



DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Agency Co-Location County Summary

Agency:	Department of Government Efficiencies	County:	Orange
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------	--------

PLAN COMPLETED BY:	Bill Sample	DATE:	4/23/2012	TOTAL LEASES IN COUNTY?	6	CURRENT FULL SERVICE MARKET R	\$19.47
DOES YOUR AGENCY OWN BUILDINGS IN THIS COUNTY?	No	SPACE AVAILABLE?		APPROXIMATE SF AVAILABLE?		DMS SPACE AVAILABLE?	Yes
WOULD ANY LEASES BELOW BE A CANDIDATE FOR CO-LOCATION IN AN ADJOINING COUNTY?			No	LIST YOUR LEASE(S) HERE:			

Lease Source	Lease ID	Co-Location Candidate?	CL Grouping	Lease End Date	Square Footage	Rate Per Square Foot	Rate Type	Annual Rent	FTE Current FY 2012-13	FTE Estimate FY 2013-14	FTE Estimate FY 2014-15	Telecommuting FTE	% OF Telecommuting Time
Private	8900041	No	N/A	11/30/2013	2,626	\$19.78	Full Service	\$51,942.28	10	10	9	0	
Private	8900050	Yes	1	2/28/2014	4,500	\$21.50	Full Service	\$96,750.00	18	18	18	0	
Private	8900071	No	N/A	3/31/2013	3,365	\$16.88	Janitorial only	\$56,801.20	14	14	14	0	
Private	8900110	Yes	1	4/30/2013	1,800	\$19.75	Full Service	\$35,550.00	7	7	7	0	
Private	8900082	Yes	1	8/31/2014	4,872	\$20.10	Full Service	\$97,927.20	20	20	20	0	
Private	8900095	No	N/A	6/30/2012	9,867	\$17.55	Full Service	\$173,165.85	35	35	35	4	50%

Group Key	Lease ID	NEXT ACTION FOR LEASES ---- SEE NEXT SHEET FOR GROUPING ANALYSIS
1	8900050	Extend to 8/31/14 to coincide with ending date for 8900082
1	8900110	Extend to 8/31/14 to coincide with ending date for 8900082
1	8900082	Put out ITN for co-located leases 8900050, 8900110 & 8900082 in July of 2013
N/A	8900041	Work with field personnel to determine if extension or new lease would be in best interest of the State. Course of action to be decided by 10/31/12.
N/A	8900071	Propose to extend lease for 3 years and move to full service rate.
N/A	8900095	This lease has two more 2-year options remaining. Will recommend picking up 2-year renewal at reduced rates.



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

Date: 4/23/12

GROUP#: 1

Agency: Department of Government Efficiencies

Reference Lease Numbers: 8900050, 8900110 & 8900082

These leases are recommended for co-location.

I. Overview (Provide a brief summary of the analysis):

These three leases are generally located in the southeast quadrant of Orange county and were determined to be suitable candidates for co-location in order to achieve operational efficiencies as well as cost savings. Co-locating these leases will not adversely affect the agency's ability to conduct its core business functions or the interaction with clients in the area.

II. Future Environment & Anticipated Needs – Where We Are Going:

1) Agency leased-space goals and strategies (as they support strategies in agency's LRPP)

The agency will be implementing strategies to support an overall goal of reducing its space utilization down to an average of 210 square feet per FTE and a total annual rent cost of \$4,500 per FTE.

2) Workforce - Changes and/or shifts in workforce as a result of legislation/budget changes, telecommuting programs, alternative workplace programs, etc.

Within the next 12 months, the agency will implement a pilot telecommuting plan to determine the potential effectiveness of allowing employees to telecommute. A successful telecommuting policy will help facilitate the agency's goal of reducing its space needs and costs.

3) Client and/or business needs - Changes in agency's service delivery models, client services, client traffic impacting space needs

The agency does not anticipate major changes in its delivery models, client services or client traffic over the next four years. We will continue to have the need for space that includes client waiting and service areas, as well as back office operations space.

4) Client/Stakeholder expectations as related to business operations

Client/Stakeholders will continue to want to have offices conveniently located so that they can interact in person with agency personnel.

5) Availability of space- State-owned building availability, other expiring leases, etc.

While there is vacant space in the Hurston Building, the agency has determined that location to be outside of the primary area of the client base served by the applicable programs.



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

6) Identify what other agencies that your agency can or can't be co-located with and why?

The agency would be comfortable co-locating with any other state agencies.

III. Current Environment – Where We Are:

1) Historical basis of current location(s), layout(s), site selection(s), etc

The leases within this group have been in existence from about 1998 to 2003. Separate leases were obtained due to timing issues as well as operational issues that were not conducive to a single location.

2) Client/Stakeholder expectations as related to business operations

Same as listed in Section II.4. above.

3) Customers/client traffic volume

Currently, these three locations have a total of approximately 150 client visits per day.

4) Program or business needs in current space

These programs need to be close to some form of mass transit system for convenience of our clients. As an agency, we want to promote and facilitate the use of buses, trains and other forms of mass transit.

5) Total Current Occupancy - Current FTE, OPS, Contracting Staff, Other

These programs currently have a total FTE count of 45 at the three locations.

6) Pros/cons of current space(s)

The three separate spaces are currently in attractive, clean buildings with easy access for mass transit as well as walkers and bicyclists. However, all three locations are somewhat deficient in available parking.

7) Current pros/cons of co-locating programs/divisions

Pros of co-locating would include cost savings, increased ease of communications (i.e., easier for employees to meet) and having less lease payments to process. There are no apparent cons to co-locating.



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

IV. Co-Location Recommendation and Justifications

1) *State-space availability (Agency name, available SF)*

We are unaware of any agency owned space available in this area.

2) *Timing of the expirations and transition to co-located site*

We anticipate producing an ITN to procure the co-located space on or before July 31, 2013.

3) *Cost-Benefit Analysis (Summarizes the results from the following page)*

As shown in the attached sheet, we anticipate the co-location of these three leases will produce a savings of approximately \$269,835.00 over a five-year period.



DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Agency Co-Location Cost-Benefit Analysis

AGENCY:	Department of Government Efficiencies	GROUP KEY NUMBER:	1	COUNTY:	Orange
---------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	---	---------	--------

CURRENT LEASE DATA								OUT YEAR ESTIMATES					CURRENT ANNUAL OPERATION COSTS						
Lease Number	SF	FTE	Expires	Rate	Rate Includes	Janitorial Rate	Utility Rate	Full Service Annual Rent (FY 2012-13)	(FY 2013-14)	(FY 2014-15)	(FY 2015-16)	(FY 2016-17)	FY 2012 -17 Subtotals	Special Equipment	Data	Communications	Office Equipment	Other	Current Operation Costs Sub-Total
8900050	4,500	18	2/28/2014	\$21.50	Full Service			\$96,750	\$99,653	\$102,642	\$105,721	\$108,893	\$513,659	\$6,000	\$2,800	\$1,800	\$6,500	\$7,200	\$24,300
8900110	1,800	7	4/30/2013	\$19.75	Full Service			\$35,550	\$36,261	\$36,986	\$37,726	\$38,480	\$185,004	\$2,500	\$1,500	\$1,200	\$2,100	\$2,200	\$9,500
8900082	4,872	20	8/31/2014	\$20.10	Full Service			\$97,927	\$100,865	\$103,891	\$107,008	\$110,218	\$519,909	\$10,200	\$3,000	\$2,200	\$5,800	\$5,100	\$26,300
								\$0					\$0						\$0
TOTALS	11,172	45						\$230,227	\$236,779	\$243,519	\$250,455	\$257,591	\$1,218,571	\$18,700	\$7,300	\$5,200	\$14,400	\$14,500	\$60,100

ASSUMPTIONS: Leases 8900050 & 8900082 have 3% rate escalations per year; 8900110 has a 2% rate escalation per year. Annual Operating Costs were obtained from field personnel located at the subject offices.

CO-LOCATION OPTIONS								ANTICIPATED OUT YEAR ESTIMATES					ANTICIPATED OPERATION COSTS						
Lease Number	SF	FTE	Anticipated Procurement Date	Anticipated Rate	Rate Includes	Janitorial Rate	Utility Rate	Full Service Annual Rent (FY 2012-13)	(FY 2013-14)	(FY 2014-15)	(FY 2015-16)	(FY 2016-17)	FY 2012 -17 Subtotals	Special Equipment	Data	Com	Office Equipment	Other	Sub-Total
New	10,500	45	7/31/2013	\$18.75	Full Service			\$196,875	\$202,781	\$208,865	\$215,131	\$221,585	\$1,045,236	\$15,000	\$3,500	\$2,500	\$9,000	\$9,800	\$39,800

ASSUMPTIONS Combining the three leases into one will result in a reduction in square footage. While the average market rate for Orange County provided by DMS is listed at \$19.47, the area this lease will be located in has a somewhat high vacancy rate and we believe we should be able to obtain a full service rate at \$18.75/sf including TI. We have provided for 3% annual rent escalations. Reductions in annual operating costs are estimates derived from discussions with field office personnel.

RELOCATION COSTS	
Furnishings	\$3,800
Fixtures & Equipment	\$1,200
Data & Communication	\$0
Other	\$0
TOTAL	\$5,000
MOVING COST AVERAGE	\$4,050

* SQUARE FOOT ANALYSIS		
Current	New	Difference
11,172	10,500	-672

* SQUARE FOOT PER FTE ANALYSIS		
Current	New	Difference
248	233	-15

* COST BENEFIT SUMMARY									
YEAR	LEASE COSTS			OPERATIONAL COSTS			FINAL ANALYSIS		
	CURRENT	NEW	DIFFERENCE	CURRENT	NEW	DIFFERENCE	MOVE COSTS		\$ DIFFERENCE
YEAR 1	\$230,227	\$196,875	-\$33,352	\$60,100	\$39,800	-\$20,300	\$5,000	YEAR 1	-\$48,652
YEAR 2	\$236,779	\$202,781	-\$33,997	\$60,100	\$39,800	-\$20,300	\$0	YEAR 2	-\$54,297
YEAR 3	\$243,519	\$208,865	-\$34,655	\$60,100	\$39,800	-\$20,300	\$0	YEAR 3	-\$54,955
YEAR 4	\$250,455	\$215,131	-\$35,324	\$60,100	\$39,800	-\$20,300	\$0	YEAR 4	-\$55,624
YEAR 5	\$257,591	\$221,585	-\$36,007	\$60,100	\$39,800	-\$20,300	\$0	YEAR 5	-\$56,307
TOTALS	\$1,218,571	\$1,045,236	-\$173,335	\$300,500	\$199,000	-\$101,500	\$5,000	TOTAL ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS	-\$269,835

*** SAVINGS/REDUCTIONS WILL BE INDICATED AS A NEGATIVE**



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

Date: 4/23/12

GROUP#: N/A

Agency: Department of Government Efficiencies

Reference Lease Numbers: 8900041, 8900071 & 8900095

These leases are not recommended for co-location.

I. Overview (Provide a brief summary of the analysis):

These three leases are generally located in the northeast, northwest and southwest quadrants of Orange county and were determined to not be suitable candidates for co-location. Keeping these leases separate will not adversely affect the agency's ability to conduct its core business functions and will facilitate the interaction with clients in the area.

II. Future Environment & Anticipated Needs – Where We Are Going:

1) Agency leased-space goals and strategies (as they support strategies in agency's LRPP)

The agency will be implementing strategies to support an overall goal of reducing its space utilization down to an average of 210 square feet per FTE and a total annual rent cost of \$4,500 per FTE. Future modifications to these leases will be made keeping in mind the agencies overall goals and objectives with respect to space utilization.

2) Workforce - Changes and/or shifts in workforce as a result of legislation/budget changes, telecommuting programs, alternative workplace programs, etc.

Within the next 12 months, the agency will implement a pilot telecommuting plan to determine the potential effectiveness of allowing employees to telecommute. A successful telecommuting policy will help facilitate the agency's goal of reducing its space needs and costs.

3) Client and/or business needs - Changes in agency's service delivery models, client services, client traffic impacting space needs

The agency does not anticipate major changes in its delivery models, client services or client traffic over the next four years. We will continue to have the need for space that includes client waiting and service areas, as well as back office operations space.

4) Client/Stakeholder expectations as related to business operations

Client/Stakeholders will continue to want to have offices conveniently located so that they can interact in person with agency personnel.



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

5) Availability of space- State-owned building availability, other expiring leases, etc.

While there is vacant space in the Hurston Building, the agency has determined that location to be outside of the primary area of the client base served by the applicable programs.

6) Identify what other agencies that your agency can or can't be co-located with and why?

The agency would be comfortable co-locating with any other state agencies.

III. Current Environment – Where We Are:

1) Historical basis of current location(s), layout(s), site selection(s), etc

The leases within this group have been in existence since about 1992 to 2001. Separate leases were obtained due to timing issues as well as operational issues that were not conducive to a single location.

2) Client/Stakeholder expectations as related to business operations

Same as listed in Section II.4. above.

3) Customers/client traffic volume

Currently, these three locations have a total of approximately 300 client visits per day.

4) Program or business needs in current space

These programs need to be close to some form of mass transit system for convenience of our clients. As an agency, we want to promote and facilitate the use of buses, trains and other forms of mass transit.

5) Total Current Occupancy - Current FTE, OPS, Contracting Staff, Other

These programs currently have a total FTE count of 59 at the three locations.

6) Pros/cons of current space(s)

The three locations are currently in newer, class A buildings with easy access for mass transit as well as walkers and bicyclists. These locations have no known deficiencies.



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES
Co-Location Business Case Analysis

7) *Current pros/cons of co-locating programs/divisions*

Pros of co-locating could include cost savings, increased ease of communications (i.e., easier for employees to meet) and having less lease payments to process. However, clients served by these locations would have difficulty accessing the services of the agency if they were all combined into single location.

IV. Co-Location Recommendation and Justifications

1) *State-space availability (Agency name, available SF)*

We are unaware of any agency owned space available in this area.

2) *Timing of the expirations and transition to co-located site*

N/A

3) *Cost-Benefit Analysis (Summarizes the results from the following page)*

Co-locating these sites would not meet the business needs of the agency.