REPORT IN BRIEF

For the past six years, staff has been working on a public safety building project. On July 2, 2001, the City Council gave approval to proceed with the conceptual design for four potential options for the expansion and renovation of the current police facility. Since then, considerable analysis has been completed on the four options. Specifically, seismic evaluations, operational and logistical reviews, cost estimates, and potential environmental impacts have been completed on each option.

Initial projections at the beginning of this project included space needs of over 66,000 square feet at costs ranging from $52 to $66 million dollars. Staff has reduced the space needs to approximately 50,000 square feet, the minimum amount of space that would meet the full programmatic requirements for the next 20 to 30 years. The associated cost estimates have also been reduced to a range of $38 to $45 million.

After a review of the information on the four options, only one option meets the programmatic needs of the Police Department. This option is also estimated to be the least costly of the four. Staff is therefore going to proceed with the schematic design of that option.

Although the source of funding for this project has not yet been determined, staff is proceeding
with the schematic design phase of the project in order to develop a 30 percent design that would determine the level of funding actually required for this project. Additionally, the need for the City’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and the 9-1-1 Emergency Dispatch Center (9-1-1 EDC) to remain operational after a disaster has taken on even greater significance after September 11, based upon the increased responsibilities for the Police and Fire Departments.
BACKGROUND

The first needs assessment for this project was completed in 1985. In 1996, a second needs assessment was initiated. Ekona Associates was hired in 1997 to complete this assessment and the findings were presented to the Council. The findings determined that the facility was: 1) too small to meet current programmatic needs; 2) operationally and technologically deficient; and 3) did not conform to current codes and standards for a public safety facility. These deficiencies create security issues, health and safety risks, evidence tracking constraints, confidentiality problems, inefficiencies, and potential legal concerns.

Based upon the Ekona findings, in 1998, the Council approved a $275,000 contract with Ross/Druulis/Cusenbery Architects (RDC) for Phase I of the project. Phase I consisted of site survey and selection, architectural program development, conceptual drawings, cost estimates, preliminary environmental assessments, and initiation of community outreach. The scope of the project involved an architectural program that included space for the Fire Department administrative offices. With staff support, RDC completed the architectural program that projected the needs of the Police and Fire Departments for the next 20 years. At that time, a need for over 66,000 square feet was identified.

Community outreach meetings were conducted during 1998 and 1999 to share the need for a new facility and to obtain feedback from residents regarding potential site selections. Ten potential sites were discussed at these meetings. Based upon feedback from these meetings, together with information about the inadequate size, private ownership, and location of some of the sites, the list was reduced to four: the existing location at the Civic Center, 2700 Park Boulevard, Page Mill Road/El Camino, and 251 Sherman. At Council direction, a split-facility study was also conducted to determine the cost and feasibility of other alternatives that would not require the purchase of property or the construction of a full public safety building. The original estimate of 66,000 square feet was reduced to 52,790 square feet.

Preliminary environmental assessments, economical impact studies, preliminary conceptual designs and cost analyses were completed for each site together with the split-facility study. A decision was made not to present the findings to the Council until the City’s long-range financial plan was discussed by the Council. At the time of the financial plan discussion, Council tentatively approved in concept the inclusion of a public safety building, together with funds for library upgrades, in a possible March 2001 bond election.

In 2000, the City Manager decided to go forward with a project that would include only a police facility, the EOC, and the 9-1-1 EDC. The findings of the above studies on the four sites were presented to Council, with cost estimates ranging from $51.8 million to $66 million. Council
directed staff to complete preliminary review of the potential use of the Downtown Library site at that time.

In October 2000, the Council determined that the Downtown Library site was not feasible due to strong neighborhood concerns regarding the compatibility and the size and configuration of the lot. The site was removed from further consideration.

A $400,000 CIP proposal was approved as part of the FY 2001-2002 CIP budget for the purpose of completing the analysis of potential site options and to develop cost figures that would be required for financing the project. On July 2, 2001 Council approved, in concept, the current Police Department building site for the project and directed staff to proceed with the conceptual design of four potential preliminary options at the existing location.

**DISCUSSION**

Since July 2001, RDC and staff have been working on more detailed information on each of four options at the existing Civic Center site. This report provides the results of these studies: the pros and cons, the estimated ongoing operational costs and construction costs for each option; justification that resulted in the decision to move forward with additional work on one of the options; and an explanation of the work that will follow in the schematic design phase of the project.

**Description of Four Options**

While only one of the four options meets the full programmatic requirements of the Police Department, the following provides a description of exterior changes and the pros and cons for each option:

1. **Option A – “Up Only”**

   This option would expand the police facility upward, build out the mezzanine and add a second floor. This is the only retrofit option and would not require the demolition of the building because the changes would be made within the existing building exterior.

   Square footage: 48,000
   Estimated cost: $39,080,000

   Advantages:
• Allows for the retention of current building exterior.
• Retains the current Council Chamber’s roof.
• 9-1-1 EDC and the EOC could be located on the same floor.

Disadvantages:

• Results in the highest new construction cost due to retention of existing building.
• Does not accommodate full program needs.
• Would require the property/evidence function to be relocated off-site resulting in higher ongoing operational costs.
• Extensive seismic retrofitting would be required below first floor in order to retain existing structure.
• Provides the least seismically sound or predictable option.
• Height constraints between existing floors would result in less efficient design and placement of mechanical systems.
• Provides less flexibility for green building features.
• Requires addition of a new level, which may be a neighborhood issue.

2. Option B – “Out” One Level

This option would expand the first floor out to columns on the surrounding arcade area. The arcade area is that space between the existing exterior walls and the columns. This option would entail the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a new one.

Square footage: 42,000  Estimated cost: $42,446,000

Advantages:

• No additional floors would be added.

Disadvantages:

• Results in a severe shortfall in programmatic space needs.
• Property/evidence function would need to be relocated off-site resulting in higher ongoing operational costs including additional staff.
• Design flexibility is limited resulting in less efficient design of mechanical systems, shaft and stair placement.
• Significant overcrowding would occur due to the “shoehorn” approach that would be needed to cover operational needs.
• New roof over expanded first floor and connection to existing roof present design and construction difficulties.
• Provides the least flexibility for green building features.

3. Option C – “Out” Two Levels

This option would expand the first floor and mezzanine level out over arcade area. The demolition of the current structure and the construction of a new one is included in the scheme.

Square footage: 47,000 Estimated cost: $44,667,000

Advantages:

• No additional floors would be added.
• 9-1-1 EDC and the EOC could be located on the same floor.

Disadvantages:

• Most expensive option.
• Property/evidence function must be located off-site resulting in higher ongoing operational costs including additional staff.
• Design flexibility is limited, resulting in less efficient design of mechanical systems, shaft and stair placement.
• New roof over expanded first floor and connection to existing roof present design and construction difficulties.
• Some overcrowding exists.
• Less flexibility for green building features.
• Represents the most costly of the options.

4. Option D – “Up and Out”

This option would expand both the first floor and mezzanine levels out to the arcade and add a smaller second floor. This option would also entail the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a new one.

Square footage: 50,000 Estimated cost: $38,325,000
Advantages:

- Only scheme that allows full accommodation of program and service requirements.
- Least costly option.
- 9-1-1 EDC and the EOC may be located on the same floor and could be restricted or to prohibit public access.
- Greatest flexibility for green building features.
- Provides for most efficient operations (i.e., property/evidence function located on-site).

Disadvantages:

- Requires the addition of a new level.

Staff is proceeding with Option D to schematic design. The recommendation is based upon programmatic considerations, cost, sustainability factor flexibility, and operational efficiencies.

Option D would entail the demolition of the current structure and the construction of a new building that would create some traffic and noise issues during construction. However, based upon the seismic upgrading that is required for an “essential facility,” it is easier and less costly to build a new structure as opposed to retrofitting an existing one. The benefits of removing the current facility and replacing it with a lightweight steel structure include a simplified construction process, enhanced seismic performance, more efficient HVAC layouts, and less structural impact and thus less associated parking space elimination in the Civic Center garage.

This option also provides the most square footage and allows for the greatest flexibility on the use of space, making it the only option that meets the Police Department’s programmatic needs. The additional space would allow for the property/evidence function or the processing and storage of all except large evidence items to remain on site. Other options would necessitate moving this function to another location and would result in the need for additional staff with corresponding increased ongoing costs, as well as the loss of productive time as officers and staff would have to travel to/from the off-site location for property/evidence storage and retrieval.

The additional square footage and configuration of Option D would allow for more opportunities for the introduction of sustainability strategies. Strategies that will be studied as part of the schematic design will include natural ventilation, high levels of day lighting to interior spaces, and other energy saving and stress mitigating approaches. Option D will provide the interior space required to accomplish some of these ideas and will provide the
flexibility to study orientation of individual programmatic elements to optimize day lighting exposure.

**Key Issues**

There are several key issues that staff and RDC will be working to resolve as part of the schematic design phase of this project.

*Parking* - As a result of the seismic upgrade needed for the building, there would be associated impacts to the Civic Center garage, and corresponding impacts on number of available parking spaces during the construction period. The exact number of spaces cannot be determined until a 30 percent schematic design of one option is completed. Additionally, the zoning requirement for additional parking spaces associated with the increased square footage cannot be determined until a more detailed design is completed. RDC has included in-lieu parking fees in the cost estimates for each option. The parking and transportation studies that have already been initiated will be completed during the next phase of the project.

*Temporary Relocation During Construction* - Police Department services and staff, including the City’s EOC and the 9-1-1 EDC would need to be temporarily relocated during the construction period (estimated 24-month period).

It would be impossible to carry on the day-to-day operations in the building during construction. Staff anticipates that the 9-1-1 EDC could be relocated to the City’s SCADA building during this time. Costs associated with the installation and operational costs of moving the EDC are included in the total project costs. Staff has just begun studying the possible locations where the Police Department and the EOC could be moved to during construction. Results of this study would be presented to the Council at a later date.

*Council Chambers Roof* - As a result of the Council Chambers roof attachment to the Police Department wing and the associated modifications that would be required for the seismic modifications, the City Council Chambers would be unusable during a portion of the construction period and the City Council would need to be temporarily relocated during an estimated 12-18 month period. Council meetings would need to be conducted in other facilities such as Cubberley or the Art Center. Preliminary indications are that it may be more cost effective and enhance the seismic performance of the roof if it was replaced completely. The cost estimates for Option D includes projections for the roof replacement, but do not include relocation costs for Council and other meetings. Staff will be reviewing several funding opportunities associated with photovoltaic that may be available for this part of the project.

*Off-site Warehouse* - All options would require the lease or acquisition of an off-site warehouse
for the storage of large property/evidence items including bicycles. All options would allow for the storage of money, weapons, and narcotics at the police facility. Space for the property/evidence function or the actual processing of evidence would only be available in Option D. Off-site space in addition to the warehouse would be needed for the property/evidence function for the other three options.

*Mechanical Equipment Room* – Similar to the other options, Option D would require the inclusion of a mechanical equipment room on the roof of the new police facility.

*Historical Significance* – Architect Edward Durrell Stone designed the Civic Center, including the police wing. Staff has done some preliminary review to determine if there would be any potential historical impact resulting from this project. Significant changes have already been made to the Civic Center, including the removal of the arcade that previously surrounded the Civic Center complex.

*Use of Level A Space* - Level A of the Civic Center currently includes an employee lunchroom and the City’s mailroom/print shop. The square footage of each is similar. All the options would require the use of one of these spaces. Staff has evaluated the feasibility of relocating the mail room/print shop and determined that it not only would be very expensive, but it would result in significant disruption and inefficiencies for City staff. Staff has also assessed the possibility of eliminating the employee lunchroom. The size of this room has already been reduced in size by one-half as the space needs of the Police Department have increased over the years. While every attempt would be made to provide some “break” space for use by City employees, the preliminary conclusion is that the lunchroom as it currently exists would be removed.

While some City staff may be concerned about the closure of the lunchroom, RDC and staff have been directed by the City Manager to include if possible, space in the project design that would allow for a workout area that could be used by all City employees. Council may recall that about five years ago, due to security reasons associated with the design of the current facility, the Police Department had to change the use of the gym area to only Police and Fire employees. As a result, the City has been helping to subsidize non-public safety City employees’ use of a private facility in close proximity to City Hall. Further evaluation on this issue will be completed during the next phase.

**NEXT STEPS**

The following are the steps that will be completed as part of the schematic design phase:

- Preliminary building systems’ design
- Full schematic layout of the building
- Energy load evaluations
- Green building element scoping
- Preliminary integration of public art into the design
- Parking/transportation studies
- Review of potential relocation sites
- Detailed cost estimation for funding proposal

Upon completion of these tasks, staff plans to hold a second study session with the ARB. At the point of 30 percent design, staff will provide the information to the Planning and Transportation Commission and to the City Council for review. Staff believes that prior to this point there would not be enough concrete information available on which the Commission and Council could provide specific direction, but that it is early enough in the process for the Council to make any changes.

**RESOURCE IMPACT**

Since 1996, a total of $515,024 has already been spent on this project.

No additional funds will be needed for the schematic design of Option D. The Council, as part of the FY2001-2002 budget, approved the Public Safety Building Capital Improvement Project #19820 in the amount of $400,000, which will bring the total project costs to over $857,000.

The funding mechanism needed for this project has not yet been identified. Staff is proceeding with the schematic design work needed to achieve a 30 percent design. The information obtained by developing this level of design will determine the level of financing required for the project.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

This direction is consistent with prior Council direction.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**
Complete CEQA documentation will be completed as part of the schematic design phase. Attachment D provides a draft summary of environmental findings that have been developed to date.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Massing Model Renderings for Each Option
Attachment B: Cost Summary Comparisons for Four Options
Attachment C: Detailed Cost Summaries for Each Option
Attachment D: Draft Summary of Key Environmental Findings
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