

## **Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**

Johnson County, Kansas

### **III. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

Historically, judicial systems have operated most efficiently when all functions of the Court are located in the same physical facility. The current space needs of the judiciary are met through the 145,000 useable square feet of the existing Courthouse. All functions of the Court, with the exception of field staff of Court Services, Community Corrections, and the Public Defender's Office are located in the Courthouse. One of the outcomes of growth, however, is the potential loss of some efficiency as the space requirements grow to a point of exceeding the expansion capability of existing buildings, forcing either a new "full service" Courthouse or the separation of functions. Such is now the case in Johnson County.

The process in this study included two separate, but linked Phases. Phase I focused on assessing the needs and operational intentions of the Court, forecasting future estimates of judicial officers and support staff, and the assignment of general space standards to the projected staff so as to develop an order of magnitude size for the needs of the judiciary. In Phase II, the general space needs of the courts were further refined into an architectural program where each individual space was identified and sized and from which sites could be tested for suitability.

In the following pages, the major outcomes of both Phases I and II are presented in a summary format. The full architectural program that includes component descriptions, space tables, and adjacency diagrams is included in the Appendix.

#### **A. General Space Needs**

The Phase I process of defining space needs is different from defining space for an architectural program that leads to a building design. The aim at the study level is to define general space requirements by applying space standards against the projected number of courtrooms (by type) and the estimated personnel by component of the Court. While this approach will not produce a finite space allocation, for planning purposes the method has historical validity and can be used to reach consensus on the physical organization of the Court.

At this space planning level, the size of individual offices/work stations is not as important as the total allocation of space for each staff position. For example, an office may be 100 square feet (SF), but the total space necessary to support that office requires corridors, conference rooms, public counters, etc. Therefore, the total *Department Gross Square Footage* (DGSF) used at this level represents the sum of the various personnel, support, public, storage, equipment, and circulation net square footage spaces within the confines of that department, including interior walls.

While most counties (including Johnson County) promulgate net square footage standards as a means of assuring parity amongst the various agencies and departments, these standards are most useful in the subsequent architectural programming stage, but not at the early planning level. Therefore, at the planning level, these net square feet standards (NSF) must be increased to allocate not just the size of individual offices/workstations, but to also include in the standards a factor for support spaces. Research conducted nationally enables us to translate the net space assignments into departmental gross standards (DGSF) that can then be applied against the previously proposed personnel estimates.

The Federal General Services Administration (GSA) conducted a benchmark analysis of office space use in the Federal government and private sector in 2002. Based on GSA's research, it was found that most of the organizations surveyed use a space-per-person allocation standard to

## Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study

Johnson County, Kansas

allocate square feet. As a result of the analysis, the GSA adopted a standard of 230 *rentable*<sup>1</sup> (200 usable) square feet per person for government office space use.

Using this research, an office DGSF per staff allocation was proposed for each department or division based on: (1) a review of the net standards adopted by and proposed in the County's SFMP; (2) the existing allocation of office space per staff; (3) private and public sector standards; and (4) the Consultant's planning experience. When possible, the following standards were applied:

- Varying space allocations for different types of litigation spaces
- Aggregation of all spaces to support a courtroom set, such as 4,389 DGSF for General District courts; 5,057 DGSF for Large District Courts; 2,883 DGSF for Juvenile Courts; and 3,262 DGSF for Magistrates' Courts
- 1,155 DGSF for judicial sets (judges chambers and related spaces)
- 300 DGSF/staff for main offices of elected officials and department directors
- 250 DGSF/staff for departments with primarily private and open work areas, public waiting/contact spaces, and large work, equipment, and/or document storage needs
- 230 DGSF/staff for departments with a combination of private and open workstation spaces and average work, equipment, and/or document storage needs
- 150 DGSF/staff for departments with primarily open workstations and common file areas
- 50 DGSF/staff for divisions with primarily field staff

Exceptions were considered for departments requiring larger meeting rooms, public lobby areas, executive offices, etc. For County administration or Sheriff's Department functions, the space that was identified in the SFMP was used as a "place hold" estimate.

Table III-1 presents the resulting general DGSF space standards for each component of the Court and other departments/divisions included in the Master Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rentable Area* includes the number of square feet in a commercial building or suite deemed actually occupied by a tenant for its sole and exclusive use (usable space) plus a prorata portion of common areas on the entire office floor, excluding vertical shafts such as elevators, stairs, mechanical risers, etc.

**Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**  
Johnson County, Kansas

**Table III-1**  
**General Space Needs for Court Components**

Component of Court	2015		2025	
	Total Staff	DGSF	Total Staff	DGSF
<b>COURTS AND COURT SETS</b>				
Civil Court	7	41,992	8	47,402
Domestic Relations Court	8	47,118	9	53,008
Juvenile Court	2	8,376	3	12,563
Court Trustee	2	5,630	2	5,630
Criminal Court	7	45,136	8	51,026
Traffic Court	1	6,240	1	6,240
Magistrate Court	4	16,996	4	16,996
<b>Subtotal Court Component</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>171,488</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>192,865</b>
<b>SUPPORT COMPONENTS</b>				
District Attorney	146	50,918	169	58,939
Court Administration	8	1,860	10	2,325
Clerk of Court	64	18,446	72	21,005
Court Services (Court-Related)	7	1,721	8	1,907
Court Trustee	54	12,110	60	13,365
Court Reporters	24	4,050	27	4,556
Public Defender	16	800	18	900
Justice Information Management Systems (JIMS)	23	7,130	35	10,850
Guardian Ad Litem	4	836	8	1,672
Law Clerks and Interns	14	2,930	16	3,348
Jury Assembly and Lounge	280	13,230	320	15,120
Law Library	8	4,320	9	4,860
Court Security (Sheriff Department)	22	1,595	25	1,813
Public Functions	31	12,555	35	14,175
Internal Prisoner Security and Escort (Sheriff's Department)	20	10,850	23	12,400
<b>Subtotal of Court Support Components</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>143,349</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>167,235</b>
<b>TOTAL DGSF REQUIRED COURTHOUSE COMPONENTS</b>		<b>314,837</b>		<b>360,100</b>
Building Gross Factor @ 20%		62,967		72,020
<b>TOTAL REQUIRED COURTHOUSE COMPONENTS</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>377,805</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>432,119</b>
Court Services (Field-Related)	67	19,707	74	23,648
Community Corrections	42	15,000	48	18,000
Public Defender's Office	30	10,400	36	12,480
Sheriff's Administration	24	6,231	29	7,477
Sheriff's Civil Division	26	2,863	31	3,436
Sheriff's Warrants Division	18	2,712	22	3,254
<b>Total Non-Court Support Components</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>56,913</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>68,296</b>
Building Gross Factor @ 20%		11,383		13,659
<b>TOTAL REQUIRED NON-COURT FUNCTIONS</b>		<b>68,296</b>		<b>81,955</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL COURT AND NON-COURT FUNCTIONS</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>446,100</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>514,074</b>

Source: Carter Goble Lee; February 16, 2005

For study purposes, Table III-1 applied the block space standards against the estimated number of staff by component and determined that approximately 432,119 departmental gross square feet (DGSF) would be required to meet the 20-year needs of the Court. These estimates by Court component provided the basis for testing the various operational options.

## **Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**

Johnson County, Kansas

### **B. Development Options**

Kansas operates a single-tier court but includes a magistrate's court that functions much as a "county" court in other states. The District Court hears both high value civil matters and the more serious felony cases, as well as the lower value civil cases and misdemeanor violations. Both civil and criminal cases are assigned to the Magistrates' Court with appeals made to the District Court. The most dynamic growth, as noted previously, has been in Limited Actions and Domestic Violence cases. Administrative oversight is provided through a peer elected and State approved Chief Judge.

This organization of the Court is important in any decision regarding potential physical separation of functions. Using the space estimates previously defined, a series of development options were considered that separated the Court into operating divisions. The basic development options included various groupings of the Court by divisions, including: all criminal courts; all civil courts; and all family-related courts.

Through consultations with the District Court judges, as well as the District Attorney, Clerk of Court and other component managers of court support agencies, a decision was reached that any future spatial separation of Court operations would seriously impact an efficient operation of the Court. During the course of this study, the Board of County Commissioners concurred with the Court and directed that the remainder of the study was to be based on a consolidated approach to meeting the future Court needs.

In the following pages, the space requirements to maximize the existing Courthouse and the space needs to increase the current 23 judicial positions to a total of 33 judicial positions in 2025 is identified based on the summary of a detailed architectural program.

### **C. Summary of Architectural Program**

The purpose of an architectural program is to translate the operational basis of a building into a spatial description. To accomplish this, standards such as those previously discussed were applied to definitions of personnel, functions, and equipment resulting in a determination of the amount of space and the functional relationship between spaces that is appropriate to satisfy the operational objectives. The operational basis of the proposed new Courthouse was developed from interviews with all managers of Court components and experience with other court systems having similar functions. Using operational and spatial information, the size and functional relationships of the new Courthouse were defined.

The identification of the candidate agencies for inclusion in the new Courthouse previously presented is critical in the development of an architectural program that attempts to define, in spatial and functional terms, the operational mandate of participating agencies. The new Courthouse will be comprised of these components while representing the operational basis for the Court. The Architectural Program developed for this study is organized to describe each of the nine functional components in narrative, spatial and graphic terms, according to four basic topics: (1) Component Role; (2) Operational Description; (3) Space Allocation; and (4) Functional Relationships.

A summary of the Architectural Program appears in the Appendix, as the inclusion of the entire document in the body of this study would be too voluminous. As a decision-making document, a working summation of the space needs for the nine components of the Court in 2025 is presented in Table III-2. While Table III-1 presents space based upon the application of general space standards against the estimated number of staff for each function of the Court, Table 4-2 summarizes the detailed space assignment for the nine major Court components based upon interviews with each component manager.

**Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**  
Johnson County, Kansas

**Table III-2**  
**Summary of Architectural Program by Court Components**

	NSF	DGSF	BGSF	2025 TOTAL
<b>1.000 Public Lobby</b>				<b>30,300</b>
1.100 General Lobby Spaces	14,708	2,942	3,530	21,180
1.200 Security Response Team	2,410	844	651	3,904
1.300 Law Enforcement Court Waiting	680	238	184	1,102
1.400 Staff Support Area	2,190	767	591	3,548
1.500 Building Management	350	123	95	567
<b>2.000 Building Shared Spaces</b>				<b>49,684</b>
2.100 Law Library	7,372	1,474	1,769	10,616
2.200 Children's Waiting Area	1,445	289	347	2,081
2.300 Snack Area	3,800	570	874	5,244
2.400 Inmate Holding	11,014	3,855	2,974	17,843
2.500 Loading Dock	2,000	300	460	2,760
2.600 Central Mechanical Space	8,440	844	1,857	11,141
<b>3.000 Courtroom Sets</b>				<b>232,726</b>
3.100 Standard District Courtroom	61,530	21,535	16,613	99,678
3.200 Large District Courtroom	15,084	5,279	4,073	24,436
3.300 Standard Juvenile Delinquency and CINC Courtroom	8,580	3,003	2,317	13,900
3.400 Standard Magistrate Courtroom	14,980	5,243	4,045	24,268
3.500 Large Magistrate Traffic or Limited Actions Courtroom	5,385	1,885	1,454	8,724
3.600 Judicial Office Clusters	23,650	8,278	6,386	38,313
3.700 Judicial Conference and Training Center	1,640	492	426	2,558
3.800 Court Reporters	3,510	1,229	948	5,686
3.900 Courtroom Floors Public Spaces	9,360	3,276	2,527	15,163
<b>4.000 Court Administration and Court Interpreters</b>				<b>4,021</b>
4.100 Court Administration	2,118	741	572	3,431
4.200 Court Interpreters	364	127	98	590
<b>5.000 District Attorney</b>				<b>44,148</b>
5.100 District Attorney	27,252	9,538	7,358	44,148
<b>6.000 Clerk of the Court</b>				<b>23,153</b>
6.100 Information Services/Finance Division	1,643	411	411	2,465
6.200 Clerk Services	9,236	2,309	2,309	13,854
6.300 Data Entry and Intake Services	1,508	377	377	2,262
6.400 Administrative and Support Services	3,048	762	762	4,572
<b>7.000 Jury Services</b>				<b>6,120</b>
7.100 Jury Lounge	4,080	1,020	1,020	6,120
<b>8.000 Court Support Services</b>				<b>22,726</b>
8.100 Court Services	4,071	1,425	1,099	6,595
8.200 JIMS	8,698	3,044	2,348	14,091
8.300 Public Defender Work Area	1,360	340	340	2,040
<b>9.000 Court Trustee</b>				<b>21,935</b>
9.100 Child Enforcement Division	9,920	3,472	2,678	16,070
9.200 Court Trustee	3,620	1,267	977	5,864
<b>TOTAL NEW COURTHOUSE</b>				<b>434,812</b>

Source: Carter Goble Lee; May 13, 2005

## **Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**

Johnson County, Kansas

A comparison of the planning level results of 432,119 and the detailed program summary of 434,812 is not as significant as may appear. The planning estimate was derived by applying a DGSF space factor against the forecasted number of staff, while the architectural program was based upon a detailed listing of all spaces within a component/department. The only reason for using planning level estimates here is because they were used in the development of the design concept options to narrow the choices; after which a more detailed program could be developed.

### **D. Phasing**

Other than site selection, the most difficult decision before the County will involve how best to structure the appropriate capital improvement phasing for the new Courthouse. The forecasting approaches previously described identified the requirement for 34 judges to meet the projected case load need in 2025. Given the nature of the cases and the ability to use mediation spaces for many of the Court proceedings, 31 courtrooms and two hearing rooms were programmed in the space needs plan. With this level of resources, the Court may actually include more judicial positions (with chambers) than the number of courtrooms in future years. However, for the next 20 years, the plan is based on virtually an equal number of judicial positions (34) and courtroom / hearing rooms (33). As noted in Table III-2 the 2025 square footage need of the Court is 434,812.

In 2015, the projected need is for 29 litigation spaces, with essentially an equal total number of judges, magistrates and hearing officers. Using the space per judicial set that was established through the detailed architectural program, the required square footage for the courtroom sets was determined by multiplying the number and types of litigation spaces times the space allocation derived from the architectural program. Since the courtroom floor plate establishes the "footprint" of the courthouse in most cases, any phasing plan must identify reasonable means for future expansion of the litigation spaces so as to function within the original operational design concept.

Projecting the 2015 interim space requirements for other components of the Courthouse involved using the projected staff estimates (five years after the anticipated occupancy date) and multiplying the square footage per staff times the number of estimated occupants in 2015. This approach is not as precise as the 2025 space estimate since the latter was based on a complete architectural program, but will nonetheless, yield a reasonable estimate of the interim need.

Finally, as a part of the interim space need estimate, the number of "fixed" spaces was identified. For example, the General Lobby, Inmate Holding, Mechanical Room, and Loading Dock are not staff-driven, but are function-driven. The 20-year needs of these functions should be constructed initially.

Having addressed the methodology of phasing the 20-year needs, the decision remains as to an appropriate means of phasing the building. Again, site selection is critical in this process. If the chosen site permits a physical connection between the new and existing Courthouse, then some of the Court support functions could remain in the existing building for the initial phase. However, under any site option that separates the existing and new Courthouses, the potential use of the existing Courthouse changes.

The exploration of the options for phasing is based upon an estimated need of 383,147 Building Gross Square Feet (BGSF) in 2015. This space estimate utilized the methodology explained in the preceding paragraphs and was intended to establish a minimum requirement for initial construction. The difference between the 2015 and 2025 space need is only 50,000 BGSF, or basically one floor of a new Courthouse.

Table III-3 presents the 2015 and 2025 space needs comparison by Court component to establish a basis for exploring various phasing approaches.

**Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**  
Johnson County, Kansas

**Table III-3**  
**Comparison of Space Requirements by Court Components**

		2025 TOTAL	2015 TOTAL
<b>1.000</b>	<b>Public Lobby</b>	<b>30,300</b>	<b>30,300</b>
1.100	General Lobby Spaces	21,180	21,180
1.200	Security Response Team	3,904	3,904
1.300	Law Enforcement Court Waiting	1,102	1,102
1.400	Staff Support Area	3,548	3,548
1.500	Building Management	567	567
<b>2.000</b>	<b>Building Shared Spaces</b>	<b>49,684</b>	<b>51,039</b>
2.100	Law Library	10,616	8,257
2.200	Children's Waiting Area	2,081	2,081
2.300	Snack Area	5,244	5,244
2.400	Inmate Holding	17,843	17,843
2.500	Loading Dock	2,760	2,760
2.600	Central Mechanical Space	11,141	14,854
<b>3.000</b>	<b>Courtroom Sets</b>	<b>232,726</b>	<b>201,000</b>
3.100	Standard District Courtroom	99,678	89,186
3.200	Large District Courtroom	24,436	24,436
3.300	Standard Juvenile Delinquency and CINC Courtroom	13,900	13,900
3.400	Standard Magistrate Courtroom	24,268	18,201
3.500	Large Magistrate Traffic or Limited Actions Courtroom	8,724	-
3.600	Judicial Office Clusters	38,313	35,029
3.700	Judicial Conference and Training Center	2,558	2,558
3.800	Court Reporters	5,686	5,054
3.900	Courtroom Floors Public Spaces	15,163	12,636
<b>4.000</b>	<b>Court Administration and Court Interpreters</b>	<b>4,021</b>	<b>3,138</b>
4.100	Court Administration	3,431	2,745
4.200	Court Interpreters	590	393
<b>5.000</b>	<b>District Attorney</b>	<b>44,148</b>	<b>38,140</b>
5.100	District Attorney	44,148	38,140
<b>6.000</b>	<b>Clerk of the Court</b>	<b>23,153</b>	<b>20,202</b>
6.100	Information Services/Finance Division	2,465	2,054
6.200	Clerk Services	13,854	13,161
6.300	Data Entry and Intake Services	2,262	1,939
6.400	Administrative and Support Services	4,572	3,048
<b>7.000</b>	<b>Jury Services</b>	<b>6,120</b>	<b>6,120</b>
7.100	Jury Lounge	6,120	6,120
<b>8.000</b>	<b>Court Support Services</b>	<b>22,726</b>	<b>16,202</b>
8.100	Court Services	6,595	5,129
8.200	JIMS	14,091	9,260
8.300	Public Defender Work Area	2,040	1,813
<b>9.000</b>	<b>Court Trustee</b>	<b>21,935</b>	<b>17,006</b>
9.100	Child Enforcement Division	16,070	14,661
9.200	Court Trustee	5,864	2,346
		<b>434,812</b>	<b>383,147</b>

Source: Carter Goble Lee; May 13, 2005

## Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study

Johnson County, Kansas

In addition to the 383,147 BGSF required to meet the Court needs in 2015, the SFMP prepared by the County identifies a need for approximately 70,600 SF of space for general government functions by 2015, increasing to 83,800 in 2025. The existing Courthouse can meet a substantial (if not all) portion of this additional space need, depending upon the site and phasing scenario selected.

In the analysis of phasing scenarios, the functions of the Court were divided into three groups:

- **Court Specific.** The physical location of this group in the Courthouse where the courtrooms are located is very important due to the direct and continuous relationship between the judicial officers and these specific functions. Examples include: the judicial chambers; Clerk of Court; Court Reporters; security staff; inmate holding; and jury services.
- **Court Related.** These functions have a close relationship with the courtrooms and the Clerk of Court, and require a direct physical linkage that does not necessitate passing through additional security screening to enter the Courthouse. Examples include: District Attorney; Court Administration; JIMS; Law Library; and Court Trustee.
- **Court Support.** The judiciary is a part of the entire justice system that includes law enforcement, corrections, indigent defense, and community supervision. Staff from these agencies regularly appear in the courtroom and also have regular contact with the Clerk of Court. While a physical connection is not required, close proximity is desirable. Examples include: Sheriff's functions (administration, civil division, warrants division); Court Services field staff; Community Corrections; and the Public Defender's Office. Under any development scenario, these support functions would likely be housed in a separate building.

As previously suggested, phasing options for the construction of the new Courthouse will depend very much on the site selected. The following section of this study presents detailed analyses of the site selection process, the results of which served to narrow six possible locations to a final three. Specific to the selected three sites, four basic phasing scenarios were developed and are summarized as follows:

- **Scenario 1.** Complete use of the existing Courthouse (145,000 DGSF) for Court related and Court support functions. Under this scenario, no space would be available for the estimated 70,600 SF of general government space needs.
- **Scenario 2.** Primary use of the existing Courthouse would be Court support functions with all direct Court related functions located in the new Courthouse. Virtually all of the 70,600 SF of general government space needs could be met in the existing Courthouse under Scenario 2.
- **Scenario 3.** Only Court support functions would occupy the existing Courthouse, leaving significant room for the inclusion of general government functions.
- **Scenario 4.** The initial construction would be based upon constructing the 2025 space need (434,812 BGSF) and leaving unfinished the difference between the 2025 and 2015 space needs (approximately 50,000 SF) allowing the expansion to occur internally as required by the demands at that time.

These four basic approaches to phasing were considered in the context of both a "connected" and "non-connected" site relative to the existing courthouse. Of the three sites, one (identified as Site A) is directly north of the existing Courthouse, across Santa Fe Street and could be physically connected to the existing Courthouse through a tunnel or "sky bridge".

## Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study

Johnson County, Kansas

### Scenario 1

The site north of the existing Courthouse could potentially permit the continued use of the existing building for direct Court functions (i.e. District Attorney, Law Library, Trustee, JIMS, Court Administration, Court Services) if the existing and new buildings are physically linked. Other Court-support functions could be re-located to the existing Courthouse under this scenario, as well as County administration functions if space is available. Table III-4 presents such an option.

**Table III-4**  
**Potential Re-Use of Existing Courthouse in 2015 and 2025: Scenario 1**  
 (Requires Physical Connection)

Function	2015 DGSF Space Needs	2025 DGSF Space Needs
<b>Court Related Function</b>	<b>60,641</b>	<b>79,009</b>
District Attorney	30,512	36,790
Court Administration	2,510	3,351
JIMS	7,408	11,742
Law Library	6,605	8,846
Court Trustee	13,605	18,279
<b>Court Support Function</b>	<b>56,913</b>	<b>68,296</b>
Sheriff's Administration	6,231	7,477
Sheriff's Civil Division	2,863	3,436
Sheriff's Warrants Division	2,712	3,254
Court Services Field Staff	19,707	23,648
Community Corrections	15,000	18,000
Public Defender's Office	10,400	12,480
<b>General Government Functions</b>	<b>70,592</b>	<b>83,819</b>
General Government Functions	70,592	83,819
<b>Potential Space for Existing Courthouse</b>	<b>188,146</b>	<b>231,123</b>
Unused Space in Existing Courthouse	(43,146)	(86,123)

Source: Carter Goble Lee; May 20, 2005

While this scenario makes good use of the existing Courthouse, unless the buildings are physically connected, Scenario 1 is not feasible. Under this scenario, 117,554 DGSF of the 145,000 DGSF in the existing Courthouse would be used for Court related and support functions, leaving 27,446 SF for general government functions. Since the 2015 estimated general government space need is 70,592, the remaining 43,146 DGSF of general government space need would have to be provided in another structure. However, even with the connection, leaving the District Attorney, JIMS, and Court Administration in the existing building will present significant operational challenges.

### Scenario 2

As shown in Table III-5 this phasing scenario leaves the Court Trustee and Library in the existing Courthouse along with Court support components, such as the Sheriff's functions, Court Services (field staff), Community Corrections, and the Office of the Public Defender, all of which have a need to be in close proximity to the Court.

While a physical connection would be desirable, this is not essential since in Scenario 2 all of the Court related functions would be included in the new Courthouse, increasing the efficiency of the Court. Those functions that would remain in the existing Courthouse are essentially "self-contained" relative to their relationship to the functions within the Courthouse.

**Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**  
Johnson County, Kansas

**Table III-5**  
**Potential Re-Use of Existing Courthouse in 2015 and 2025: Scenario 2**  
(Physical Connection Desirable, but not required)

Function	2015 DGSF Space Needs	2025 DGSF Space Needs
<b>Court Related Function</b>	<b>20,210</b>	<b>27,125</b>
Law Library	6,605	8,846
Court Trustee	13,605	18,279
<b>Court Support Function</b>	<b>56,913</b>	<b>68,296</b>
Sheriff's Administration	6,231	7,477
Sheriff's Civil Division	2,863	3,436
Sheriff's Warrants Division	2,712	3,254
Court Services Field Staff	19,707	23,648
Community Corrections	15,000	18,000
Public Defender's Office	10,400	12,480
<b>General Government Functions</b>	<b>70,592</b>	<b>83,819</b>
General Government Functions	70,592	83,819
<b>Potential Space for Existing Courthouse</b>	<b>147,715</b>	<b>179,240</b>
Unused Space in Existing Courthouse	(2,715)	(34,240)

Source: Carter Goble Lee; May 20, 2005

Under Scenario 2, approximately 50% of Court related and support functions (77,123 DGSF) would remain in the existing Courthouse in 2015. While this option can work, ultimately both the Court Trustee and the Law Library would be best located in the new Courthouse. In Scenario 2, practically all of the 2015 general government space needs, as well as the Court needs that have been identified could be satisfied through a renovation of the existing Courthouse.

**Scenario 3**

This scenario assumes that the buildings are not physically joined, but that the new Courthouse is located in Downtown Olathe. Under this scenario, the functions identified as court-support spaces could efficiently remain in the existing Courthouse in 2015 as shown in Table III-6.

As shown below, approximately 39% of the existing useable space in the existing Courthouse could remain in a Court-support use in 2015, increasing to 47% by 2025 if the selected site remains in Downtown Olathe, but is not directly linked to the existing Courthouse. With the addition of general government functions, in 2015, 88% of the existing Courthouse would be used. Under Phasing Scenario 3, approximately 88,000 square feet in the existing Courthouse would be available for non-Court uses, exceeding by approximately 17,000 square feet the estimated general government need in 2015.

**Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**  
Johnson County, Kansas

**Table III-6**  
**Potential Re-Use of Existing Courthouse in 2015 and 2025: Scenario 3**  
(Physical Connection not required)

Function	2015 DGSF Space Needs	2025 DGSF Space Needs
<b>Court Support Function</b>	<b>56,913</b>	<b>68,296</b>
Sheriff's Administration	6,231	7,477
Sheriff's Civil Division	2,863	3,436
Sheriff's Warrants Division	2,712	3,254
Court Services Field Staff	19,707	23,648
Community Corrections	15,000	18,000
Public Defender's Office	10,400	12,480
<b>General Government Functions</b>	<b>70,592</b>	<b>83,819</b>
General Government Functions	70,592	83,819
<b>Total Court Support Functions</b>	<b>127,505</b>	<b>152,115</b>
Unused Space in Existing Courthouse	17,495	(7,115)

Source: Carter Goble Lee; May 20, 2005

**Scenario 4**

The most efficient means of phasing would be to construct the new Courthouse to the 434,000 square foot need and to complete only the 383,000 square feet required in 2015. All of the functions that were identified above in Table III-6 could remain in the existing Courthouse. Similar to Scenario 3, this approach would provide significant room for general government function to share space with Court support functions in the existing Courthouse.

The "expand-in-place" scenario has many advantages, some of which are noted below:

- The long-term building "footprint" is established initially making future expansion more easily accomplished.
- Department expansion needs will not occur simultaneously. With "shelled" space created at the time of initial construction, the various components can grow according to differing timetables.
- The volatility of construction cost generally favors achieving as much of the long-term need in the first building increment as possible.
- Numerous "backfill" options for accommodating additional governmental space needs become available as interim uses of "shelled" space, including other governmental jurisdiction such as federal representatives.
- Phased construction means disruption to the Court operations at the time a second phase is required. Internal partitioning is more easily accomplished with minimal disruption to daily operations.
- Visible expansion of a new building within 10 years of initial construction can send a false message to the public that initial planning was flawed.
- While the construction of the 20-year Court space need initially could cost approximately \$10 million more than the 2015 need, complete renovation of the existing Courthouse to house those Court function left behind could cost at least \$5 million.

Essentially, all of the four phasing scenarios that continue a Court role for the existing Courthouse assume a Downtown Olathe site. If a site outside of Downtown Olathe is chosen, then the 56,913 DGSF (68,000 BGSF) in 2015 and 68,296 DGSF (82,000 BGSF) in 2025 of Court support functions would need to re-locate to a building(s) in closer proximity to the out-of-Downtown site. This would allow the existing 145,000 DGSF Courthouse to be renovated as a County office building.

## **Downtown Olathe Facilities and Courthouse Study**

Johnson County, Kansas

### **E. Summary**

The 20-year, programmed space need for the Court is approximately 435,000 square feet. While the 145,000 DGSF in the existing Courthouse, with significant improvements, can be effectively used for another 20 years, this will substantially expend the useful life remaining with the existing facility. Continued use of the existing Courthouse for Court functions will limit the site selection and ultimately the design options of the County.