



Legislation Text

File #: 23-0128, **Version:** 1

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Steven Lederer, Director, Public Works
REPORT BY: Steven Lederer, Director, Public Works
SUBJECT: Facilities Planning Workshop

RECOMMENDATION

Director of Public Works and Assistant County Executive Officer request the Board receive a report on current County facilities and provide input and possible direction to initiate a planning process to develop a Facilities Master Plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The County last completed a Facilities Master Plan (FMP) in 2011, before the purchase and relocation of Health and Human Services Agency (HHS) to the south campus and the development of the replacement jail. The study as such (including employee growth projections) is entirely out of date. Most County Departments are currently out of space to house even their current needs, and the Board previously voiced an interest in selling 1127 1st St. As such, it appears that it's time to commence a master planning process that will help guide the County's facilities needs for the next two decades.

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS:

1. Staff Report
2. Public Comment
3. Discussion and Board direction

FISCAL & STRATEGIC PLAN IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Yes
Is it currently budgeted? Yes

Where is it budgeted?	General Fund - Public Works
Is it Mandatory or Discretionary?	Discretionary
Discretionary Justification:	County facilities are not able to meet current or future needs. A plan is needed to meet these needs.
Is the general fund affected?	Yes
Future fiscal impact:	The Board approved \$250,000 for this planning effort. If the Board directs us to move forward, a more detailed schedule and budget for the effort will be developed.
Consequences if not approved:	The facilities planning effort will not commence.
County Strategic Plan pillar addressed:	Effective and Open Government

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The County last completed a Facilities Master Plan (FMP) in 2011, before the purchase and relocation of HHSA to the south campus and the development of the replacement jail. The study as such (including employee growth projections) is entirely out of date. Most County Departments are currently out of space to house even their current needs, and the Board previously voiced an interest in selling 1127 1st St. As such, it appears that it's time to commence a master planning process that will help guide the County's facilities needs for the next two decades.

No specific decisions are being requested today other than general direction from the Board to continue to investigate our options and to commence the process by hiring technical help to move forward (or direction not to move forward and terminate this effort). However, Board members are welcome to provide their thoughts on any of the topics discussed today if they so choose.

What are our resources? (see attached for more detail on each)

- Administration Building
- 1127 1st St
- 650 Imperial Way
- Sullivan Lot/ 3 Hour Lot
- South Campus (Buildings A&B - HHSA), 1a & 3 (warehouse, long term lease), 4 (a mixed use)
- Existing Jail Annex/HOJ site (available in 2025; will still likely be hosting non-detention operations)

Other facilities with possibilities (but limits):

- o Re-Entry (financially restricted use)
- o 2000 Airport (FAA rules limit use for non-aviation purposes)
- o 1710 Soscol (privately owned space we lease for Agricultural Commission)
- o 960 Kaiser Rd. (privately owned space we rent for Records)
- o Probation Reporting Center (privately owned space we rent for Probation)
- o Juvenile Justice Center (assessing whether space is available for other uses, any restrictions)
- o Flood Building (owned by Flood District) at 804 First St. (very limited parking/space)
- o Library (is space available for other uses)?
- o Historical Court House

What are our needs/other considerations?

1. The initial step is to contract for a “space and adjacencies study” which will compare our existing space to how many employees we have currently, and then apply escalation factors into the future, so we know how much space we project needing going forward.
2. The study can also make recommendations as to how much space should be allotted per employee; and
3. Provide some recommendations as to how remote work may or may not impact our space decisions. For instance, if many employees are working 2 days/week remotely, can we have 40% fewer offices and expect people to share an office (“hot bunking”), or just have a certain number of unassigned desks (“hoteling”).
4. Distributed offices around the County versus centralized buildings? The County could consider a more decentralized approach to providing services. This may hold some customer service benefits, though this can be a more expensive and inefficient method of providing services.
5. Swing Space-Ideally sequence the development so people don’t move twice or provide “swing space” during construction. It is very costly and time consuming.
6. Parking-provide enough parking wherever we put the people; probably means a new or expanded parking garage. Are private spaces on the Third Floor available for purchase or lease?
7. Do we want class A, B, or C commercial buildings?
8. Where does the City of Napa fit in? Is there a way of sharing some facilities to fit both our needs?
9. The County is not subject to the City’s zoning but may want to adhere to some of their requirements as a “good neighbor”.
10. Underground limitations given geotechnical or groundwater factors.

11. Balancing Principles:

a. Examining the location of departments (the fact that some Departments have a current location and share buildings with others doesn't mean those are the optimal locations). Who needs to be downtown (because of the Courts or other reasons)?

b. A consideration in the ultimate location of any County service should include:

i. Public access and the extent to which all/part of a department(s) should ideally exist in certain geographic locations, and

ii. The extent to which some business functions are logically related to each other and to other related services in the community.

iii. Some further factors to be balanced include:

1. Efficiency of providing the service/customer service
2. Cost
3. Employee satisfaction
4. Environmental impacts
5. Neighborhood/Community compatibility including architectural context

How might we pay for it?

- \$250,000 already budgeted for consultant support
- Accumulated Capital Outlay balance approx. \$30 million with potential for annual Excess ERAF deposits, subject to ultimate vehicle licensing fee issue solution and competing demands
- Sell one or more commercial properties?
- Pursue joint project with City?
- Consider joint project with a private developer?
- Does the Board have one or two specific priorities?
- County will have no collateralized debt after 2024 and has the capacity and credit score to leverage revenue streams if desired.
- State bonds restrict uses of Re-Entry Facility (\$13.5M draw) and Replacement Jail (\$20.2M draw)

Next Steps:

1. RFP for a space study (or RFP for a Master Architect and include the space study as a task).
2. Obtain master planning option recommendations for remodel/retrofits of existing buildings or for additional new buildings necessary to meet master planning goals for a future targeted year. This will be more

of a brainstorming initial effort before it becomes a master plan recommendation. Also develop range of costs estimates for the various options. Could include partnership with the City of Napa and/or the private sector.

3. Return to the Board (and Public) for input.