



architecture.
interiors.
planning.
facilities.

beijing
cincinnati
louisville
pittsburgh

18 June 2014

Cincinnati Cultural Facilities Task Force
Chair, Robert A. McDonald
Cincinnati, Ohio

Re: **Cincinnati Cultural Facilities Task Force
Valuation Team Update
Union Terminal Restoration Evaluation**

Dear Mr. McDonald:

Serving at the request of the Cultural Facilities Task Force, the Langan / GBBN team has continued to support the efforts of investigative work around options and alternatives for the Union Terminal renovation, in an effort to further test and validate the considerations presented in January 2014. We are highly appreciative of the access granted to the team that authored earlier Master Plans for Cincinnati Museum Center, and found their insights invaluable during our initial study, and as resources since that period. George Skarmeas of PDP Architects, his consulting team of ARUP, RSA, ICI, HLF, and *glaserworks* - the architect responsible for the original renovation in 1989; and the documents they created dating back to 2006, afforded the Task Force Team a tremendous resource.

In addition to the team above, Langan and GBBN also solicited such expert opinions from THP Limited and Heapy Engineers for Structural and Mechanical & Electrical Engineering, respectively. Turner and Messer, as Construction Management experts in complex renovations and cultural venues, worked concurrently on detailed costs analyses that were reconciled together with the Architectural and Engineering team.

In total, over 3,200 professional hours were dedicated to a collaborative and investigative process of Scope Review and definition of the renovation of Union Terminal, and in the preliminary Budgeting of the work, during January and February of 2014. This team also considered a full building replacement at the current location, and the alternative of relocating the Cincinnati Museum Center to a downtown location, spending an additional 2 months and 780 hours investigating an existing structure of over 350,000 sf as a potential new home for the museum.

It is a result of this careful examination that the Task Force can make the recommendation that a renovation of the existing structure at Cincinnati's Union terminal is the most cost-effective option considered. This renovation solution also enhances long-term flexibility for the Museum Center, taking advantage of under-utilized space within the existing Union Terminal building, maintains a location in the city which surveys demonstrate is more accessible to families than downtown, and preserves an icon of the community and a nationally-recognized historic building.

GBBN Architects, Inc.
332 East 8th Street | Cincinnati OH 45202
T 513.241.8700 F 513.241.8873
www.gbbn.com



Mr. Robert A. McDonald
 Re: **Cincinnati Union Terminal Restoration**
 18 June 2014
 Page 2

The following serves to demonstrate the costs evaluation of the primary options pursued during the 6-month efforts of the Task Force, including the input of the Cost Reduction Subcommittee:



Cincinnati Cultural Facilities Task Force
 Cincinnati Museum Center Relocation Options

	Union Terminal Renov 500,000 SF	Replacement Facility 450,000 SF	Alternative Facility 350,000 SF
Building & Renovation	\$174,200,000	\$265,000,000	\$102,625,000
Addition	\$0	\$0	\$53,295,000
Design / Engineering	\$13,500,000	\$22,500,000	\$12,200,000
Additional Exhibit Costs	\$0	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000
Building / Site Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$10,000,000
Structured Parking (Land NIC)	\$0	\$0	\$20 - \$38,000,000
Union Terminal Demolition	Not necessary	\$11,000,000	Not incl
TOTAL Project Cost	\$187,700,000	\$353,500,000	\$260,000,000

While the overall Total Construction costs vary, the overall square footage of the options also vary dramatically, based upon the desire to keep any of the options aligned to the goals of the Cincinnati Museum Center. While Union Terminal is a larger building, offering more space that could be fit out in the future for additional exhibit growth, the alternative plan options were smaller structures, designed to accommodate only current program spaces without future growth, and to be responsive to property constraints.

Major components of the additional costs of relocating the museum is that of the Exhibits and Parking Strategies. Renovating Union Terminal does require protection of exhibits, but at significantly less cost than full replacement. Our team solicited 4 national experts in museum and exhibit design to arrive at the \$55,000,000 cost estimate for specialized design, production, fabrication and installation. A similar variation occurs in the parking analysis. Dedicated parking throughout the 7-day week is a must-have for the CMC, and a vital source of revenue generation. The downtown site would have to include a strategy for structured parking that is convenient and accessible, in order to be feasible. The variance presented allows for the cost range of above or below-grade solutions to that parking need.

Recognizing the Costs / Benefit Analysis does demonstrate an advantage to renovating Union terminal as the continued home of Cincinnati Museum Center, it is also worth restating a summary of the proposed scope of work for that renovation.



Mr. Robert A. McDonald
Re: **Cincinnati Union Terminal Restoration**
18 June 2014
Page 3

Scope of Work Summary

The following components were determined as most appropriate priorities for the work:

- Exterior Restoration and Preservation:
Preventing continued water infiltration and damage from façade, roof, and parapet conditions, including repairs and protective measures to impacted structural steel;
- Mechanical Equipment Replacement:
In-kind equipment replacement, with exception of Lower Level North, where new high-efficiency equipment shall be installed in alternative locations, to allow modest future exhibit expansion in space with appropriately controlled HVAC;
Note: Most of this equipment dates from 1970's CUT renovation as a retail mall;
- Replacement of obsolete and inefficient Lighting and Electrical systems;
- Fountain and Dalton Street work:
Relining the existing fountain basin & remedial work to the Dalton Street overpass, currently damaging the structure, and leaking into the building and the street below;
- Site work to improve Parking Lot Lighting, Fencing, Security and lot repairs;
- Historic Restoration of Entry Canopy, Vestibule and Rotunda;
- Life Safety improvements of Sprinklers and Smoke Evacuation.

Items below were determined a lower priority, and therefore recommended to be removed from the original scope as Value-Engineering:

- Reduced renovation scope in areas of Children's Museum, Omnimax, and large exhibit spaces, working around exhibits in place;
- Reduced scope of Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Scopes;
- Refurbish existing historic windows in Concourse facades ilo replacement;
- Reduced Office Renovation, and Rotunda corridors finishes;
- Remove 'Tower A' renovation and new elevator access;
- Eliminate proposed green roof.

The savings from the above reductions offered over \$10,000,000 in savings from the original budget, proposing \$187,700,000 as a working budget for the project. Items that were preserved in the scope focused on long-term benefits to the CMC – namely preserving the envelope from continued accelerated deterioration, and minimizing any premium associated with already necessary equipment replacement, other than a modest increase in exhibit space, so the CMC can continue to be competitive in attracting world-class exhibits to Greater Cincinnati. Additional value-engineering and scope reduction remains possible, as the engineering team does further evaluation of using more sustainable technologies to find operational-cost savings in building HVAC systems definition.



Mr. Robert A. McDonald
Re: **Cincinnati Union Terminal Restoration**
18 June 2014
Page 4

We hope this serves to summarize and update the Task force on the work performed by our dedicated team since our January 29, 2014 report.

On behalf of all parties involved in these studies and explorations, we sincerely appreciate the opportunity to be a part of this Task Force. We remain on-call for further evaluation and consideration at the request of the Committees, and the community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S.T. Kenat".

Steven T. Kenat, AIA LEED AP
Principal | Director, Community Development

cc: Douglass McDonald, CMC; Wick Ach, CFTF; Scott Rowland, Langan

J:\13343\Final Valuation Summary Report\140618_CMC_CFVT_Update.doc