

**City of Claremont
Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee (PSCAC)
AGENDA**

**Alexander Hughes Community Center - Padua Room
1700 Danbury Road, Claremont, CA 91711
Wednesday, December 5, 2018 @ 6:00 p.m.**



COMMITTEE MEMBERS

**MATTHEW MAGILKE
CHAIR**

**HAROLD GAULT
VICE CHAIR**

DAVID BURGDORF

RICHARD CHUTE

JOHN JOCELYN

AUNDRE JOHNSON

MATTHEW JONES

JIM KEITH

ANTHONY NELIPOVICH

BETH PFAU

KATHARINE ROSACKER

JOYCE SAUTER

SALLY SEVEN

JESS SWICK

JOHN WATKINS

EX OFFICIO: FRANK BEDOYA

****PUBLIC COMMENT WILL BE TAKEN ON EACH ITEM****

1. MINUTES
2. UPDATE ON HISTORICAL INFORMATION
3. UPDATE ON MODULAR BUILDINGS
4. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ON DIRECTION
5. SCOPE OF ADDITIONAL STUDY FOR RETROFITTING EXISTING POLICE STATION AND CITY YARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
6. ADJOURNMENT

- Next scheduled meeting **Wednesday, February 20, 2019**

**Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee
MINUTES
Wednesday, October 17, 2018
6:00 P.M., Hughes Center – Padua room**

Present: Richard Chute, Harold Gault, John Jocelyn, Aundre Johnson, Matthew Jones, Jim Keith, Matthew Magilke, Anthony Nelipovich, Katharine Rosacker, Joyce Sauter, Sally Seven, Jess Swick, Frank Bedoya; City Manager Tara Schultz, Assistant City Manager Colin Tudor, Chief Shelly Vander Veen, Captain Aaron Fate, Finance Director Adam Pirrie, Management Analyst John Costa; Assistant to the City Manager Jamie Harvey, Sr. Administrative Assistant Lisa Amaya; Transtech Engineers, Inc. - Ali Cayir; Ninyo & Moore - Jay Roberts and Michael Cushner; IDS Group - David Pomerleau

Not Present: David Burgdorf, Elizabeth Pfau, John Watkins

Chair Magilke called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

City Manager Schultz stated there was a request to move Item #4 after the approval of the minutes so that the Engineers could make their presentations and respond to questions in the beginning of the meeting.

Ms. Seven moved that the agenda be rearranged so that Item #4 comes after the minutes; seconded by Richard Chute and unanimously approved.

1. POLICE STATION CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Seven stated that on page 6 of the minutes, she would like to add “GO Bond” to her comments so that it reads, “...more of them would have supported the GO Bond Measure.”

Chair Magilke noted an error on page 6 as well. He said the vote to appoint him as Chair was not unanimous; it was a 10-1-4 vote.

Ms. Seven moved to approve the Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee meeting minutes of August 28, 2018, as amended; seconded by Mr. Johnson; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Committee Members Chute, Gault, Jocelyn, Johnson, Jones, Keith, Magilke, Nelipovich, Rosacker, Sauter, Seven, and Swick

ABSENT: Committee Members Burgdorf, Pfau, and Watkins

The minutes will be amended to reflect Ms. Seven and Chair Magilke’s comments.

City Manager Schultz shared staff’s concerns after Measure SC failed, specifically that the station was unsafe, wasn’t built to code, and didn’t meet ADA requirements. She believed it was important to take a serious look at the station to determine what could be done to ensure the safety of employees who work in the building. She reached out to Ali Cayir from Transtech, who is a well-respected contractor she had worked with in the past. Mr. Cayir worked with staff on Request for Proposals (RFPs) from environmental and structural firms. City Manager Schultz explained that she sought out a firm that would have a neutral perspective on how they can move forward with the station, because of concerns that were brought up at the last

PSCAC meeting. After reviewing proposals, staff selected an environmental firm and a structural engineering firm, and they will make presentations tonight on the results of their analyses.

City Manager Schultz stated she wanted to discuss some paths forward with the Committee as well as their recommendation to the City Council. She is prepared to ask for additional funds next week so that staff can gather further information on some items.

City Manager Schultz noted the six different paths that will be discussed tonight aren't the only options; however, it's what they currently have.

Paths

1. Occupant Safety Improvement
2. Building Performance Improvements
3. Systems for Intermediate Length Occupancy
4. Expand and Retrofit (requires additional study): \$15,000
5. City Yard Administration Building Expansion and Reuse (requires additional study): \$15,000
6. New Building on Existing Site

Mr. Nelipovich stated that it seems City leadership and staff aren't working together, given that money was spent on new patrol vehicles and now staff is asking to spend more on a new station. He believed the purchase of vehicles could have been delayed.

Vice Chair Gault questioned why money should be spent on patching up the existing station. Although it is out of spec, the station is still operational as-is and did not collapse during the recent earthquake. With that said, he believed that every effort should be made on getting a new station because repairs would only be temporary and expensive and wouldn't address the overall seismic problems.

Mr. Jocelyn commented on the lack of confidence residents have with how the City spends money and questioned the costs associated with Path 1.

City Manager Schultz responded to questions from the Committee related to police vehicles being budgeted items and must be replaced on a regular basis; the engineers addressing the Committee's concerns/questions as they present their environmental and structural analyses, as well as reviewing options for making the police facility safe and functional; commented that staff is working toward another measure because the building needs to be safe now for the people who work in it; and commented on the OSHA complaint the City received immediately after the last election. She said there's no way to avoid spending money on this building.

City Manager Schultz added that staff has received feedback from residents in person or via ThoughtExchange and is well-aware of the lack of trust residents have toward the City. It's crucial that staff listens and shares as much information as possible moving forward to gain that trust back.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL & STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS – Presentation

City Manager Schultz introduced Ali Cayir from Transtech Engineers, Inc.

Mr. Cayir reviewed the PowerPoint presentation and responded to a question related to the target budget for Path 1.

Mr. Jay Roberts, PG, CEG from Ninyo & Moore commented on the environmental issues on the current site and for the building itself.

Mr. Mike Cushner, Sr. Project Manager from Ninyo & Moore, oversaw the hazardous material survey that was performed on the interior and exterior of the building. He spoke about the assessment and reported there is asbestos, lead, and mold in the building. However, it's intact and poses no immediate environmental concern to the health and safety of everyone working in the building. There are a couple of small areas of visible mold growth that will be removed soon.

Mr. Cayir, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Cushner responded to questions related to whether vapors were found and if so, how it would be addressed; if asbestos would be disturbed if structural changes to the building were made for more stability; and if the contractors could determine where asbestos is located before any renovations are made.

Mr. David Pomerlau, Structural Engineer from IDS Group, said his team performed the preliminary study looking at the existing reports and documentation that were previously done, as well as walking through the building for both the structural and architectural surveys. He highlighted the report and responded to questions related to what would be considered a major seismic event on the Richter scale; if the building's roof would fall during an earthquake; and if there's a price to fix the station so that it's usable.

Mr. Cayir reviewed each path in more detail and responded to questions from the Committee related to what the estimated construction cost would be. Using the industry cost range, he said the cost would be close to \$1k per square foot and would include soft costs. However, at this point they only have general numbers to compare. His team is looking at all opportunities and they believe renovating the station is possible and would be a less expensive alternative.

Mr. Cayir and Mr. Pomerlau responded to questions from the Committee related to constructing a second level above the existing building and the costs associated with renovation. Those costs can't be determined until they know what the renovations will be. There would also be costs for inside the building.

City Manager Schultz stated that IDS Group was hired to conduct a structural analysis; however, their team brought the idea of reusing the existing building to City staff as an alternative option. She wanted the Committee to be aware of that option and said it's important to remember it's only an idea and hasn't been explored yet. She added that the community and some Committee members expressed interest in exploring the City Yard building as well.

City Manager Schultz clarified for a Committee member that structural work is a necessity now to ensure the safety of employees who work in the station. She added that if the Committee recommends City staff pursue reusing the existing facility, the investment made in the current structure would not be lost.

Mr. Cayir noted there are multiple paths forward to discuss tonight, with varying costs associated to them whether they are for building new or renovating the current station.

Chief Vander Veen responded to Chair Magilke's question related to how many square feet would be required for essential services. With the last Ad Hoc Committee, Chief Vander Veen said they determined an (approximate) 25k square foot building would be sufficient and she believes that to still be true. She also confirmed that it's more expensive to build to essential services standards.

Mr. Cayir commented on the site layout for the building and pointed out some opportunities that could be considered to maximize space on the lot.

Mr. Keith asked if there was an explanation as to why the latest finding indicates the building would withstand a major seismic event, with some strengthening, and yet the previous analysis noted otherwise. He also asked if staff had reached out to the previous firm to discuss the matter.

Chair Magilke noted this was why he had expressed his concerns at their first meeting regarding the selection of the previous engineering firm.

City Manager Schultz responded staff hasn't reached out to the previous firm, but Mr. Cayir's team did review the previous report. Staff is considering reusing the current building at the Committee's request. She was also focused on what could be done to ensure the safety of everyone in the station.

Mr. Swick said he wasn't convinced the previous engineering firm was considering ways to reuse the building when they did their walk through. City Manager Schultz said she doesn't know that that was actually part of their review. Mr. Swick said he's very encouraged by the new report.

Chair Magilke invited public comment.

One member of the public believed the community should know the roof isn't as dangerous as originally reported. The public should know it's a possibility to reinforce the roof.

City Manager Schultz and Mr. Cayir both responded that the roof could collapse, and it's still a major concern.

Ms. Seven commented on having two opposing findings and believed it would be a mistake to take the latest findings to the public too quickly. She wondered if they could have experts weigh in on the matter first.

Chair Magilke invited comments from the Committee.

Mr. Pomerlau noted his firm would generally agree with the previous firm's conclusion that the building and detailing do not meet the standards that it was reviewed to. There are concerns with connections that don't meet current code. He said they're not indifferent with those conclusions, however, they do see opportunities for reuse with strengthening.

Mr. Jones asked about the longevity of the building once it's strengthened and Mr. Pomerlau responded that it would last 40 years.

Mr. Chute asked if the two firms were actually tasked with looking at reuse.

Assistant City Manager Tudor pointed out that the initial part of the scope for both firms were very similar, as well as the findings as they relate to the issue of the connections with the roof. However, the previous architect had concerns with the costs being prohibited and still performing differently than a new building would. He explained that newer construction would flex more during a seismic event.

Mr. Pomerlau further explained the difference in movement with a rigid building and said the current connections would be damaged during a seismic event.

Assistant City Manager Tudor noted that IDS has presented different ideas about the costs of retrofitting the building, but the connections of the building remain a concern. The difference now is that the new firm is considering options that weren't previously considered and they have different assumptions on retrofitting costs. It's important to note that a lot of details were presented with the last report and the details haven't been worked through with this new concept yet. Once the details have been factored in, staff will have a better idea on whether it would be more cost effective to retrofit the building.

City Manger Schultz invited public comment.

Mr. Cayir responded to a question from one member of the public related to whether it's common practice to retrofit a building this size. He said all structural engineers follow the same procedures. Mr. Pomerlau added the construction detailing they are considering for strengthening the building is very common.

Assistant City Manager Tudor noted the standards they are looking at now have also changed.

Ms. Rosacker asked how much of the current facility could be used during the retrofitting process and with construction going on. Mr. Cayir responded the goal is to have maximum use of the facility, but that it could be a matter of days/weeks while they temporarily move things around.

Mr. Cayir and Mr. Pomerlau responded to Ms. Seven's question related to how the second floor would be built. Essentially, they would build the columns outside the existing building and they would have their own foundations. The existing structure would be strengthened prior to building the second floor.

City Manager Schultz said the Committee would come back to this item when they discuss which paths moving forward will be presented to City Council next week.

3. FEEDBACK RECEIVED AT COMMUNITY WORKSHOP AND THROUGH THOUGHTEXCHANGE

Public Information Officer Bevin Handel stated she would be presenting some summaries of the two public engagement opportunities the City had prior to this meeting: the community workshop on September 26 and then ThoughtExchange, an online platform. The goal of these efforts was just to listen to the community, not to moderate. What are the concerns and issues people are talking about? The results are to inform the Committee, so they have this information moving forward.

Ms. Handel highlighted the PowerPoint presentation for the September 26 workshop. There were twenty participants from the community, along with staff facilitators and Committee members at each of the six tables. She reviewed the comments that were gathered on the three topics of discussion that evening: Financing, Design & Needs, and Past Ballot Measures.

Ms. Handel also commented on the outreach for ThoughtExchange, an online platform where citizens can provide thoughts and rate other people's thoughts. It is not moderated by the City. The question posed was, "What important perspectives should the City consider when moving forward with the police station?" Staff wanted to listen to the community's opinions and get the temperature of what is out there. She shared the various ways that ThoughtExchange was advertised. In total, there were 166 participants, 224 thoughts, with 797 ratings.

Ms. Handel responded to questions related to the small percentage of residents who participated in the polls. She explained during the last measure, staff held two open houses at the Police Station, two community meetings, all the Coffee With A Cop events and they had only 41 people who participated in the poll. Additionally, Ms. Handel commented on the demographics of the respondents.

Ms. Handel then commented on a handout that was provided with the Top 20 thoughts that people agreed upon and some topics that had a lot of interaction. Some of the highest rated topics included: the Colleges should contribute more, fairness of finance mech; businesses need to contribute; tax fatigue (too many taxes in general); campaign tactics; impact to the City budget; Sheriff's contract; and alternative to new construction (renovation). All 244 comments were included as an attachment in the Committee's packets.

Assistant City Manager Tudor explained staff is still working on some ThoughtExchange reports and will be sharing that information when they can.

Ms. Handel responded to questions related to the results of the workshop and ThoughtExchange comments and stated it's a way for staff to know the touch points in the community. She explained the rating system as well.

Chair Magilke invited public comment.

One member of the audience asked if there was a way to verify whether different individuals were submitting comments or if it was the same few submitting multiple times. Ms. Handel responded that staff could see the IP addresses and said it was okay for someone to have multiple responses. The IP addresses were taken into account for report purposes.

Ms. Handel responded to questions from the Committee related to whether residents knew how ThoughtExchange worked and how residents were notified about it; why the City didn't conduct a traditional survey; the benefits of ThoughtExchange; and she shared that ThoughtExchange is available to use to run other queries, at no cost, if the Committee wished to see other data.

Mr. Chute shared that he served on the School District's committee and is familiar with online surveys. He spoke in favor of ThoughtExchange, which gathers a broad range of opinions, so

City staff and the Committee knows what the community is thinking. He believed having 166 expressed opinions is a really good number for the Committee to review. However, what the Committee decides to do may or may not be impacted by those results.

Ms. Sauter asked if a newsletter could go out to residents informing them of the Committee's discussions/decisions. Ms. Handel responded the City's Newsletter provides that information and the November newsletter will address what this Committee is doing. Additionally, City staff will use various methods to promote and to explain or provide information on what this Committee is doing throughout the entire year.

City Manager Schultz added to Mr. Chute's comments about school districts using online surveys by commenting on the convenience of these tools for parents. The surveys are easily accessible, it's a good way to reach out to citizens, and ThoughtExchange allows them to participate even when they can't attend meetings.

Lastly, one member of the audience wanted to know how many people purchase the Claremont Courier. She wondered if some sort of progress report could be published in the paper. Ms. Handel responded two articles were published in the Courier, and she will ensure they get this information as well. Another member of the audience responded that the Courier had 3,300 newspapers in their last circulation.

4. ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS - Discussion

Ms. Handel said at the September 26 workshop some committee members expressed concern and wanted to know when they would be able to give their opinions/comments on the police station issue. Their comments will be heard tonight.

City Manager Schultz asked the Committee if there is anything staff missed.

Mr. Nelipovich commented on the tax burdens that residents are already dealing with and stressed the importance of presenting this information to all residents so that they understand all of the reasons and benefits to the city on voting for this. He also thought any marketing efforts should be strong because he believed it's our last chance for a new station.

Mr. Chute shared that his sense of trust with the City is stronger than some in the community, and he wanted to share some perspectives regarding the planning process. Specifically, he noted the lack of reports that the architect or the community could rely on in terms of trying to understand what their goals are for this project. He commented on the benefit to all of having a source document to explain the difference in cost for the first station proposal compared to the second proposal and said it would be prudent to do more planning to answer some of those questions. He believed the Committee has more work to do in terms of understanding the needs of the Police Department and the community, he recommended grouping together several of those paths forward for further exploration, said he appreciated seeing multiple paths forward that have some flexibility and to hear about a possible reuse of the station. He said being thorough would add to the trust level to the community and he didn't believe the Committee has the beginning base of knowledge to do that. Lastly, he commented on spending time researching the project, but that's something the Committee can't expect the community to do.

Mr. Keith believed there were three major options for the station: 1) build a new, but smaller station at the current location; 2) reuse the existing station, and 3) renovate the City Yard building. However, they haven't been presented information on the City Yard option or the cost to make the existing station safe. Without the costs for any of those three options, Mr. Keith believed it would be premature to recommend any of them. One thing that will remain consistent is how much space will be needed. He commented on being on the previous committee and said he has some knowledge of how it went from \$50M to \$25M, questioned what could be done to reduce the costs further and what would they lose with further cuts, and he also believed there is a lot of work yet to be done. He said he appreciated the information on office space that would be required in a new station and said that's the kind of transparency they need, as well as having the drawings available. Lastly, he said false information in the Courier, just before the last vote, was very misleading about the gym. It's critical to have numbers available for residents to review the next time this issue goes before the voters.

Ms. Seven expressed concern about the lack of trust in the City and said it's something they must take very seriously. Having been involved with the last committee as well, she had a sense the design was based on a needs analysis and the process involved collaborating with people who work in the building. She was much more comfortable about the proposed station than other people in the community. She echoed Mr. Keith's comments about false information that was circulated, believed the Committee must address how to get the community to feel that City information is open and accessible to them, and she commented on a chart from 2012 that listed the City's indebtedness and requested an updated chart. Communication is a major problem and watching for misleading information and responding to it in a way that doesn't make it worse is important as well.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was any other mechanism for financing the station, without raising taxes. He wondered if the City could sell assets or find other creative ways to finance it.

Mr. Jocelyn echoed Mr. Johnson's comments and added that during the first Committee meeting, he had requested a list of assets the City could sell to offset the costs. He also wondered what "fat" they could trim from the City. He realizes a new station will require some amount of taxes to be raised, but that shouldn't be the sole funding mechanism. He questioned how much the City wants a new station and asked if they willing to cut somewhere else. He believed it should be a combination of both.

Mr. Gault said they're dealing with two different subjects, the station design and financing. After hearing the survey results, it's clear to him that financing is more important than design and residents are opposed to financing the station solely with a property tax increase. He believed some of the costs should be shared by the Colleges and non-profits, the Police Department's needs should be a priority, he commented on the contradictions of the charts shown earlier and liked the unique approach for adding a second story but said there was no mention of an elevator (for ADA requirements). He wondered what Police Department staff would prefer - a single or two-story station - and said everyone must be on the same page and work to find the best method of financing. He also commented on residents' distrust of the City after the water company debacle.

5. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL ABOUT NEXT STEPS – Presentation

City Manager Schultz commented on the paths to move forward that were presented tonight and said she needs a recommendation from the Committee to take to City Council. Each option presented has a cost associated with it, but it gives the Committee an opportunity to decide which option they'd like to support. She said financing is an important element that still needs to be addressed, regardless of which option/s they decide to recommend.

City Manager Schultz stated the City is dealing with a structural deficit and a finance committee has been established to look at financial opportunities for the future. She has reiterated to that committee one of their recommendations to City Council, and one of the City's priorities, is to build a new police station. She said it's a very fine line they have to walk because the community only wants to pay so much for certain items. She is also open to any ideas the Committee has about financing. The structural deficit issue and the police station are both priorities.

Chair Magilke asked if she could explain what a structural deficit is so that everyone has a clear understanding.

City Manager Schultz explained the City anticipates having a \$1.3M structural deficit for the next year and said the City isn't bringing in the revenues necessary to cover their expenses on an ongoing basis. They aren't dipping, however, the expenses are outpacing revenues. She explained that expenses such as retirement/PERS costs and utility and Lighting & Landscaping District assessments continue to increase; labor costs affect our contract services; and Workers' Compensation and Liability are also affecting the City.

Chair Magilke reiterated in a nutshell the City's revenue is less than their expenses and it's being covered by reserves.

City Manager Schultz responded the City hasn't covered that deficit with any reserve funds and is trying to avoid doing so. She commented on budget cuts that affected staffing levels and said staff will be evaluating whether they need vacant positions filled. She said it slowly affects the service levels staff provides and they try to adjust, so that the community isn't impacted.

City Manager Schultz responded to Mr. Nelipovich's questions related to whether the City would need to acquire more land to build a station at the City Yard, and if the City has unfunded liability of \$30-\$40M for the Police Department's pension fund. She said staff would first need to evaluate the building to determine if it is usable or can be renovated to essential services standards. She confirmed the City currently has unfunded pension liability of \$49.6M and various factors go into that amount.

City Manager Schultz wanted to ensure the Committee and the community understands she has no problem sharing information, however, she wants that information to be complete and accurate. She added that she doesn't want to derogate the credibility staff is trying to establish during this process.

With regard to the Committee's recommendation to City Council, Chair Magilke stated it's important to look at every option. The City Yard option could potentially be cheaper, and the Department isn't opposed to moving to that site. Chair Magilke supported all three of the listed recommendations.

Mr. Nelipovich expressed his opposition to spending \$15k to acquire more land at the City Yard site and said Recommendation #3 was a waste of money at this time. He believed this option should have been included in the first two proposals when the City Yard site was initially discussed.

Vice Chair Gault asked for clarification on the wording for the recommendation and asked if staff had already made a decision on the recommendation. He also commented on the process for building a second floor and believed the City should just build a new two-story station. City Manager Schultz explained the City's standard format is being used for the Committee's recommendation and said staff is recommending the options, however, it's up to the Committee to decide if they would like to present any of them to City Council.

Mr. Swick disagreed with Mr. Gault, and said he believed the engineers could build over the existing station and save money.

Mr. Keith supported the idea of re-evaluating the City Yard site with the new concept and said they would also need to look at where additional acreage would come from for the expansion.

Mr. Jocelyn shared that spending \$15k to keep their options open seems feasible. He asked for clarification on the Request For Proposals recommendation. After City Manager Schultz confirmed it's only to request proposals, not for the Committee to approve any of them, Mr. Jocelyn was in favor of supporting all three recommendations.

City Manager Schultz responded to Mr. Swick's questions related to whether Recommendation #3 would include where Community Services would move to while determining whether the Police Department could fit at that location.

Mr. Chute expressed his support for all three recommendations, however, he would like to request that staff look at what it would cost to obtain a program plan because he believed they'll have to do that at some point. He would like staff to bring it back at a future meeting as another option. City Manger Schultz said staff can do that once they decide which direction the Committee would like to go. Mr. Chute believed a source document should be obtained beforehand.

Mr. Jocelyn moved to approve all three recommendations; seconded by Chair Magilke.

Chair Magilke commented on exploring what to do with the current station and questioned whether it could be sold, and if those funds could be used to offset the costs of a new facility. He believed knowing what the current site is worth and what to do with those funds is important to Recommendation #3.

Chair Magilke asked if there were any other comments. He noted there was a first and second on their recommendation.

Mr. Jocelyn seconded Chair Magilke's amendment to Recommendation #3.

Ms. Seven said it wouldn't be fair not to express her concern and she said she supports Mr. Gault's comments about the recommendation language. She said it's clear the recommendation is not something the Committee developed but was brought to them by staff and are being encouraged to support it. She commented on being reminded of some of the things she read about the distrust of city government as she watched this process. It's one thing to say that having gone through all this information this is where staff has arrived, and they are seeking Committee's approval of it, but she believed anything less than that is not a fair representation.

Chair Magilke asked Ms. Seven if she had a recommendation she'd like to suggest. He also asked the Committee if they had anything different to offer for discussion tonight.

City Manager Schultz said the Committee needs to make a decision.

Mr. Keith requested a vote on the motion that was first and seconded.

Mr. Nelipovich expressed his support for staff and their recommendation.

Chair Magilke called for a vote to end their discussion before voting on the motion, and a majority of the Committee voted to continue with their discussion.

After further discussion on the language of Recommendations #1 and #2, the Committee unanimously voted to end further discussion.

Mr. Jocelyn moved that the Committee approve all three recommendations as written; seconded by Mr. Johnson; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Chute, Jocelyn, Johnson, Jones, Keith, Magilke, Nelipovich, Rosacker, Sauter, Seven, and Swick

NOES: Gault

ABSENT: Burgdorf, Pfau, Watkins

Chair Magilke adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Matt Magilke, Chair

ATTEST:

Lisa Amaya, Sr. Administrative Assistant

PSCAC Meeting

December 5,
2018

Minutes

Update on Historic Information

Update on Historic Information

Staff has received requests from Committee and community members to provide all of the historic documents and to put together a single document which summarizes the history of the project.



Two different projects to address these issues

Timeline and summary document is being prepared by Community Volunteer Sandra Emerson

City staff is close to launching a website that has historic documents about the station all in one place.

- Site will include staff reports, minutes, and committee reports. We will continue to add technical studies and background documents as they are digitized.

Update on Modular Buildings

Update on Modular Buildings

- ▶ On November 27, 2018, the City Council accepted three modular buildings and appropriated \$39,676 to move and place the modulares at the PD.
- ▶ Portables will be moved before the end of December.
- ▶ *These portables have already exceeded the normal useful life and are only a temporary asset, and the most cost-effective alternative to allow for the safety repairs and potential future seismic retrofitting of the existing police facility.*
- ▶ *The modular buildings are strictly temporary, while safety and possible future seismic improvements are made to the existing police facility.*
- ▶ *The modular buildings do not solve existing issues pertaining to space, mechanical and seismic deficiencies, or coming into compliance with current building codes and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.*
- ▶ *The purpose of the modular buildings is to act as extra space while initial safety improvements are made and to provide additional options for the department while the Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee (PSCAC) and City Council move forward on more permanent solutions.*

Committee Discussion on Direction

Committee Discussion on Direction

- ▶ Following the last meeting and subsequent City Council action, staff received several requests from Committee Members to have an open discussion item for the Committee to discuss and determine the Committee's direction.
- ▶ This item is an open forum for discussion and determination of PSCAC direction.
- ▶ Public comment will also be taken on this discussion.

Scope of Additional Study for Retrofitting Existing Police Station & City Yard Admin Building

Background

- ▶ On October 17, 2018, the Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee heard a presentation from the IDS team and recommended (on a vote of 11-1) the following:
 - ▶ A. Direct staff to begin a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process for occupant safety improvements and bring back a contract to the City Council to complete the improvements (estimated cost \$200,000 - 400,000);
 - ▶ B. Appropriate \$15,000 from the Operating and Environmental Emergency Reserve for additional study of the reuse and expansion option at the current site; and
 - ▶ C. Appropriate \$15,000 from the Operating and Environmental Emergency Reserve for additional study of the reuse and expansion of the administration building at the City Yard.

Background

- ▶ On October 23, 2018, the City Council took the following actions:
 - ▶ City Council directed staff to begin a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process for occupant safety improvements at the existing Police Station, and bring back for City Council consideration a contract to complete the improvements (estimated cost \$200,000 - \$400,000.)
 - ▶ City Council directed the Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee to review and send back recommendations to the City Council on the amended agreement with IDS Group to increase the compensation amount by \$30,000 for a total cost of \$43,345 to provide for additional analysis of the feasibility of retrofit, reuse, and expansion of the existing Police Station, and repurposing and expanding the administration building at the City Yard.

Paths to Move Forward

PATH 1- Occupant safety improvements (*Improvements need to be made regardless of plan to move forward*):

- ▶ Includes securing light fixtures, ceiling tiles, anchoring bookshelves to walls, flexible gas line connections, etc.
- ▶ Also includes mold removal (already completed).
- ▶ *Target Budget for Path 1 is in the range of \$200,000-400,000.*

PATH 2- Building performance improvements:

- ▶ Structural system improvements including reinforcing wall to ceiling connections.
- ▶ This work will also be needed for Paths 3 and 4.
- ▶ Target budget for Path 2 is in the range of \$1.5M.
- ▶ Staff and Councilmembers are talking to local Legislators and researching possible grants to fund this Path.

PATH 3- Systems for intermediate length occupancy:

- ▶ In addition to the structural work, if the PD is going to utilize the facility for 5+ years, the electrical and mechanical systems will also need to be replaced and properly braced.

PATH 4- Expand and retrofit (requires additional study):

- ▶ Build new structure on top of, and adjacent to, the current facility then retrofit the existing facility.

PATH 5- City Yard Administration building expansion and reuse (requires additional study):

- ▶ Retrofit and expand the Administration Building at the City Yard.
- ▶ This has not been evaluated with current needs and latest plans.

PATH 6- New building on existing site:

- ▶ Put additional resources into reviewing, revising, and advancing the planning of a new building on the current site adjacent to the existing facility as proposed in Measure SC.

Approach to Studies

- ▶ Studies will be done in a phased approach
- ▶ The initial phase will focus on identifying constraints that would make the concept infeasible.
 - ▶ Some potential constraints could be:
 - ▶ Site accessibility and parking
 - ▶ Emergency vehicle access and circulation
 - ▶ Design constraints that severely impact operations
- ▶ If determined infeasible, the concept will be eliminated from consideration and no further funds will be spent.

Current Police Station Retrofit and Reuse Study

Path 4

Current Police Station Retrofit and Reuse Study Scope Details

1. CONDUCT FURTHER STUDIES TO EXPLORE FEASIBILITY OF UPGRADING AND EXPANDING EXISTING PD BUILDING TO 26,000 SQFT SPACE.



Questions to be answered by the additional study

Can the building accommodate a second floor?

What seismic retrofits to the existing building are anticipated?

How much area is proposed to be added?

What options are available for providing the additional floor and building area?

How will the space needs be provided for in a renovated building?

Can the building be occupied during the renovation and expansion? What impacts to operations are anticipated?

Questions to be answered by the additional study

How long is the renovation and expansion project anticipated to take?

What is the cost to retrofit, renovate and expand the existing facility?

What project/construction phasing is proposed?

What is the anticipated site layout?

How will the renovated building compare with a new building?

What are the pros and cons for this “Path”?

What are the steps for further development of this “Path”?

Current Police Station Retrofit and Reuse Study DRAFT Scope Details/Deliverables (Path4)

- ▶ Prepare preliminary floor space plans (2 maximum) to confirm the “fit” of the necessary areas to meet the needs of the Police Department. These preliminary plans would be based on the 2016 Needs Assessment report as well as the layouts and area sizes for the proposed new building on the property.
- ▶ Prepare a preliminary project scope of work describing the items included in the potential renovation.
- ▶ Prepare a preliminary site plan.
- ▶ Meet with the City and Police Department staff to review the plans and obtain comments (1 meeting assumed).
- ▶ Update the preliminary plans based on the comments received.
- ▶ Prepare a phasing plan for the potential retrofit, renovation and expansion.

Current Police Station Retrofit and Reuse Study DRAFT Scope Details/Deliverables (Path4)

- ▶ Develop an opinion of construction duration based on the phasing plan.
- ▶ Develop an opinion of probable construction cost for the proposed retrofit, renovation and expansion.
- ▶ Attend a maximum of two (2) Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee meetings to present materials and respond to questions.
- ▶ Attend a maximum of one (1) Claremont City Council meeting to present materials and respond to questions.
- ▶ Prepare a summary report to present the results of the work plan development. This report will provide:
 - A summary description of the option proposed including the building structure modifications and building and utility system modifications.
 - An opinion of probable construction duration and a discussion of potential operational impacts.
 - An opinion of probable construction costs.
 - A figure illustrating a possible floor plan for each level of the renovated station.
 - A figure illustrating a possible site plan for the facility.
 - Several examples of building types that illustrate possible concepts for the building exterior.

Recommendations



Review the proposed scope of work and provide suggestions or changes.



If the Committee believes the Current Police Station Retrofit option should be studied further, provide a recommendation to the City Council to appropriate \$15,000 and authorize the City Manager to enter into a Contract with IDS Group to conduct the study.



If the Committee does not believe this option should be studied further, direct staff to remove this option from any further consideration.

City Yard Admin Building Retrofit and Expansion Study

Path 5

City Yard Admin Building Retrofit and Expansion Study

2. CONDUCT FURTHER STUDIES TO EXPLORE FEASIBILITY OF UPGRADING AND EXPANDING EXISTING PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN BUILDING TO 26,000 SQFT SPACE.



Questions to be answered by the additional Study

Can the site accommodate both Community Services and Police Department Operations?

How much additional land would be required to meet parking and circulation demands?

How much expansion of existing Admin building could take place on site?

Can emergency vehicle ingress and egress requirements be met?

Does the entire facility need to be brought to essential services standard?

What options are available for providing the additional floor and building area?

How will the space needs be provided for in a renovated building?

Questions to be answered by the additional Study

What impacts to operations are anticipated?

How long is the renovation and expansion project anticipated to take?

What is the cost to retrofit, renovate and expand the existing facility?

What project/construction phasing is proposed?

What is the anticipated site layout?

How will the renovated building compare with a new building?

What are the pros and cons for this “Path”?

What are the steps for further development of this “Path”?

City Yard Admin Building Retrofit and Expansion Study DRAFT Scope Details/Deliverables (Path 5)

- ▶ Prepare preliminary floor space plans (1 maximum for each level of the building including the proposed addition) to confirm the “fit” of the necessary areas to meet the needs of the Police Department. These preliminary plans would be based on the 2016 Needs Assessment report as well as the layouts and area sizes for the proposed new building on the property.
- ▶ Prepare a preliminary structural seismic assessment of the existing Administration Building to identify deficiencies that would prevent it from performing as an Essential Services building.
- ▶ Prepare a preliminary project scope of work describing the items included in the potential renovation and addition
- ▶ Meet with the City and Police Department staff to review the plans and obtain comments (1 meeting assumed)
- ▶ Update the preliminary plans based on the comments received

City Yard Admin Building Retrofit and Expansion Study DRAFT Scope Details/Deliverables (Path 5)

- ▶ Develop an opinion of probable construction cost for the proposed retrofit, renovation and addition
- ▶ Attend a maximum of two (2) Police Station Citizens Advisory Committee meetings to present materials and respond to questions
- ▶ Attend a maximum of one (1) Claremont City Council meeting to present materials and respond to questions
- ▶ Prepare a summary report to present the results of the work plan development. This report will provide:
 - ▶ A summary description of the option proposed including the building structure modifications and building and utility system modifications
 - ▶ An opinion of probable construction cost
 - ▶ A figure illustrating a possible floor plan for each level of the renovated building with addition

Recommendations



Review the proposed scope of work and provide suggestions or changes.



If the Committee believes the City Yard Administration Building Retrofit and Expansion option should be studied further, provide a recommendation to the City Council to appropriate \$15,000 and authorize the City Manager to enter into a Contract with IDS Group to conduct the study.



If the Committee does not believe this option should be studied further, direct staff to remove this option from any further consideration.

Adjournment