MEMORANDUM

Date: November 8, 2011

To: Chairman and Members
Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex Implementation**

Attached please find a memorandum report I recently transmitted to the Board of Supervisors for their review and consideration. The report has also been provided to the City of Tucson via City Manager Richard Miranda (see attached letter).

There are essentially two options available for proceeding with implementation of this project. The first is to contract for shell, physical plant and site improvements with Sundt Construction beginning in January 2012. Such would require joint City/County interim financing to bridge the timeframe between the cash flow requirements associated with shell, physical plant and site improvement construction and a future supplemental bond authorization. The second option is to delay the entire project until a supplemental bond authorization occurs, which may be in late 2013. This means construction would not proceed until 2014 – essentially a two-year delay.

As I pointed out in my letter to the City Manager, there is really no right or wrong answer for project implementation. Proceeding with either option carries risk. The Joint Courts Complex Management Team believes the risks associated with delaying the project far outweigh the risks associated with proceeding with bridge financing. The decision regarding whether to proceed with bridge financing will be a joint decision of the Board of Supervisors and the Tucson Mayor and Council.

It should be remembered that the Bond Advisory Committee has already approved tentative supplemental bond funding of $50 million to complete this project when a new bond authorization is requested of the voters.

CHH/mjk

Attachments

c: The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Richard Miranda, City Manager, City of Tucson
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE
PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER
130 W. CONGRESS, TUCSON, AZ 85701-1317
(520) 740-8661 FAX (520) 740-8171

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

November 8, 2011

Richard Miranda, City Manager
City of Tucson
P. O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Re: **Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex Development**

Dear Mr. Miranda:

I have transmitted the attached report to the Board of Supervisors regarding continuing with implementation of the Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex (JJMCC) in downtown Tucson. As you know, this project was authorized by the voters in 2004 with a fixed amount of bond funding. For a variety of reasons, the amount of bonds authorized is insufficient to complete construction of the facility.

The attached report discusses two options for proceeding with project development. The first is to provide bridge, or temporary, financing to construct the building shell, physical plant and site improvements beginning in early January 2012. The second option is to delay implementation until after a future, supplemental bond authorization, which likely will not occur until November 2013; meaning construction would be delayed until 2014 at the earliest. There is no right or wrong answer regarding the alternatives discussed in the report. There are risks for either continuing with construction today using temporary financing or delaying the project until voters authorize supplemental bond funding.

Our respective court systems have been directly involved in the design development of the JJMCC. I believe the courts favor proceeding with the project, since the risks of delay far outweigh the risks of proceeding with interim financing.

I intend to discuss this report with the Board of Supervisors later this month or in very early December to obtain their direction regarding providing County assurances for interim financing for our share of the project.

Since your staff may not be aware of all of the details regarding project design and implementation, I would be happy to make County staff available to provide any additional information you, your staff or the Mayor and Council may require to make a decision as to how best to proceed with implementation of this joint City/County project.

Sincerely,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/mjk

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Reid Spaulding, Director, Facilities Management
Tom Burke, Director, Finance and Risk Management

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 7, 2011

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Financing Continuing Improvements for the Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 2
II. Original Scope and Purpose of the 2004 Bond Question 3
III. Formation of the Joint Court Complex Management Team 3
IV. Authorized Bond Funding 3
V. Project Design Status 4
VI. Basis of City/County Cost Sharing 5
VII. Use of Remaining Bond Funds 6
VIII. Options for Construction Implementation 6
IX. Phasing Cost and Timing 7
X. Cost Implications for the City and County to Proceed with the Joint 8
XI. Advantages and Disadvantage of the Phased Improvement Option 8
XII. Detailed Cost Analysis of Sundt's Construction Manager at Risk Process 9
XIII. Possible Future Bond Funding of Tower Shell and Central Plant 11
XIV. Actions Necessary for Award of a Guaranteed Maximum Price Contract for Construction of the Tower Shell, Central Plant and Site Improvements 12

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1. Excerpts from the 2004 Bond Implementation Plan.
Attachment 2. Current Design Site Plan and Floor Plans for Levels 1 through 8.
Attachment 3. Sundt Construction, Inc. September 24, 2011 Schedule of Values.

I. Introduction

The County has been in the process of implementing a 2004 bond project to develop a County/City Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex (JJMCC).

For a variety of reasons, present bond funding allocated is insufficient to complete the proposed facility, and it is unlikely a new bond authorization could supplement funding for the project until 2013 or 2014. However, construction of the new facility could begin as early as this December if the City and County make certain funding commitments to assure each party will pay its fair and proportionate share of the cost of proceeding with phased construction of the facilities, with the possibility that certain portions of advanced funds could be returned proportionately to the City and County if a future bond issue provides funding to complete the facility.

The purpose of this report is to explain the present option of constructing the facility in two phases; specifying the total cost for Phase One, which is the Tower Shell, Central Plant and limited sitework; determining the cost in excess of available bond funding and the proportion each party should bear in this cost if Phase One proceeds to construction; and how Phase One excess costs could be financed by the City and County. It is important a decision be made regarding whether the City is willing to participate in paying their fair share of Phase One construction costs no later than November 15, 2011 as the County has entered into a Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) contract with Sundt Construction, Inc., and Sundt has established a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for Phase One, based upon competitive bids, which expires shortly thereafter.

Sundt has completed Tier 1 of a two-tier agreement. Tier 1 included working with the design team to establish a GMP for the Tower Shell, Central Plant and limited sitework. A critical component in the development of the GMP was establishing a clear understanding of what interior core build-out and exterior sitework would be included under the definition of Tower Shell. The CMAR's advice and expertise was paramount to the development of this initial scope of work to avoid remedial or duplicative costs at the time of future interior improvements. Tier 2 of the agreement would be entering into the actual construction phase of the limited sitework, Tower Shell and Central Plant should the GMP be acceptable to the County. The CMAR solicitation was authorized and approved in such a manner as to allow the future interior build-out and Parking Garage construction to be contracted concurrently with Sundt Construction should that delivery method prove advantageous to the County. We would be ready to execute a construction contract December 1, 2011 for the Tower Shell, Central Plant and limited sitework.

Without some City agreement to pay their share of excess bond costs for limited sitework, Tower Shell and Central Plant construction, the County will be unable to proceed with

development of the new JJMCC, and the project will be held until bond funds are secured in the future, which may be in 2013 or 2014.

Since this project is very complex, this report summarizes major project details, timelines and funding.

II. Original Scope and Purpose of the 2004 Bond Question

The original scope and purpose contained in the Bond Implementation Plan Ordinance for the 2004 election is attached (Attachment 1). The original scope called for improvements totaling $91,000,000 for a joint courts complex of approximately 337,000 square feet. It is important to note the originally planned size of the building was the primary basis for estimating cost. The Courts Tower and Central Plant presently planned for implementation total approximately 295,000 square feet but had, through the Joint Court Complex Management Team, ballooned to 470,000 square feet, including prosecution and defense office space – something that was unaffordable. To satisfy prosecutor and defender space needs of the County, the County in 2007 purchased the Bank of America Plaza, a 195,000 square foot building, for $24.1 million financed as part of a series of Certificates of Participation with principal and interest payments paid over 15 years.

III. Formation of the Joint Court Complex Management Team

To assist in refining the scope of improvements and to involve court users in the beginning stages of architectural programming, the Joint Court Complex Management Team (JCCMT) was formed. The JCCMT includes judicial and administrative representatives of the Superior, Justice and Municipal Courts; the City General Services Division, the County Facilities Management Department and AECOM, the architect for the project. (The original architectural firm for the project was DMJM, which was acquired by AECOM.) This team, in cooperation with the Facilities Management Department, developed an architectural program for the building size and function. The JCCMT remains active in reviewing, planning and architectural design for building implementation. I am providing a copy of this report to the JCCMT for their review and comment regarding whether the City and County should proceed with constructing the new complex using a two-phase approach as discussed herein. I have asked the JCCMT for a recommendation regarding how to proceed with this project.

IV. Authorized Bond Funding

Authorized bond funding has been spent to implement the project. This funding has been spent for planning, architectural design, land acquisition and assemblage, and relocation of utilities as well as archaeological mitigation and clearance as shown in the table below.

Table 1
Joint Courts Complex Expenditures to Date

Description	Cost
Planning and Design	$11,600,000
Acquisition of State-owned Land	2,090,000
Acquisition of Other Lands	2,525,000
Archaeology	16,800,000
Demolition and Abatement, including Utility Relocation	1,632,000
Total	**$34,647,000**

V. Project Design Status

Construction documents for the revised project design were 50 percent complete on April 20, 2011 and were 95 percent complete for the purpose of establishing the GMP for the Tower Shell and Central Plant on July 22, 2011. The site plan and floor plans for each level are included as Attachment 2 to this report. Design development milestone dates are shown below.

Table 2
Design Development Milestones

Activity	Date
Original Architect/Engineer Contract	08/15/05
Initial Program Analysis Complete	12/08/06
Initial Schematic Design Complete	06/18/07
Initial Design Development Complete	01/30/08
Project Placed on Hold	July 2008
Alternative Study Initiated	01/06/09
Alternative Study Completed	April 2009
Alternative Scheme Re-design Initiated	08/04/09
35 Percent Design Development Completed	07/15/10
100 Percent Design Development Completed	09/20/10
50 Percent Construction Documents Completed	04/20/11
95 Percent Construction Documents for Tower Shell and Central Plant GMP Establishment	07/22/11
Receipt of Contractual GMP	09/08/11

The design for the JJMCC prior to January 2008 was based on a detailed study conducted by consultants using those factors common for judicial growth, including anticipated population growth, demographics, frequency of appeals and other socio-economic factors.

This analysis, coupled with the anticipated implementation of various changes in courtroom technology as approved by the State, were the driving factors in the design of the 470,000 square foot proposal. As mentioned previously, authorized funding was not commensurate with this design.

The predicted indicators gathered during a period of tremendous regional growth and cost escalation have changed dramatically due to the continued sustained economic downturn. Consequently, the JCCMT reexamined those indicators starting in January 2009, and directed the project consultant, AECOM, to redesign the facility to serve the courts' needs based on more accurate reflection of the new economic and growth reality. The resultant design includes a phased approach allowing for a 120,000 square foot future addition to accommodate 12 to 16 additional courtrooms. This new design successfully utilized all the functional relationships, consolidation and adjacencies achieved in the initial design and maximized site utilization, while still allowing for a constructible future building addition.

The current design, inclusive of all interior build-out, has been estimated by an outside cost estimating firm at $77,000,000. The project fund balance available for construction spending is approximately $17,000,000. Recognizing the shortfall is significant, both the City and County would be well served to consider the financial options available to aggressively capture the extremely favorable construction market and proceed with the project. It is with this mindset that the concept of phasing the construction into Tower Shell with future Tenant Improvements was developed.

VI. Basis of City/County Cost Sharing

The 2004 bond issue authorized $76 million in bonding for the JJMCC. County General Obligation bonds are paid for by all taxpayers throughout the County; and, since the County unincorporated area and City of Tucson assessed value comprise 84.5 percent of the tax base, it is appropriate to not allocate cost of the facilities to specific benefitting parties – either the City or the County. However, when expenses exceed bond revenues, such expenses should be shared in proportion to the benefit received by each party. In this case, the City will functionally occupy and benefit from 58 percent of the building space, with the County occupying 42 percent. Therefore, any capital construction cost in excess of authorized bonds should be borne by each party in proportion to their space utilization of the facility.

Under a separate contract, the County will design and construct the parking structure to support the JJMCC. The parking structure includes one level of below grade secure parking designated for judges and seven levels of at or above grade parking. The parking

structure design accommodates over 750 vehicles and approximately 8,000 square feet of multi-tenant retail such as sandwich shops, coffee vendors, etc.
The estimated cost of the parking structure, including necessary sitework, is approximately $20 million. The financing of this structure will be independent of constructing the court building itself and will be financed by the County based on anticipated revenues from the parking structure. Parking within the new structure will be on an employee contract basis for all Court staff, both City and County, and will match those monthly rates for surrounding County garage facilities. Additional fee-based parking will be available for public use, including annual, monthly, daily and hourly options. The parking structure will also be available after business hours and on weekends for special event parking and access to downtown businesses and venues, including the Warehouse District development.

VII. Use of Remaining Bond Funds

As discussed previously, after all expenses are paid for land acquisition, utility relocation, street abandonment and land assemblage, archaeological clearance and mitigation, as well as architectural design, approximately $17 million in bond funds remain available for construction. Other remaining bond funds are earmarked for remaining necessary expenses to support completion of the project, including permits, construction testing, utility fees, courtroom furnishings and audio/visual technology. The $17 million is insufficient to construct the project; in fact, it is insufficient to construct the site improvements and the building shell, let alone tenant improvements. However, any remaining bond funds will be dedicated to project construction. It should also be noted that a previous bond amendment anticipated the present funding shortfall and allocated $12 million for courtroom improvements within the Superior Court Building, providing some judicial court trial capacity improvements that were originally contemplated in the 2004 bond authorization.

VIII. Options for Construction Implementation

Two options are available regarding implementing project construction. Given the investment made to date for land acquisition assemblage, utility relocation, architectural design and archaeological clearance, the project is poised for construction. Unfortunately, the amount of remaining bond funds from the original 2004 authorization is insufficient. The Pima County Bond Advisory Committee (BAC) reviewed and considered the project implementation progress made to date and deemed the project important to complete for significant public benefit. At their meeting of May 21, 2010, the BAC authorized an additional initial allocation of $50 million to essentially complete the project, supplementing

the 2004 authorization. At this time, the future authorization is not in sync with the completion of design and the ability to proceed with facility construction; hence, the two options below for construction of the facility. It is likely any voter consideration of further bond funding will not occur until November 2013.

The first option is to construct the facility in two phases: the first phase being building shell construction, which would essentially complete the shell structure, some limited site improvements and the Central Plant, followed thereafter by tenant improvements that would build out offices and courtrooms as designed. Under this two-phase approach, construction would begin on the Tower Shell and Central Plant in December 2011 with completion of this phase in June 2013. Phase Two, consisting of the tenant improvements, would commence immediately upon issuance of voter-approved bonds and would be complete approximately one year later.

The second option would be to put the project on temporary hold until a new bond authorization is approved by the voters to finance both the shell and tenant improvements. Since a future bond election will occur no sooner than November 2013, funding would not be available for building construction until 2014 or 2015, which would delay building completion to 2018. Using a construction cost escalation of four percent per year, the financial impact to further delay the project could potentially range from $6 to $9 million.

IX. Phasing Cost and Timing

If the first phase of the Tower Shell, Central Plant and site development are started late this year, it is likely the next phase of construction, the completion of tenant improvements within the Tower Shell, could begin no sooner than late 2013 and require approximately one year to complete. Phase One Tower, Shell and Central Plant cost is estimated at approximately $48 million (see Attachment 3). With $17 million in remaining bond funding, the balance of Phase One Cost would be $31 million. The cost of tenant improvements (Phase Two) is estimated at $28 million, and the cost allocation of Phase Two improvements is identical to the use square footage of the overall project, which 58 percent City of Tucson use and 42 percent Pima County use.

Given it is unlikely a bond election will be held until November 2013, it is very possible that at least the Phase Two tenant improvement cost of approximately $28 million would be bond cost without the use of interim financing that will be required for Phase One. Hence, the full cost of Phase Two could be financed with General Obligation bonds of the County if the voters approved same. There is, however, always the possibility the voters would reject such a question, and Phase Two would have to be paid directly by the City and County via other financing mechanisms.

X. Cost Implications for the City and County to Proceed with the Joint Justice/Municipal Courts Complex Development

Without bond funding, the maximum cost to the City and County for proceeding with Phase One and Phase Two construction improvements would be as listed below assuming a typical Certificate of Participation and/or lease/purchase 15-year amortization schedule at an interest rate of four percent.

Table 3
City/County Phase One and Two Costs

Jurisdiction	Phase One Cost	Annualized Cost at Four Percent Over 15 Years
City of Tucson	$17,400,000	$1,565,000
Pima County	12,600,000	1,133,000
Totals	**$30,000,000**	**$2,698,000**

The lease/purchase financing could be arranged such that at any time, the City or County could pay their portion of the Certificate of Participation debt should cash flow and budget conditions allow or if a future bond issue funding allocation would allow the Certificate of Participation to be paid off for both the City and County.

XI. Advantages and Disadvantage of the Phased Improvement Option

Generally, the advantages fall into two categories. First is the early delivery of an operational joint court facility that will alleviate overcrowding in the County Justice Court system and replace an obsolete building for the Tucson Municipal Court. Second is the anticipated significant construction savings because of a very competitive market in the construction industry. Hundreds of construction jobs will be created for this project, including onsite labor and second- and third-tier suppliers and manufacturers. Since December 2008, Pima County Facilities Management has contracted for over 25 vertical construction projects estimated in excess of $80 million. The actual contracted amount was slightly over $53 million, a significant savings of nearly 34 percent as a direct result of the extremely competitive construction market.

Under the delayed implementation awaiting bond funds, it is likely construction costs will increase due to market conditions in 2015 and increased commodity prices. Commodity prices are likely to increase substantially by the earliest implementation timeframe if the joint courts project waits for a bond authorization since the earliest construction timeframe

would be mid 2014 to 2015. It is estimated commodity prices alone for the total project build-out between now and that period could increase by as much as $6 to $7 million. In addition to the vulnerability of cost escalation, delayed implementation carries several other project risks, including any changes to the Building Code(s), which could negatively impact costs; loss of key personnel either internal or external (consultants) intimately familiar with the project design; loss of both County and City operational efficiencies inherent in the new facility; increased criteria required to achieve the Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) Silver rating; and those quantifiable gains realized by all entities achieved through the improved and prompt delivery of judicial services.

An advantage to the County of proceeding now is to offset current Justice Court rental courts being incurred at La Placita Village. The County leases approximately 17,500 square feet in La Placita for Justice Court purposes. Given current lease payments, if the County delays implementation of the JJMCC and the Justice Courts are unable to relocate by 2014 and such is delayed to at least 2018 or 2019, the County will incur an additional approximate $3.3 million in rental costs. These additional rental costs would substantially offset the annualized debt cost for proceeding with Phase I JJMCC improvements.

The primary disadvantage of proceeding with a two-phased, early implementation is the fact that both the City and County could be obligated to repay the advance cost using operating funds as opposed to overall County secondary property taxes if the two-phased construction was amortized under a typical Certification of Participation and/or lease/purchase financing arrangement over a 15-year period. At the present interest rate of four percent, the proportional annual cost of Phase One would be $1,133,000 for the County at 42 percent occupancy and $1,565,000 for the City at 58 percent occupancy.

XII. Detailed Cost Analysis of Sundt's Construction Manager at Risk Process

Based on the Tier One Agreement, using the CMAR project delivery method, Sundt Construction established the GM) for the Tower Shell, Central Plant and limited sitework. Parallel cost estimates and financial modeling performed by both Sundt and Parametrix (County hired third party estimating firm) estimated the total building cost, including all tenant and site improvements, as $77 million, excluding the Parking Garage. Sundt's GMP for the Phase One Tower Shell, Central Plant and limited site improvements is $48 million. Notwithstanding unanticipated commodity or labor spikes beyond the typical two to four percent annual construction increases and based on the parallel estimates referenced above, Facilities Management believes the remaining balance of $28 million will cover the future 260,000 square feet of designed tenant improvements. The 35,000 square foot balance comprises lower level mechanical and Central Plant space that would already be built out in the Tower Shell phase.

It should be noted that at the beginning of the GMP negotiation process with Sundt, the Tower Shell, Central Plant and sitework were initially estimated to cost $48 million in direct cost alone. This direct cost estimate did not include contractor overhead or profit, nor did it include additional industry standard indirect costs such as builder's risk insurance, payment and performance bonds, general conditions or Arizona privilege tax. With these items added for the CMAR per rates pre-negotiated in the Tier One Agreement, the total initial cost to deliver the project was $56.6 million. Through detailed negotiation and subcontractor and material pricing, the direct cost of the project has since been reduced from $48 million to $38 million, which includes nearly $5 million in contingency.

Given the detailed plans and cost analyses conducted during the GMP process, it is unlikely any significant portion of the contingency will be needed for construction; however, such will not be known until the project has been constructed. Therefore, the GMP, including all subcontractor and material competitive pricing and all indirect costs listed above, has been established by Sundt at $48 million, which could be as low as $43 should the contingency not be required.

A detailed cost analysis has also been completed for the Tenant Improvements, and if included in the present GMP contract, would equal $27 million. This includes additional contingency of approximately $1.4 million; hence, the total amount needed in potential additional bonding could be as high as $63 million. If contingency is not necessary, the amount could be as low as $56 million, which is fairly close to the additional $50 million allocation now authorized by the BAC for the project in a future bond election.

In preparation of the JJMCC Phase One GMP proposal, Sundt conducted an extensive subcontractor outreach, including prequalified local subcontractors for each trade, as well as Pima County/City of Tucson Small Business Enterprises (SBEs) with business categories relevant to this project. The following summarizes the subcontractors invited to bid on the project, the actual subcontractor bids received, and the tentative percentages of local Pima County businesses and registered SBEs included in the draft GMP proposal reviewed on September 8, 2011:

Table 4
Draft GMP Subcontractor Participation

Description	Amount
Total subcontractors invited to bid on the project	447
Registered SBE subcontractors invited to bid on the project	108
Total subcontractor bids received	154
Total bids received from registered SBE subcontractors	26
Total Pima County subcontractors included in Draft GMP amounts	46.63 percent
Registered Pima County SBE subcontractors included in Draft GMP amounts	6.414 percent

Per our contract, Sundt's establishment of the GMP required the utilization of an open-book, competitive solicitation of all subtrades. As anticipated and evidenced by the attached Schedule of Values prepared by Sundt (Attachment 3), the County has received the benefit of both widespread subcontractor participation and market competitiveness. All scopes of work were required by contract to be competitively bid with Pima County Facilities Management actively reviewing all subcontractor bids received. In addition, Sundt Construction's GMP exceeds SBE prebid goals as established by the Pima County Procurement Department.

The County has reserved the right to utilize this same project delivery method for the ensuing tenant improvements, parking garage and balance of sitework, or if deemed advantageous, return to the more traditional hard-bid option.

It should be noted that the expertise, insight and value added by having a CMAR as an active contributor in the development and definition of Tower Shell construction versus tenant improvements was invaluable. As planned, the phased construction of the JJMCC will capture the extremely competitive market and result in no duplicative effort or remedial work to seamlessly progress from core and shell construction to tenant improvements.

XIII. Possible Future Bond Funding of Tower Shell and Central Plant

As presented in this report, interim (or bridge) financing using Certificates of Participation, backed by both the County and City in proportion to their use of building, is used to finance the Tower Shell, Central Plant and Site Improvement costs not to exceed $48 million and potentially as low as $43 million. The question then is whether this bridge financing can be repaid if a future bond issue authorizes supplemental funding to this project, which was originally authorized by the voters in 2004. Such is likely; however, any repayments made by the City and County, in both principal and interest during the period of bridge financing, could not be recovered. If the project begins construction now and is funded in late 2011, it is likely three payments – possibly four – of the bridge financing 15-year term Certificates of Participation would have been paid and not recovered through General Obligation bond payments. It is likely that if the voters would authorize repayment, this bridge financing through a General Obligation bond and financing of the Tenant Improvements through such a bond authorization, the initial bridge financing payments, perhaps for three to four years, would not be refundable. Given straight-line principal and interest repayment, it is likely the principal amount of the initial indebtedness would have been reduced by $10.2 million through four payments, thereby reducing the project cost to well within the BAC's supplemental authorization of $50 million.

XIV. Actions Necessary for Award of a Guaranteed Maximum Price Contract for Construction of the Tower Shell, Central Plant and Site Improvements.

Action by both the City and County regarding this matter is necessary by early December 2011, primarily because Sundt, and their 154 subcontractors and suppliers, have agreed to guarantee their pricing for 120 days after August 16, 2011, which is December 16, 2011.

CHH/mjk

Attachments

c: The Honorable Sarah Simons, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
The Honorable Keith Bee, Presiding Judge, Pima County Consolidated Justice Court
The Honorable Antonio Riojas, Presiding Magistrate, Tucson City Court
Joint Court Complex Management Team Members
Lisa Royal, Administrator, Pima County Consolidated Justice Court
Joan Harphant, Administrator, Tucson City Court
Reid Spaulding, Director, Pima County Facilities Management
Tony Larrivee, Administrator, City of Tucson Facilities Management

ATTACHMENT 1

Bond Implementation Plan
May 18, 2004 Special Election

ORDINANCE NO. 2004 - 18

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA ADOPTING THE BOND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE MAY 18, 2004 SPECIAL BOND ELECTION.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Purpose 1

II. Secondary Property Tax Impact and Wastewater Management Fee Impact of Issuing New General Obligation and Revenue Bond Debt 1

A. General Obligation Bond Debt Service 2
1. Secondary Property Tax Rate Not to Exceed $0.8150 per $100 Assessed Value 2
2. Management of Debt and Secondary Property Taxes 3
a. Debt Service on Existing General Obligation Bonds 3
b. Municipal Bond Market Interest Rates 4
c. Growth in Secondary Assessed Value of All Property in Pima County . . . 4
3. Scheduling of Sales of General Obligation Bonds Approved at the May 18, 2004 Special Bond Election 5
4. Cost Implications of Selling General Obligation Bonds Approved by Voters at the May 18, 2004 Bond Election 6
B. Sewer Revenue Bond Debt 8
C. Bonds Also Paid Back by New Residents 10
D. Cost Estimates, Bond Funding, and Other Funding 10

III. General Schedule of Implementation of the County's 2004 Bond Project Development 13

A. Schedule of Bond Sales 13
B. Capital Programming 13
C. Funding Competition from Large Projects 15
D. Coordinating Implementation Among Several Jurisdictions 15
E. Funding New Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs 15

IV. Intergovernmental Coordination and Cooperation 16

A. General Intergovernmental Agreement Requirement Relating to Design, Construction and Equipping of County Bond Projects by Other Jurisdictions . . 16
B. No Modification of Jurisdictional Bond Projects Unless Requested by Jurisdiction 18

V. Future County General Obligation Bond Capacity if All Bond Questions are Approved 18

VI. Arbitrage Compliance Required 19

VII. Specific Project Description, Scope of Work, and Location by Question and Project 20

A. Question No. 1 - Sonoran Desert Open Space and Habitat Protection; Preventing Urban Encroachment of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base 21
1. Basic Acquisition Guidelines 21
a. Acquisition Amount 21
b. Estimated Acquisition Costs 21
c. Condemnation Prohibited 21
d. Independent Review 21
e. Habitat Protection by Conservation Easement 21
f. Conservation in Perpetuity 22
g. Habitat Protection and Community Open Space Allocation 22
h. Federal, State and Private Contributions 22
i. State Trust Land Reform 22
j. Davis-Monthan Related Acquisition 22
k. Wildlife and Game Management 22
2. General Categories of Open Space and Habitat Protection 23
3. Funding of Open Space Categories 23
a. Matching Funds 24
b. Habitat Protection Project Area Allocation 24
c. Conservation Easements and Development Rights 24
d. Priority Acquisitions 25
4. State Trust Land Reform 25
5. Accountability and Transparency 25
6. Rights of Property Owners 25
7. Property Acquisition Process 26
8. Specific Project Description, Scope of Work, and Location by Project 26
a. Community Open Space Parcels 26
1.1 Tucson Mountain Park-Sweetwater Preserve 27
1.2 Tucson Mountain Park-Camino de Oeste 28
1.3 Tucson Mountain Park-Dos Picos 28
1.4 Tortolita Mountain Park - Arizona Preserve Initiative 29
1.5a Tucson Mountain Park-Robles Pass Arizona Preserve Initiative . . . 29
1.5b Tucson Mountain Park-Trails End Arizona Preserve Initiative 30
1.6 Catalina Conservation Easements 31
1.7 Canoa Ranch 31
1.8 Tucson Mountain Park-Los Morteros 32
1.9 Tortolita Mountain Park - Carpenter Ranch 33
1.10 Tortolita Mountain Park - East Biological Corridor Arizona Preserve Initiative 33
1.11 Catalina State Park Expansion - Arizona Preserve Initiative 34
1.12 Colossal Cave Mountain Park Expansion 34
1.13 Tucson Mountain Park-Painted Hills 35
1.14 Tucson Mountain Park-South Corridor 36

b. Urban Open Spaces Requested by Jurisdictions 36
City of Tucson Priorities 36
1.15 Agua Caliente 36
1.16 36th Street Corridor 37
1.17 Habitat at 36th and Kino 38
Town of Oro Valley Priorities 38
1.18 Kelly Ranch 38
Town of Sahuarita Priorities 39
1.19 Santa Cruz River Open Space and Environmental Protection 39
c. Urban Open Spaces to Prevent Encroachment on Davis-Monthan Air Force Base 40
1.20 Urban Open Spaces to Prevent Encroachment on Davis-Monthan Air Force Base 40
d. Habitat Protection Priorities 41
1.21 Southeast Project Area 42
1.22 Santa Cruz Basin Project Area 43
1.23 Altar Valley Project Area 44
1.24 Avra Valley Project Area 44
1.25 Tortolita Mountains Project Area 45
1.26 Tucson Basin Project Area 46
1.27 San Pedro Project Area 47
B. Question No. 2 - Public Health and Community Facilities 48
1. Specific Project Description, Scope of Work, and Location 49
a. Public Health Facilities 49
2.1 Kino Public Health Center 49
2.2 New Psychiatric Hospital 49
2.3 Teresa Lee Health Clinic 50
b. Other Public Facilities 51
2.4 Animal Care Center 51
2.5 Roy Place Commercial Building Restoration 52
2.6 Green Valley Performing Arts Center Phase 2 53
2.7 Mt. Lemmon Community Center 54
2.8 Amado Food Bank Kitchen 55
c. Neighborhood and Housing Reinvestment 55
2.9 Pima County Neighborhood Reinvestment Projects 57
2.10 Neighborhood Reinvestment Affordable Housing Programs 58
d. Ina Road Tire Relocation 59
2.11 Ina Road Tire Facility Relocation 59
e. County-Owned Museums 60
2.12 Arizona Sonora Desert Museum - Auditorium 60
2.13 Arizona Sonora Desert Museum - Gray Water 60
2.14 Pima Air and Space Museum - Hangar #1 Center 61
C. Question No. 3 - Public Safety and Justice Facilities 63
1. Specific Project Description, Scope of Work, and Location 63
3.1 Pima County Regional Public Safety Communications System . . . 63
3.2 New Pima County Justice Court/City of Tucson Municipal Court Complex 69
3.3 Rehabilitation of Old Courthouse 71

3.4 Corrections Jail Security Project 72
3.5 Interagency Victim Advocacy Center 73
3.6 Juvenile Court Build-Out 75
D. Question No. 4 - Parks and Recreational Facilities 76
1. Specific Project Description, Scope of Work, and Location 78
a. Cultural/Historic Resources Bond Program 78
4.1 Empirita Ranch Buildings Rehabilitation 78
4.2 Canoa Ranch Buildings Rehabilitation 79
4.3 Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail 80
4.4 Fort Lowell Acquisition and San Pedro Chapel 81
4.5 Helvetia Townsite Acquisition 81
4.6 Steam Pump Ranch Rehabilitation 82
4.7 Binghampton Historic Buildings Rehabilitation 83
4.8 Marana Mound Community Site 84
4.9 Dakota Wash Site Acquisition 85
4.10 Coyote Mountains Sites Acquisition 86
4.11 Honey Bee Village Site Acquisition 87
4.12 Performing Arts Center Rehabilitation 87
4.13 Valencia Site Preservation 88
4.14 Los Morteros Preservation 89
4.15 Pantano Townsite Preservation 90
4.16 Ajo Curley School Art Institute 91
4.17 Dunbar School 92
b. Pima County Parks 93
4.18 Flowing Wells Community Center 93
4.19 Southeast Regional Park/Shooting Range 94
4.20 Lighting of Existing and New Sports Fields 95
4.21 Curtis Park - Flowing Wells East 96
4.22 Catalina Community Park 97
4.23 Dan Felix Memorial Park 97
4.24 Brandi Fenton Memorial Riverbend Park at Binghampton Historic District 98
4.25 George Mehl Family Memorial Park 99
4.26 Rillito Race Track 100
4.27 Kino Public Sports Field Lighting 101
4.28 Feliz Paseos Universal Access Park 101
4.29 Picture Rocks Pool 102
c. City of Tucson Parks 103
4.30 Eastside Sports Complex and Senior Center Site 103
4.31 Northside Community Park 104
4.32 Southeast Community Park 105
4.33 Houghton Greenway 106
4.34 Julian Wash Linear Park 107
4.35 Arroyo Chico Wash Improvements 108
4.36 Atturbury Wash Sanctuary Land Acquisition and Expansion . . 108
4.37 Pantano River Park 109
4.38 Rio Vista Natural Resource Park 110

In summary, it is the first time in history that there is a convergence of need at a time when technology is prepared to meet that need. A regional communications system will create an opportunity for agencies to work closely together for a common goal. It will provide effective interoperable voice communications to public safety workers so that they may provide improved services. It will eliminate duplication of effort and eliminate increased costs to taxpayers. It will provide all public safety workers with a communications network that will improve their safety and access to resources. It will dramatically improve the safety of all citizens in Pima County.

3.2 New Pima County Justice Court/City of Tucson Municipal Court Complex

Location: East side of Stone Avenue, between Council Street and Toole Avenue. Pima County owns the southeast corner of Council and Stone. The City of Tucson owns the northeast corner of Council and Stone. The southeast corner of Toole and Stone will be acquired.

Scope: Design, construct and co-locate a new Pima County Justice Court and City of Tucson Municipal Court. The Pima County Justice Court building will consist of 165,000 square feet and provide for a minimum of 16 courtrooms, as well as office space for departments supporting the courts such as the Constables and the County Public Defender and Legal Defender. The City of Tucson Municipal Court will consist of 172,000 square feet and provide for a minimum of 22 courtrooms, as well as office space for departments supporting the courts such as the City Prosecutor and City Public Defender. By co-locating the Justice Court and Municipal Court, Pima County and the City of Tucson can design, construct and operate shared spaces, functions and activities, such as central plant, mechanical and electric spaces; a building entrance lobby; security screening stations; jury assembly space; public restrooms; and cafeteria (if included). There are several options for co-locating the two courts, such as a shared building, or two adjoined buildings, etc. Final planning concept and building form will be determined during planning and design.

Construction of this project will also require design and construction of a parking garage, with upwards of 1,500 spaces. The parking garage will be designed and constructed in conjunction with the courts, but construction and operation of the garage will be funded through parking fee revenues.

Benefits: Pima County Justice Courts is now located in three separate facilities downtown: the Old Courthouse, the Legal Services Building, and leased facilities. The existing facilities are too small for current and projected volumes of work; being located in three facilities is very inefficient; public security is difficult to assure at the Old Courthouse; and the volume of activity is inappropriate for the Old Courthouse. This project will house the Consolidated Pima County Justice Court, which provides services to all residents in eastern Pima County and several law enforcement agencies.

The City Municipal Court Building was constructed approximately 40 years ago as a parking garage. It was converted in the early 1980's for court and office use. It is inadequate from

Other Funding: $15,000,000 - The Pima County Bond Advisory Committee reduced their recommendation for bond funding for the Tucson Municipal Court from $45 million to $41 million. The Committee assumed that the sale of the residual value of the City's current assets in the Municipal Court would yield $4 million that could be invested into this project. Pima County and the City of Tucson will consult closely through planning and design of this facility. If additional funding cannot be realized, either the project will need to be re-scoped to fit available bond funding or completed in phases, as additional funding becomes available. These are issues that both jurisdictions will mutually decide.

Project Duration: Planning/Design at 24 to 36 months, Land Acquisition at 12 to 18 months, and Construction at 36 to 48 months.

Implementation Period: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Project Management: Pima County and the City of Tucson will execute an intergovernmental agreement to set forth the joint duties and responsibilities of each jurisdiction for finance, design, and construction of the Joint Justice Court/Municipal Court. Pursuant to this intergovernmental agreement, Pima County and the City will create a County/City Project management Team, consisting of the respective Court Administrators and each jurisdiction's Facilities Management Director. The Project Management Team will develop a request for proposals to select a third-party professional project manager for project development and implementation, including management of design and construction contracts for the court facilities and parking garage. Procurement of design and construction will be managed by Pima County and contracts will be awarded by the Board of Supervisors.

Future Operating and Maintenance Costs: Pima County and the City of Tucson will execute intergovernmental agreements setting forth joint duties and responsibilities for management of and proportionate shares of annual operating and maintenance costs and for management of the parking garage.

3.3 Rehabilitation of Old Courthouse

Location: Pima County Courthouse; 115 North Church, Tucson, Arizona 85701

Scope: Following relocation of Consolidated Justice Court to a new facility downtown, rehabilitate and remodel the historic Old Courthouse to correct building deficiencies and provide additional office space for the Pima County Assessor, Recorder, Treasurer and other departments.

Benefits: Space vacated by Justice Court is be remodeled to provide office space of County departments to relieve overcrowding and consolidate departmental operations. Currently the Assessor is located in four different locations downtown and the Recorder in two. In spite of this, many staff from all three departments still work in overcrowded conditions. This project will consolidate Assessor and Recorder functions, relieve overcrowded conditions and provide better access for the public. The offices of the Assessor, Recorder and Treasurer

the standpoint of space, design and age. The adjacent parking garage serving Municipal Court has been closed due to structural problems, reducing available parking for judges, staff and potentially adversely impacting prisoner transport to court should the structure have to be torn down.

City Court and Justice Court are operating in structures that are inadequate due to the lack of space as well as design. The two facilities are located several blocks from each other. There is significant confusion by the public as to which court they need to report. The safety and convenience of the public will be better served by a facility in which both courts are co-located.

A new court facility will provide improved physical security for Justice Courts not possible in their current location. A new facility will also provide additional space to relieve court overcrowding and to consolidate Justice Court functions from three locations to one. There is the potential for cost savings by sharing of space or functions commonly used by each court.

Costs: $91,000,000 (assumes inflation factor of 2.5 percent per year through the mid-year of construction; does not include cost of the parking garage)

	Pima County Justice Court	**Tucson Municipal Court**	**Shared Functions**
A/E and CM Costs	$ 2,947,000	$ 3,500,000	
Construction	$28,400,000	$35,000,000	$2,620,000
Land Cost			$3,000,000
FF&E	$ 1,765,000	$ 1,000,000	
Other Costs	$ 942,000	$ 1,428,000	$ 948,000
Inflation	$ 4,230,000	$ 4,800,000	$ 420,000
Subtotal	$38,284,000	$45,728,000	$6,988,000
Total Cost	**$91,000,000**		

Total A/E and CM	$ 6,447,000
Land	$ 3,000,000
Construction	$66,020,000
Other	$ 6,083,000
Inflation	$ 9,450,000

Bond Funding: $76,000,000

ATTACHMENT 2

Joint Courts Complex Tucson,AZ

AECOM · GLHN

TE PLAN

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX FOR PIMA COUNTY
TUCSON, ARIZONA 01.22.2010

DRAFT

AECOM

Department Legend

- Central Mail Room
- TCC Court Services (Records)
- TCC Domestic Violence
- TCC Executive Administration
- TCC Financial Unit
- TCC Information Desk
- TCC Judicial Support Services
- TCC Public Services / Cashiers
- Shared Staff Spaces
- Pro-Se Center
- Public Restrooms
- Public Entry and Lobby
- Building Systems
- Public Circulation
- Private Circulation
- Semi-Private Circulation
- Secure Circulation

LEVEL 1 SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

Department Legend

- Semi-Private Circulation
- Secure Circulation
- Security Operations/Sheriff

MID LEVEL SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

Department Legend

- Alternative to Jail Courtroom
- Arraignment (OCC) Courtroom
- Department of Motor Vehicle
- Law Enforcement Waiting
- NJ HV IC Courtroom
- NJ Video Appearance Courtroom
- TCC City Probation
- TCC Court Services (Records)
- TCC Information Technology
- Public Restrooms
- Public Entry and Lobby
- Building Systems
- Public Circulation
- Shared Court Services
- Private Circulation
- Semi-Private Circulation
- Secure Circulation
- Security Operations/Sheriff

LOWER LEVEL SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

Department Legend

- Beach Head Offices
- Central In-Custody Holding
- CJC Information Technology
- Jury Standard IC Courtroom
- TCC Information Technology
- Public Restrooms
- Building Systems
- Public Circulation
- Shared Court Services
- Private Circulation
- Semi-Private Circulation
- Secure Circulation

LEVEL 3 SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

Department Legend

- Beach Head Offices
- Central In-Custody Holding
- Jury Standard IC Courtroom
- NJ CV Traf/Pkg/SC/OV/FD Court
- Public Restrooms
- Building Systems
- Public Circulation
- Shared Court Services
- Private Circulation
- Semi-Private Circulation
- Secure Circulation

LEVELS 4-6 SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

Department Legend

- CJC Courtroom Services
- Collegial Chambers Area
- TCC Court Services (Records)
- TCC Judicial Support Services
- Shared Staff Spaces
- Public Restrooms
- Interpreters (Contracted)
- Public Circulation
- Private Circulation
- Semi-Private Circulation

LEVEL 7 SPACE ALLOCATION

JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

TUCSON ARIZONA 08.20.2010

AECOM

2777 E. CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016

P 602 337 2700
F 602 337 2620
WWW. AECOM.COM

exterior character

Looking north along Stone

Looking down Toole and Stone

View from across Toole

JUSTICE consists not in be utral between right and
but in finding out the right a holding it, wherever fo
against the wrong.

Plaza

STICE consists not in being neutral betweer
in finding out the right and upholding it, w
ainst the wrong.

Main entry

interior character

Main Stair

Elevator Lobby

Payment Counters

Public Corridor

ATTACHMENT 3

PIMA COUNTY JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

SCHEDULE OF VALUES

SUNDT

24-Sep-11

DIVISION	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL SCHEDULE OF VALUES
1 DIVISION 1 (General Conditions & General Requirements)		
	General Requirements	933,443
	Construction Parking Accommodations (2 lots)	33,208
2 SITEWORK		
	Project Control Survey	30,502
	Earthwork	2,414,562
	Termite Control	6,857
	Site Utilities	310,875
	Dry Utilities	119,119
	Pavement	74,777
	Landscaping	48,285
	Offsite & Onsite Site Concrete	66,327
3 CONCRETE		
	Building Concrete	5,484,083
	Pre -Cast Concrete	1,345,792
4 MASONRY		
	Masonry	
	Building Masonry	476,568
	Stone Veneer	132,494
5 METALS		
	Structural & Misc. Steel	9,798,089
6 WOOD & PLASTICS		
	Misc. Rough Carpentry	54,117
7 THERMAL & MOISTURE PROTECTION		
	Waterproofing	142,805
	Rigid Spandrel Glass Insulation	206,399
	Roof Access.	3,381
	Roofing Systems	843,727
	Firesafing	193,532
	Metal Panel System at Roof	399,451
	Joint Sealants	81,146
	Expansion Control	11,838
	Applied Fireproofing	341,960
8 DOORS & WINDOWS		
	HM Door/Frame/HW	137,875
	Special Doors	207,234
	Glass & Metal Curtain Wall	5,666,113

PIMA COUNTY JOINT COURTS COMPLEX

SCHEDULE OF VALUES

SUNDT

24-Sep-11

DIVISION	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL SCHEDULE OF VALUES
9 FINISHES		
	Metal framing w/gypsum board	887,327
	Plaster	123,402
	Rubber base	3,853
	Interior and Exterior Paint	123,757
10 SPECIALTIES		
	Signage - Exterior BuildingNumbers	635
	Fire extinguishers & cabinets	10,137
11 EQUIPMENT		
	Loading Dock Equip.	7,215
	Window washing equipment	96,623
	Detention Equipment	171,457
	Entrance mats	13,463
14 CONVEYING SYSTEMS		
	Gearless Traction Elevators	1,950,672
15 MECHANICAL		
	Fire Sprinklers	
	Fire Protection Core and Shell	513,332
	Plumbing & HVAC	7,920,660
16 ELECTRICAL		
	Site & Building Electrical	4,305,923
17 DESIGN CONTINGENCY		
	DESIGN CONTINGENCY	275,000
SUBTOTAL WITHOUT CONTRACTOR'S CONTINGENCY		**$45,968,017**
Tucson Water Improvements (Bid Alternate No. 2)		**$590,758**
Contractor's Contingency		**$1,193,985**
TOTAL		**$47,752,760**