

Town of Manlius

Town Hall, Police, and Court Facility

Cost-Benefit Analysis — Overview & Explanations

A companion guide to the CBA workbook. This document explains the purpose of the analysis, walks through each scenario, and explains why specific cost items are included and where the numbers come from.

Internal planning document — figures are planning-level estimates for comparison, not final commitment numbers.

Contents

1. Purpose of This Analysis

The Town of Manlius faces three converging facility problems: an aging Town Hall that no longer meets accessibility, security, and space needs; a Police Department housed in a leased building that is far too small for its staff; and a Court that shares space and lacks the separation and security a court facility requires.

This cost-benefit analysis (CBA) was built to compare the realistic options for addressing these problems and to help Town leadership decide on a direction. It is an internal planning tool. Its job is to put the options side by side on a consistent basis, show where the costs and benefits fall over time, and identify what professional work should be commissioned next. It is deliberately not a final budget or a commitment to any single path.

Two of the scenarios are anchored by real professional estimates: the **Trophy Point feasibility estimate** for new construction and the **VIP Architectural Associates Building Conditions Assessment** for renovating the Town Hall. The remaining figures are built from the Town's own budget and expense records, from recognized industry planning guidelines, and from documented assumptions. Every assumption and its confidence level is recorded in the workbook.

How to read the workbook

- **Overview & Explanations** (this document) — the narrative behind the analysis.
- **Comparison** — the four scenarios side by side on cost, net present value, and per-resident impact.
- **Assumptions** — the framing judgments and the key numeric inputs that shaped the analysis.
- **Parameters** — every input value, with its source.
- **Benefits** — the monetized benefits and how they flow into each scenario.
- **Tax Levy Impact** — the effect on the tax levy and on a median home, if a scenario is financed with debt.
- **Scenario tabs (A-E)** — the full 30-year cash flow for each option.
- **Glossary** — plain-language definitions of the technical terms used throughout.

2. How the Analysis Works

30-year horizon and present value

All scenarios are compared over a 30-year period. Because a dollar spent years from now is worth less than a dollar spent today, future costs are *discounted* back to today's dollars at 4% per year. The result is the **present value (PV)** of each scenario's total cost — a single number that lets options with very different timing be compared fairly. Because these figures are costs, they are shown as negative numbers in the comparison.

Costs and benefits

Each scenario adds up construction or remediation costs, ongoing operating and maintenance costs, and (where relevant) the cost of continuing to carry risk. Against those costs, the analysis subtracts monetized benefits — avoided risk, insurance savings, efficiency gains — to reach a net figure. The

benefits are deliberately conservative and several real but hard-to-quantify benefits (civic value, public-meeting dignity, long-term flexibility) are described but not counted.

Why “doing the minimum” still carries a large cost

A central judgment in this analysis is that doing the minimum defers, but does not avoid, the need to eventually replace these facilities. The buildings will continue to age, systems will continue to fail, and the space problems will remain. The analysis therefore treats the status quo as a real cost stream — including the capital that will have to be spent over the next 30 years and the eventual cost of building anyway.

3. The Scenarios Explained

Five scenarios are compared. Each is summarized below, followed by an explanation of the cost items that are easy to misread.

Scenario A — Do Minimum

Remediate the most urgent compliance and safety problems, continue leasing the police building, and keep the existing Town Hall in service. No new building is constructed up front.

Why future capital replacements (e.g., the boiler) are included

Keeping a 1960s-era building in service for 30 more years is not free. Major building systems reach the end of their service life and must be replaced on a predictable schedule. The analysis includes a capital replacement schedule — boiler, roof, electrical service, HVAC, windows/envelope, and parking — because these are **expected, not optional** costs of continuing to operate the building. For example, the boiler is already past typical service life and had documented issues; a commercial boiler of this size is generally expected to be replaced roughly every 20–25 years, so the model schedules a replacement during the horizon and a second one later. Leaving these out would make “doing nothing” look artificially cheap.

These specific amounts and timings are Town estimates, not the result of an engineering study. A **Facility Condition Assessment (FCA)** would replace them with engineered figures, and the workbook flags them as estimates.

Why “cost of inaction” items are included

Some problems generate cost even if no construction happens — through liability, regulatory exposure, and inefficiency. The analysis counts a conservative, risk-weighted amount for these so the true cost of the status quo is visible. The main items, and why they belong, are:

- **Accessibility / elevator (ADA):** The Town Hall is a multi-story government building. Under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, multi-story state and local government facilities are generally required to provide an accessible route between floors, and the VIP study found the building cannot currently provide one within its footprint. This is a legal compliance obligation, not a discretionary upgrade.
- **Worker-safety / restroom exposure (PESH):** As a public employer, the Town is subject to New York’s Public Employee Safety and Health (PESH) Act, which requires a workplace free of

recognized hazards and provides for penalties of up to \$200 per day for failure to abate serious violations. The analysis carries a risk-weighted amount for these exposures.

- **Records protection:** Water intrusion and envelope problems in records storage create a risk of losing or having to reconstruct public records, with associated legal exposure.
- **Security and cash handling:** Building security gaps and the need to transport cash receipts without adequate protection create insurable risk that a properly designed facility would reduce.

These are *expected-value estimates* — a reasonable annual figure for risks that may or may not occur in a given year — and the workbook marks them for refinement with the Town’s insurance broker.

Scenario B — Full Rebuild

Construct one new approximately 50,000-square-foot building housing Town Hall, Police, and Court together. Sell the existing Town Hall (returning it to the tax roll) and end the police lease.

Why this is the most reliable cost estimate

This scenario is anchored by the **Trophy Point feasibility estimate**, a real professional construction estimate that already includes general conditions, overhead and profit, design contingency, and escalation. The Town’s analysis adds the soft costs Trophy Point excluded (design fees, owner’s contingency, construction-management/owner’s-representative fees, bond issuance, and legal). Because it rests on a professional estimate, it is the most reliable of the five.

Scenario C — Split (New PD/Court + Renovate Town Hall)

Build a new Police/Court building and renovate and expand the existing Town Hall.

Why the Town Hall cost is about \$10.5 million, not a smaller “renovation” figure

The **VIP Building Conditions Assessment** found that renovation alone cannot make the Town Hall function: the existing footprint cannot accommodate an elevator plus the building’s current functions, so a roughly 7,800-square-foot addition is required in addition to renovating the existing space. VIP’s estimate of \$9–12 million (the analysis uses the midpoint plus asbestos abatement, which VIP excluded) reflects renovation *and* the necessary addition — not a cosmetic refresh. This is why a “cheap renovation” is not actually available.

Scenario D — Purchase Building + Renovate Town Hall

Purchase and convert an existing building (placeholder of about \$1 million) for Police and Court, and renovate and expand the Town Hall to the same VIP standard as Scenario C.

Why this is the least certain scenario

No specific building has been identified. The purchase price, the size, and especially the cost to convert a general-purpose building for police use (secure holding, evidence storage, an enclosed sallyport, and 24/7 systems) are estimates that could change substantially once a real candidate is evaluated. The workbook marks this scenario as the lowest-confidence of the five.

Scenario E — Purchase Building + Do-Minimum Town Hall

A blend of Scenarios D and A: purchase and convert a building for Police and Court (as in Scenario D), but address the Town Hall with only the **base remediation from Scenario A** — the urgent compliance fixes and the ongoing capital-replacement schedule — rather than the full VIP renovation-and-addition.

This scenario answers the question, “what if we solve the police problem by buying a building, but only keep the Town Hall patched rather than fully renovating it?”

What this scenario does and does not solve

- **Solves:** Gets Police and Court out of the lease into an owned building; lowest combined cost of any option that adds a police building.
- **Does not solve:** The Town Hall’s underlying accessibility and space problems remain — the same limitations described in Scenario A persist, because only base remediation is performed.

4. Sources

The analysis draws on Town records, two commissioned professional studies, and recognized public standards. Internet sources are limited to credible government and professional-body references, listed below.

Item / Figure	Source
Town Hall renovation + addition cost; building condition; accessibility findings	VIP Architectural Associates, D.P.C. (with IPD Engineering and Keplinger Freeman Associates), “Manlius Town Hall Building Conditions Assessment,” November 2024 (commissioned study).
New combined building construction cost	Trophy Point feasibility estimate, July 2025 (commissioned estimate).
Operating costs (utilities, building maintenance, cleaning, etc.)	Town of Manlius 2026 Final Budget and historical expense records (National Grid utility history; account A00.5.1620.400 buildings-contractual history).
Police lease terms and cost	Town of Manlius / Village of Manlius lease agreement (2025); 2026 Final Budget.
Taxable value and median home value	Town of Manlius Assessor: total taxable value \$4.8 billion; median home assessed value \$332,100.
Police facility space planning (sq ft per employee)	International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), Police Facilities Planning Guidelines (theiacp.org/police-facility-planning-guidelines). IACP describes these as design guidelines, not rigid standards; space needs are department-specific and should be confirmed by the department and an architect.
ADA accessible-route / elevator requirement	U.S. Department of Justice, 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, Title II (ada.gov); U.S. Access Board, Chapter 4: Accessible Routes (access-board.gov).
Public-employer worker-safety obligation and penalties (PESH)	New York State Department of Labor, Public Employee Safety and Health (PESH) Bureau (dol.ny.gov; labor.ny.gov); penalty structure per the PESH Act as summarized by U.S. OSHA / Federal Register (failure-to-abate penalties up to \$200/day for serious violations).

Note on credibility: the externally sourced figures above come from the commissioning studies (VIP, Trophy Point), the Town’s own financial records, the Town Assessor, a national professional body (IACP), and government agencies (U.S. DOJ/Access Board, NYS DOL). No figures in this analysis rely on commercial vendor marketing pages or other non-authoritative web sources.

5. What This Analysis Is — and Is Not

- **It is** a consistent, 30-year comparison to guide direction and to identify the professional work worth commissioning next.
- **It is not** a final budget, a commitment to a scenario, or a substitute for an engineering facility assessment, a bond-capacity opinion, an asbestos survey, or an appraisal.

The most important next steps the analysis points to are: a Facility Condition Assessment of the Town Hall, a bond-capacity opinion from the Town's financial advisor, a comprehensive asbestos survey, identification of a site (Scenarios B and C) or a specific building (Scenarios D and E), and confirmation of the police space program with the Chief.