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RECOMMENDATION：That the City Council accept the project Funding and Scope Plan，and project timetable as recommended by the Administration．

BUDGET IMPACT：The City has currently committed $\$ 13.615$ million to The Leonardo project in bond proceeds，RDA funds and other general fund appropriations． Contained in this report is a recommendation that the City appropriate as much as $\$ 5.49$ million additional dollars to the project subject to other fund raising campaigns that prove to be successful．The City dollars will come from several sources that are described in the body of the report．

BACKGROUND and DISCUSSION：It has been four years and three months since City residents authorized，by election，to fund the renovation of the vacant Main Library Building so that it could become The Leonardo．At the time of the election the projected cost to complete the building renovation was $\$ 10.0$ million．The process to create The Leonardo organization，raise operation and exhibit funds，develop a reliable business plan and determine a building design and project scope has been steady，but slow moving．During that same period construction cost estimates have now increased to $\$ 21.9$ million to complete the scale of renovation envisioned at the time of the public bond election．City staff，its hired architect and engineering consultants and representatives from The Leonardo have now developed a project scope and funding plan that has the support of the Administration，and when approved by the City Council will allow the project to move rapidly forward．

Included as an attachment to this briefing narrative is a Funding and Project Scope Plan. The FUNDING plan shows that the City currently has $\$ 13.615$ million in committed or authorized funds for the project. The plan then identifies, by priority, three (3) SOLID funding options; followed by several SPECULATIVE funding options; followed by LAST-IN options that represent a potential backstop if other options do not fully materialize. The solid options present funding opportunities that, for the very most part, the Administration and City Council can control. The speculative options include donations, grant funding and legislative action that takes the decision making out of the hands of the City, and requires a process that in some cases will take a considerable amount of time and extra expense to complete. The recommended backstop option is controlled by the City if it wishes to add additional general funds to the project. The Administration believes that the City and The Leonardo each have a role to play in securing the extra funding needed to complete the renovation of the building to the level envisioned at the time of the bond election, and that a combination of the solid and speculative funding options will get us to that point.

The PROJECT SCOPE plan is developed in menu form which allows the City to choose a build-out plan based on City priority and funding opportunities. The options are: Basis of Design (BOD), which reflects a full building renovation with new internal systems, building enhancements and finishes; Hybrid, which is a reduced level of renovation of the buildings systems and fewer enhancements and finishes; and the Economy option, which provides for basic life-safety improvements, repair to existing systems and minor finish work. Both the BOD and the Hybrid options allow for The Leonardo's preferred option to build-out the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor space as funding is raised, and it delivers a Silver LEED building. The difference between the BOD and the Economy option can best be described by the following analogy. The BOD option is like buying a used car that has a factory warranty on its parts, has new tires, a shiny paint job and a refurbished interior. The Economy option is like purchasing an older used car with many more miles, which shows its wear, and has original engine parts without any warranties. The Hybrid option is in the middle. It provides for some new systems with warranties, and allows for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor build-out without having to renovate to the BOD level. It should be noted that regardless of which option is chosen, from an exterior view the building will look the same as it is right now. The changes, for the most part are inside the building, and much of the change deals with internal systems replacement and upgrade which will be hidden from the eye.

The estimated fully loaded cost of the three individual options is as follows: BOD, \$21.9 million; Hybrid, $\$ 19.1$ million; and Economy, $\$ 16.7$ million. Each estimate includes a construction inflation pad through June, 2009.

A funding gap exists between the amount of current funds available for the project and all three project scope options. The gaps are as follows: BOD, $\$ 8.29$ million; Hybrid, $\$ 5.49$ million; and Economy, $\$ 3.09$ million.

In order to move the project along the Administration and City Council must resolve the following outstanding issues:

1. Project Scope
2. Funding Level
3. The City's and The Leonardo's role in closing the funding gap.

With these three issues in mind the Administration makes the following recommendation:

1. The project should be built out to the Basis of Design level. $\$ 21.9$ million
2. The City and The Leonardo add additional funds to the project up to the Hybrid scope funding level.

- The City appropriates the $\$ 1.02$ million FEMA reimbursement back into the project.
- The City creates a CDA and appropriates a reasonable amount of the proceeds into the project.
- The Leonardo, with support from the City, initiates an aggressive effort to secure naming rights for the facility and applies whatever portion of the proceeds needed to close the funding gap between the extra funds the City has put into the project and the $\$ 19.1$ million needed to fund the Hybrid scope.
- Set the date of June 1,2008 as the date in which the naming rights funds are in place.

3. If The Leonardo is unsuccessful in selling the naming rights before the due date the City may choose to add extra funds into the project to close the Hybrid funding gap or may choose to fund only the Economy option level.

- Funds would come from the Last-in, backstop option.

4. Under no circumstance does the City fund the project beyond the Hybrid scope.
5. Based on a successful naming rights campaign, once the Hybrid option funding level is achieved the City will expect The Leonardo to apply the remaining naming rights fund balance to the funding gap between the Hybrid and BOD option so that the BOD build out level is fully achieved. If extra funds are needed to close the gap the City will expect and support The Leonardo in its efforts to raise additional funds from any source including those identified as Speculative, or $2^{\text {nd }}$ Tier funding options.
6. Set the date of June 1,2008 as the date in which the final scope of work is determined, and begin design development on that same date.

Note: Funding and construction cost figures are estimates and are subject to change. Likewise, the project inflation figure is subject to change based on market conditions and the ability of the City to meet the proposed timeline.

PUBLIC PROCESS: This information has been shared with The Leonardo organization.

## The Leonardo

## Funding and Project Scope Plan

## FUNDING

## Current Funding:

- Bond $\$ 10.2$ million
- Siesmic/Aesbestos Appropriation
- RDA Grant
\$ 2.5 million
- Blue Sky Grant
\$750,000
\$165,000
- Total Committed Today
$\$ 13.615$ million


## Additional Funding Options: Solid Options Listed by Priority

- Appropriate FEMA Reimbursement
- Community Development Area
- Naming Rights
\$5.0-\$8.0 million


## Second Tier Funding Options: Speculative Options

- Other Government Contributions
- Salt Lake County
- State
\$1.0-\$2.0 million
\$200,000
- Tax Credits
- New Market and Historic
$\$ 1.0+2.0$ million (combined)
- Federal Appropriation ?????
- Kresge Foundation
$\$ 100,000$


## Backstop Option: Last-in Option

- Sale of Surplus Property
- Planetarium
- International Center
$\$ 1.2$ million
\$3.7 million


## PROJECT SCOPE

## Options:

- Basis of Design (BOD)
$\$ 21.9$ million
- Full build-out; complete renovation
- Silver LEED
- Allows $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor build-out
- Blue Sky Solar (time sensitive funding)
- Hybrid
\$19.1 million
- Reduced renovation
- Silver LEED
- Limited warranties on systems; not all new
- Allows $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor build-out
- Blue Sky Solar (time sensitive funding)
- Economy
$\$ 16.7$ million
- Renovation to existing systems
- Limited warranties on systems
- Potential Silver LEED
- No Blue Sky Solar
- $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor Alternate Build-out
$\$ 4.68$ million
- Funded by The Leonardo


## SCOPE FUNDING GAP

| BOD | Hybrid | Economy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 21.9$ million | $\$ 19.1$ million |  |
| $\$ 13.615$ million  <br> $<\$ 8.29$ million $>$  <br>  $\$ 13.615$ million <br>   <br> $\$ 5.49$ million $>$  <br> $<\$ 3.09$ million  |  |  |

## THE LEONARDO vs. OTHER CIP PROJECTS

Projects in the Pipeline: (order of magnitude)

- Public Safety Building
- North Temple Light Rail
- Jordan River and Bikeways
- Sports Complex


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | （管 |
|  |  |










| PROJECT ESTIMATE |  | CONSTRUCT | ORATION |  |  |  | 2/7/2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```PROJECT NAME.............THE LEONARDO ENTRY ADDITION LOCATION....................SALT LAKE CITY, UT ARCHITECT.``` $\qquad$ <br> ```EWING COLENone``` |  |  | SF |  | 1400 |  |  |
| CSI \# |  | DESCRIPTION | UNIT QTY |  | COST |  |  |
| ENTRY ADDITION COST SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SITEWORK \& DEM | TION |  | \$ | 22.87 | \$ | 32,013 |
|  | CONCRETE |  |  | \$ | 20.45 | \$ | 28,623 |
| 05 | METALS |  |  | \$ | 25.36 | \$ | 35,510 |
|  | WOODS \& PLASTI |  |  | \$ | 2.63 | \$ | 3,680 |
| 07 | THERMAL \& MOIS | E PROTECTION |  | \$ | 15.99 | \$ | 22,389 |
| 08 | DOORS \& WINDO |  |  | \$ | 37.64 | \$ | 52,690 |
| 09 | FINISHES |  |  | \$ | 21.53 | \$ | 30,143 |
| 10 | SPECIALTIES |  |  | \$ | 0.19 | \$ | 272 |
| 15 | MECHANICAL |  |  | \$ | 33.27 | \$ | 46,578 |
| 16 | ELECTRICAL |  |  | \$ | 29.40 | \$ | 41,160 |
|  | SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$ | 209.33 |  | 293,057 |
|  | GENERAL COND |  | 9\% | \$ | 18.84 |  | 26,375 |
|  | OVERHEAD \& PR |  | 4\% | \$ | 8.37 |  | 11,722 |
|  | DESIGN CONTIN |  | 10\% | \$ | 20.93 |  | 29,306 |
|  | TOTALS |  |  | \$ | 57.47 | \$ | 360,461 |
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| OJECT ESTIMATE CONSTRUCTION CONTROL CORPORATION |  |  |  |  | 2/7/2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|| PROJECT NAME..............THE LEONARDO |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSI \# | DESCRIPTIO | ON |  |  | FLOOR |
| ALTERNATE \#2 ADD COOLING TOWER |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADD COOLING TOWER AT ROOF |  |  |  | \$ | 60,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$ | 60,000 |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS |  |  | 9\% | \$ | 5,400 |
| OVERHEAD \& PROFIT |  |  | 4\% | \$ | 2,400 |
| DESIGN CONTINGENCY |  |  | 10\% | \$ | 6,000 |
| TOTAL ALTERNATE CONSTRUCTION COSTS |  |  |  | \$ | 67,800 |
| INFLATION TO SUMMER 07' ${ }^{\prime}$ 17.5\% |  |  |  | \$ | 11,865 |
| TOTAL ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  |  | 79,665 |
| Demolition Permit |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Plan Check Fees |  |  |  | \$ | 1,755 |
| Building Permit |  |  |  | \$ | 2,699 |
| 1\% State Permit Fee |  |  |  | \$ | 27 |
| Impact Fees |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Geotechnical/ Soils Study |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Environmental Studies |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| City Engineering Mngmt Fee 1.5\% |  |  |  |  | 1,195 |
| Architectural design fees 9\% |  |  |  | \$ | 7,170 |
| Architectural Reimbursables |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| Enhanced Commissioning |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accelerate Hazmat \& Demo |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner's Construction Contingency 10\% |  |  |  | \$ | 7,967 |
| Special Inspections \& Testing $.75 \%$ |  |  |  | \$ | 597 |
| Art 1\% |  |  |  | \$ | 797 |
| TOTAL ADDITIONAL PROJECT COST |  |  |  | \$ | 101,872 |



| PROJECT ESTIMATE CONSTRUCTION CONTROL CORPORATION |  |  |  |  | 2/7/2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT NAME..............THE LEONARDOLOCATION.......................SALT LAKE CITY, UTAHARCHITECT.................EWING COLESTAGE OF DESIGN.........PROGRAMMING |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNI \# | DESCRIPTION | UNTT QTY | UNIT COST |  |  |
| ALTERNATE \#4 CAFĖ SEATING AREA FIT OUT |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Café Seating Carpet Tiles | 300 SY | \$ 35.50 | \$ | 10,650 |
|  | Café' Seating Ceiling | 2,700 SF | \$ 8.95 | \$ | 24,165 |
|  | Café Seating Wall Assemblies | 2,700 SF | \$ 12.65 | \$ | 34,155 |
|  | Fixed Casework | 1 LS | \$ 3,500.00 | \$ | 3,500 |
|  | Interior Doors | 8 EA | \$ 950.00 | \$ | 7,600 |
|  | FF\&E | 1 Allow | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000 |
|  | New Plumbing | 2,700 SF | \$ 2.90 | \$ | 7,830 |
|  | HVAC | 2,700 SF | \$ 11.00 | \$ | 29,700 |
|  | Electrical- Power | 2,700 SF | \$ 1.35 | \$ | 3,645 |
|  | Electrical- Lighting | 2,700 SF | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 27,000 |
|  | Special Systems | 2,700 SF | \$ 0.85 | \$ | 2,295 |
|  | Sound | 2,700 SF | \$ 0.90 | \$ | 2,430 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | 172,970 |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS 6\% |  |  |  | \$ | 10,378 |
| OVERHEAD \& PROFIT 4\% |  |  |  |  | 6,919 |
| DESIGN CONTINGENCY 15\% |  |  | . |  | 25,946 |
| INFLATION SINCE JANUARY 06' ${ }^{\prime}$ 20\% |  |  |  |  | 34,594 |
| INFLATION TO SUMMER 07' ${ }^{\circ}$ 17.5\% |  |  |  |  | 30,270 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST |  |  |  |  | 281,076 |
| Plan Check Fees |  |  |  | \$ | 1,711 |
| Building Permit |  |  |  | \$ | 2,633 |
| 1\% State Permit Fee |  |  |  | \$ | 26 |
| City Engineering Mngmt Fee 1.5\% 1.5\% |  |  |  | \$ | 4,216 |
| Architectural design fees |  | 9\% |  | \$ | 25,297 |
| Owner's Construction Contingency |  | 10\% |  | \$ | 28,108 |
| Special Inspections \& Testing |  | 0.75\% |  | \$ | 2,108 |
| Art |  | 1\% |  | \$ | 2,811 |
| TOTAL COST ALTERNATE \#4 |  |  | \$ 128.88 \$ |  | 347,986 |



