
  - Human Services - partially relocate to 2601
  - Elections - no change
  - Facilities Shop - relocate to new Fleet facility

- **2573**
  - Human Services - no change until new facility is built

- **2601**
  - Wellness Clinic - relocated to 2555
  - Human Services - additional seats relocated from 2555

- **2619**
  - Clerk & Recorder (Elections) - no change

- **2643**
  - AIIM - no growth
  - Human Services - relocate to new facility
  - Wellness Clinic - relocated to 2555
  - Clerk & Recorder (Elections) - relocate to new Fleet facility

- **2555**
  - Probation - grow in place
  - AIIM - no growth
  - Human Services - partially relocate to 2601
  - Elections - no change
  - Facilities Shop - relocate to new Fleet facility

- **2573**: Discontinue lease
  - Human Services - relocate to new facility (maybe by year 5)

- **2601**: Discontinue lease
  - Wellness Clinic - relocated to 2555
  - Human Services - relocate to new facility (maybe by year 5)

- **2619**: Discontinue lease
  - Clerk & Recorder (Elections) - relocate to new Internal Services facility

- **2643**: Previously vacated

- **5 YEARS**

- **10 YEARS**
Recommendation 4

Identify a new property location and design and construct a new central Fleet facility to house central Fleet services and support functions including Road and Bridge and Weeds. The Facilities Shop will also co-locate with these facilities. The new location should provide ease of access from major traffic arteries, such as Interstate 25, and should consider surrounding zoning and land use. It will need to be a minimum of 30 acres in size.

**Key Considerations**
- The Vine St. location will not fit all of these functions once they are “rightsized” to meet current and future requirements
- A 30-acre site is required to house these functions and will need to be identified for purchase which provides an opportunity to move to a location more central to the County
- Satellites at Laramie River, Loveland, and Waverly need to be expanded and/or replaced

**Variables**
- Exact site requirements for a new site may vary depending upon the configuration of sites available
- Vine Street can either be sold, or redeveloped for use by Internal Services

**Critical Timing**
- 1-5 YRS: This is considered to be a priority and should be implemented in the five year timeframe
- BY 10 YRS: Depending upon the direction decided re: the location for Internal Services, Vine Street would need to sold or redeveloped in the 5-10 year timeframe
- BY 20 YRS: Ops to grow in place at new location

note: At the time of publication, satellites at Estes Park, Livermore and Stove Prairie are in design for replacement.

Recommendation 5

Vacate leased space at Midpoint over 10 years, as shown in Figure 6.2.7 on the following page. Maintain only the owned space (2555 Midpoint) for use by Criminal Justice-related functions.

**Key Considerations**
- The ability to vacate leased space is dependent upon how quickly new Health & Environment, Human Services, Fleet and Internal Services space is created.
- There is no contingency space on this campus for growth for any of the functions except Human Services if some functions move to Loveland, and this is short-term growth only
- Probation & EOC cannot grow until HHS moves out

**Variables**
- There are no variable options here other than those created by default by the relocation of other functions on the campus

**Critical Timing**
- Human Services staff that has been identified for relocation to the new Loveland facility must move first for other Human Services moves to occur
- New Fleet facility must be constructed to discontinue lease for Road and Bridge at 2643 and to relocate the Facilities Shop

Midpoint for CJ functions

VACATE 2655 LEASE

RELOCATE 2601 HS FUNCTIONS TO LOVELAND

BACKFILL 2601 WITH PROB & EOC GROWTH. MAINTAIN 2573 UNTIL HS BDG BUILT

MOVE SOME HS FROM 2555 TO 2619 TO FREE UP GROWTH SPACE FOR PRODUCTION

CONTINUE LEASING 2619 UNTIL INT. SVCS BDG IS BUILT (Assume Prospect is kept)

RELOCATE PUB WKS & FAC. SHOP - RELEASE 2643 LEASE BY 5 YRS

REDEVELOP VINE ST FOR INTERNAL SERVICES

UPGRADE, EXPAND SATELLITES

SELL PROPERTY

Vacate leased space at Midpoint over 10 years, as shown in Figure 6.2.7 on the following page. Maintain only the owned space (2555 Midpoint) for use by Criminal Justice-related functions.
6.3 Phasing Plan and Estimates of Probable Cost

The cost estimate timeframes and escalation are based on the approximate timeline described in Figure 6.3.1. Because rates of growth may differ from what has been projected and funding may or may not be approved within the proposed timeframes, projects are shown within a five year window with escalation calculated for the last year in each timeframe (at 5, 10, 15 and 20 years). Where there is more than one option available to meet a space need, all options are shown on the timeline and labeled as being one of multiple options.
### ADMIN/OPS ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Expansion/Improvement</th>
<th>5 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>15 Yr</th>
<th>20 Yr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacted/Reconfigure 200 W. Oak Ave 1-10, Relocate Interior Space at Yr 10</td>
<td>$4,707,000</td>
<td>$2,780,000</td>
<td>$2,142,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct New HHS Building at Blue Spruce at Yr 5, with some Core/Sell Out at Yr 10</td>
<td>$41,207,000</td>
<td>$7,163,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$48,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct New Interior Core Building at Blue Spruce or at Vine Street at Yr 10</td>
<td>$28,863,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$28,863,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue use of 1535 Blue Spruce, Demolish 2015 at Yr 10</td>
<td>$9,740,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel 2555 Midpoint for Probation, AIM and a new EOC to convert space vacated by Human Svcs.</td>
<td>$1,449,000</td>
<td>$6,412,000</td>
<td>$1,594,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct New Fleet Facility at R&amp;B, Weeds, Fac, Shop at Yr 5</td>
<td>$59,040,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$59,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Fleet Satellite Locations across the County</td>
<td>$29,125,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$29,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct New Recycled Materials Building and upgrade remaining facilities at Landfill</td>
<td>$9,833,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,923,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Component Replacement upgrades at The Ranch</td>
<td>$2,680,000</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,743,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Component Replacement upgrades to Wastewater Reservoir</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$115,170,000</td>
<td>$45,594,000</td>
<td>$4,162,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$165,927,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs for land acquisition and potential parking structures are not included in the above estimates. At the time of the publishing of this document, sites have not been identified.

### CRIMINAL JUSTICE ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Expansion/Improvement</th>
<th>5 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>15 Yr</th>
<th>20 Yr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Justice Center to South. Core/Sell top floors until needed</td>
<td>$206,728,000</td>
<td>$40,130,000</td>
<td>$2,759,000</td>
<td>$1,602,000</td>
<td>$252,229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Phase I construction of jail expansion at Yr 5. Complete Phase II construction by Yr 15, and demolish existing bed units, Yr not used/sell units with Yr 20</td>
<td>$75,213,000</td>
<td>$5,825,000</td>
<td>$43,472,000</td>
<td>$19,883,000</td>
<td>$144,393,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand and upgrade Sheriff’s Office by Yr 5</td>
<td>$10,184,000</td>
<td>$4,473,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$14,657,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Community Corrections and Alien Sentencing by Yr 5</td>
<td>$44,647,000</td>
<td>$9,165,000</td>
<td>$508,000</td>
<td>$9,319,000</td>
<td>$63,577,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component replacement for Sheriff’s Search &amp; Rescue Bldg</td>
<td>$2,262,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$2,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$239,034,000</td>
<td>$50,381,000</td>
<td>$46,742,000</td>
<td>$35,792,000</td>
<td>$381,149,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL $392,205,000 $105,175,000 $50,904,000 $35,792,000 $584,076,000

The recommendations for the Criminal Justice facilities are to expand both the Jail and Justice Center in the five-year timeframe, with a two-phased implementation of full buildout of the Justice Center in the 5-15 year timeframe and of the jail in several phases over the 5-20 year timeframe. The Justice Center expansion is recommended to the South of the existing facility which is contingent upon acquiring City owned land. Should that prove to be non-negotiable, the facility can be expanded to the West as well, on County owned land. Additional expansions should be considered for the Alternative Sentencing and Community Corrections Facilities, though this may need to be studied further in terms of investment in programs that may shrink or remain static quo in the future. Probation/AIM programs will remain in the 2555 Midpoint building and accommodate growth by backfilling vacated space in that building over time. Those costs are included in the cost estimates related to County Administration.

A summary of the potential cost impact by five-year increments for the recommended directions is shown below. The cost of land acquisition is not included, nor are site development costs. An escalation factor has been applied using 6% for the first five years and 3% thereafter. Allowances for Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment (FF&E) and design fees have been included. Summary numbers include any component replacement costs identified through the Conditions Assessments for any County owned buildings that will remain in use during the 20-year window. Cost estimate details are included by building (including other options that have been considered) in the Appendix.

Cost Estimates are based on Gross SF for new construction. A grossing factor has been added to Net SF shown in the Space Needs Program detail (provided in the Appendix).

The recommendations for the County Administration and Operations facilities are somewhat interdependent and based, to the extent possible, on priorities established in the planning process. Top priorities are to consolidate Human Services into a single location (with Public Health and Environment) and replace the obsolete Road and Bridge/Fleet facility currently located at Vine Street. In addition, the County wants to reduce the total number of sites where their facilities are located, and be budget conscious. To accomplish all of this the preferred directions are as follows:

- In the five-year timeframe, construct a new Human Services building at the Blue Spruce campus on the County owned, vacant site adjacent to the Health and Environment Building (1525 Blue Spruce). Keep the majority of Health and Environment in their current building, but remodel their space starting with the Extension space which will be vacated when that Department moves to the Ranch. A portion of the new building will be core and shell only to be fit out as growth dictates.
- Construct a new Fleet campus at a new location to include needed expansion for Fleet, Road, & Bridge, Weeds and the shop for Facilities in the five-year timeframe (a specific site has not been identified as part of this study and site acquisition is not included in the cost estimates). Sell the Vine Street property.
- Expand facilities and site storage/parking capacities at Fleet satellites.
- Backfill 2555 Midpoint, once Human Services moves out, with Probation and AIM growth and a new Emergency Operations Center. Vacate some of the Midpoint leased space.
- Adjust space standards and implement moderate remodel at 200 West Oak Street to allow current occupants to remain in the building for the next ten years, until Internal Service functions move out. Move Elections from Midpoint to the new building, and vacate the remaining leased space at Midpoint.
- At ten years, construct a new Internal Services Building on the portion of the site where Building 1501 currently sits.
- Remodel vacated space at Oak Street to accommodate growth and internal relocations for functions that will remain in the building.
- A summary of potential cost impact by five-year increments for these facilities and the recommended directions is shown below. The same conditions outlined for the Criminal Justice estimates apply here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 YEARS</th>
<th>10 YEARS</th>
<th>15 YEARS</th>
<th>20 YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total County Admin/Ops</td>
<td>$153,171,000</td>
<td>$45,594,000</td>
<td>$4,162,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$202,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Criminal Justice</td>
<td>$239,034,000</td>
<td>$59,581,000</td>
<td>$46,742,000</td>
<td>$35,792,000</td>
<td>$381,149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$392,205,000</td>
<td>$105,175,000</td>
<td>$50,904,000</td>
<td>$35,792,000</td>
<td>$584,076,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>