## Codington County, SD Justice Facility Basic Construction Option Comparison Criteria

|          | Approved January 26. 2016       | proved January 26, 2016  |        |        |       | Option Number |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|--------|--------|-------|---------------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--|--|--|
| Priority |                                 | BKV NOMENCLATURE   | 1A     | 1B     | 2A    | 2B            | 3A      | 3B     | 4A     | 4B      | 4C      |  |  |  |
| Must do  | Minimum Size, Required Type of  | 1. MEETS 20 YEAR PROGRAM   |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          | Space & features based on 20-   | REQUIREMENTS   |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          | year projections                |  | Yes    | Yes    | Yes   | Yes           | Yes     | Yes    | Yes    | Yes     | Yes     |  |  |  |
|          | Expandability Strategy?         | 2. EXPANDABILITY   | Yes    | Yes    | Yes   | Yes           | Yes     | Yes    | Yes    | Yes     | Yes     |  |  |  |
|          | Must preserve North façade,     | 3. PRESERSVE HISTORIC FACADE AND   |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
| 0        | rotunda                         | ROTUNDA  | Yes    | Yes    | Yes   | Yes           | Yes     | Yes    | Yes    | Yes     | Yes     |  |  |  |
| 1        | Operational Cost                | WEIGHT 3 Considerations: Court/jail  |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | connection, jail on one level, courts on one   | _      | _      | _     | _             | _       | _      | _      |         |         |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | estimated 20 year operational cost   | 3      | 3      | 3     | 3             | 3       | 3      | 3      | 3       | 3       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | increase (in millions)   | \$4.4M | \$5.1M | \$10M | \$5.1M        | \$11.3M | \$5.1M | \$5.3M | \$11.3M | \$11.5M |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | RATING   | 6      | 4      | 2     | 4             | 2       | 4      | 4      | 2       | 2       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 18     | 12     | 6     | 12            | 6       | 12     | 12     | 6       | 6       |  |  |  |
|          | Efficiency of Design for safe   | WEIGHT 3 Considerations: same as   |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          | Effective ops                   | operational cost considerations & onsite   | _      | _      |       |               |         | _      | _      | _       |         |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | parking  | 3      | 3      | 3     | 3             |         |        | 3      |         | 3       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | RATING   | 6      |        | 6     | 8             |         |        |        |         | 6       |  |  |  |
|          | E                               | SCORE  | 18     |        | 18    | 24            |         |        |        | 18      |         |  |  |  |
|          | Ease of Expandability           | WEIGHT 3   | 3      | 3      | 3     | 3             |         |        |        |         | 3       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | RATING   | 5      |        | 8     | 8             |         |        |        |         | 4       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 15     | 15     | 24    | 24            | 24      | 24     | 18     | 12      | 12      |  |  |  |
| 2        | Project Cost                    | <b>WEIGHT 2.5</b> Considerations: construction, design, furnishing, property purchase, |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | phasing impact, contingency, etc.  | 2.5    | 2.5    | 2.5   | 2.5           | 2.5     | 2.5    | 2.5    | 2.5     | 2.5     |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | estimated project cost in millions   |        |        |       |               |         |        |        |         | \$32.9M |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | RATING   | 6      |        | 4     | 4             |         |        | 2      | 6       | 4       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 15     |        | 10    | 10            | 15      | 10     |        | 15      | 10      |  |  |  |
|          | Mid-term Adaptabilty for tech,  | WEIGHT 2   | 2      | 2      | 2     | 2             |         |        | 2      | 2       | 2       |  |  |  |
|          | policy change                   | RATING   | 6      |        | 8     | 8             | 8       | 8      | 4      | 4       | 4       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 12     | 12     | 16    | 16            | 16      | 16     | 8      | 8       | 8       |  |  |  |
| 3        | Location. How much county/court | WEIGHT 1.5   | 1.5    | 1.5    | 1.5   | 1.5           | 1.5     | 1.5    | 1.5    | 1.5     | 1.5     |  |  |  |
|          | business stays downtown?        | RATING   | 8      |        | 4     | 4             |         |        |        |         | 8       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 12     | 12     | 6     | 6             |         |        |        | 12      | 12      |  |  |  |
|          | Aesthetic                       | WEIGHT 1   | 1      | 1      | 1     | 1             |         |        | 1      | 1       | 1       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | RATING   | 8      | 8      | 8     | 8             | 8       | 8      | 6      | 6       | 6       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 8      |        | 8     | 8             |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          | OTHER CONSIDERATIONS            | 13. USES EXISTING BLDGS - WEIGHT 0.5   | 0.5    |        | 0.5   |               |         |        |        |         |         |  |  |  |
|          | omen consistent mons            | RATING   | 8      |        | 2     | 2             | 1       |        | 6      |         | 8       |  |  |  |
|          |                                 | SCORE  | 4      |        | 1     | 1             |         |        | 3      |         | 4       |  |  |  |
|          | Total Ranking Scores            |  | 102    |        | 89    | 101           | 94      |        | 88     |         | 76      |  |  |  |
|          | Rank                            |  | 1      | 3      | 5     | 2             | 4       | 2      | 6      | 7       | 8       |  |  |  |
|          | Natin                           |  | T      | Э      | 3     | 2             | 4       | 2      | 0      | ,       | 0       |  |  |  |

## **Qualitative Rating**

Excellent = 8 points (operational cost <\$3M, project cost <\$29M)

Good = 6 points (operational cost >\$3M but <\$5M, project cost ,>\$29M but <\$32M)

Fair = 4 Points (operational cost >\$5M but <\$7M, project cost ,>\$32M but <\$35M)

Poor = 2 Points (operational cost >\$7M but <\$12M, project cost ,>\$35M but <\$38M)

Difficult = 0 Points (operational cost >\$12M, project cost ,>\$38M)

DRAFT 9.2.2016