

FILE: REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The City Hall Review Committee was established in early March 1990 at the request of the City Council. The five (5) community members represent diverse backgrounds but with a common goal: to perform an independent study considering the perspectives of all the members as well as fellow citizens. In preparation for an analysis, discussion of findings and the formulation of conclusions, the task force performed the following activities:

- * Interviewed City Department Heads regarding the February 6th status report to clarify written sections and gain opinions on pertinent points;

- * Toured City Hall with staff Department Heads for insight on the status of City Hall;

- * Discussed with various community officials and citizens their knowledge and opinions on relevant topics;

- * Researched information from various sources such as the City Governments for comparison purposes;

- * Ascertained specific data on space allocation and parking requirements;

- * Studied city documents pertaining to the title deeds, city owned property, vacant land, property values and other matters relevant to the site selection;

- * Reviewed models and plans submitted by Cal Poly School of Architecture students;

- * Performed site inspections both within and outside the city limits.

What follows is our report to City Officials. The sections are:

- * LIMITATIONS
- * QUALIFICATIONS
- * FACILITY SPACE NEEDS
- * FACILITY SITE ANALYSIS
- * RECOMMENDATIONS
- * COURSE OF ACTION
- * EXHIBITS

LIMITATIONS

In order to develop a meaningful study of the issues surrounding the Pismo Beach City Hall, it was necessary for the committee to place some limitations on the study's scope. The following qualifications describe which criteria were held constant in our review of various scenarios for City Hall, and how those criteria were established.

Because of the study's time frame and the lack of availability of some pieces of information, the committee worked with the following limitations:

1. A detailed structural evaluation of the existing City Hall building has not yet been initiated. Specific requirements for seismic stabilization, and their attendant costs, were not available. See Exhibit A.
2. Potential alternate City Hall sites have not been reviewed by qualified real estate appraisers to establish accurate land values.

3. Citizen input has not been solicited in a formal fashion (poll, questionnaire, etc.).

The committee does not feel that these limitations have compromised the report. Preliminary analysis and informal investigation have generated information which allow informed recommendations and conclusions to be made.

QUALIFICATIONS

While there is a lack of unanimity regarding the extent of the existing City Hall's deficiencies, the committee found that serious deficiencies do, in fact, exist. These affect structural systems, building utilities, and the functioning of interior spaces.

The City's response to SB 547, the State mandated mitigation of potentially hazardous, unreinforced masonry buildings, will definitely require some upgrade of City Hall structural components within the next three years. Plumbing, electrical, heating, and ventilating systems are clearly substandard in various parts of the building.

The committee has assumed, therefore, that the current status quo is not one of the viable scenarios for the future of City Hall.

FACILITY**SPACE NEEDS**

The committee conducted interviews with Department Heads, went on a detailed tour of the existing building, and read pre-architectural programming information generated by third year Cal Poly architecture students as part of a space needs assessment. These sources provided three different levels of facility requirements for consideration:

1. Repairs and remodeling to the existing building to correct current deficiencies.
2. Remodeling and/or new construction to correct current deficiencies and provide building area to meet current unmet space needs.
3. Remodeling and/or new construction to correct current deficiencies and meet projected space needs for the year 2000.

For the purposes of this report, the third level of project development has been assumed - a facility which will satisfy City Hall space needs at least until 2000. In fact, the committee feels that the year 2000 projections should satisfy facility requirements well into the period 2010 thru 2020. This brings the City Hall analysis into step with the demographic projections for population

growth which are a part of the data base for the current update to the City's General Plan and it still yields a facility which has a realistic ratio of City Hall floor area to population size, compared to other cities which were reviewed.

Before the various scenarios for the future of City Hall were developed, the quantitative portion of the pre-architectural program was analyzed and refined. An attempt was made to bring the space needs lists for the different departments into a consistent programming format; spaces which were probably redundant have been eliminated, required spaces which were lacking have been added, and spaces of a similar function have been given a similar size for each department.

Additionally, a first pass was taken at the kind of reductions which normally occur when the first space needs assessment (which constitute the departments' "request for space") is value engineered for budget purposes. This was done primarily through the application of more conservative rule-of-thumb sizes to various offices and other specific spaces. These reductions are very arbitrary at this point and may not all be appropriate, but, taken in aggregate, are typical for a project of this size and type. And finally, the circulation was added as a percentage of the total space requirement.

The committee then took an additional 15% overall floor area reduction. This yields a target facility size, through the year 2020, of 28,000 square feet. It is our belief that a professional programming consultant would readily produce this reduction during the preparation of a refined space needs assessment. Furthermore, we concurred that a hard look ought to be given to the space requirements for the Community Development and the Police Departments. The area requests appear high relative to other departments' requirements and based partially on projected future staffing. See Exhibits B and C.

FACILITY

SITE ANALYSIS

The committee members began the analysis for a City Hall site with no limitations on locations. Land both within and outside current city limits was considered. First, we developed criteria for selecting a location. These features provided the guidelines for our selection.

* ACCESSIBILITY - proximity to freeway entrance/exit and major surface streets.

* CONVENIENCE - centralized location, i.e. available by public transportation, car and bike path.

* REALISTIC SIZE - square footage based on prioritization of basic city services, expansion possibilities for programs beyond the scope of basic city services and thought towards additional parking.

* TIMELINESS - acquisitions of land and development of funding source within State mandated timeframe for mitigation of seismic hazard in existing building.

* EASE OF EGRESS - degree of ease for emergency vehicles to safely enter and exit building, and the degree of speed to reach major surface streets and freeways.

As we reviewed possible locations, we found that we needed to consider the design of the building as well as the location. Thus we added three (3) more criteria to our evaluation list.

* SUITABILITY - efficient and comfortable work environment for employees, and for the public, welcoming civic imagery with adequate seating and parking.

* ECONOMY - price of facility within the City budget guidelines and in consideration of funding needs for other major improvement projects.

* FLEXIBILITY - potential for building and/or remodeling to accommodate phasing.

It became apparent that we could rule out locations outside the city limits as well as sites East of the railroad tracks all for the same reason - bottlenecks crossing the freeway. Five Cities Drive and Fourth Street overpasses are inadequate for the current traffic flows. Sites along Mattie Road were not seriously considered because they are likely to experience similar congestion problems.

In total seven (7) sites and nine (9) development scenarios were reviewed. Each is classified by a scenario number and follows the below format:

- * Scenario Number
- * Location
- * Site Area
- * Current Ownership
- * Discussion and Preliminary Budget Estimate
- * Benefits, and
- * Drawbacks

See Exhibit D, Scenarios 1A through 7 for detailed discussions.

A consideration worthy of note is the possibility of a land swap should the Council consider a site other than the present location. City Hall sits on a land parcel approximately 1.3 acres (excluding the Fire Station). With a zone change to multi-family residential, the parcel could be extremely attractive for a land swap. If the City were to acquire church and school district controlled land directly behind City Hall, there would be a consolidated parcel around 3 acres with an exchange value of about two million dollars. See Exhibit E.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Mayor's introductory memorandum to the City Hall Review Committee stated "the objective of your committee is to research, fact find and present an independent, unbiased report to the City Council for public comment." As the Committee became familiar with this assignment, we adopted a two-part objective for our report. First, we have sought to make an objective determination of the actual extent and type of facilities a City Hall for Pismo Beach should include. Second, we have identified what we feel is the optimum available scenario for action on a City Hall project, including site selection and development program. Given each Committee members' opportunity to form opinions on a recommended course of action, we have selected to discuss the majority and minority opinions.

MAJORITY OPINION

The majority opinion is Scenario 1B - Build a New City Hall on the Existing Location. This decision is based on the following conclusions:

1. Development of new City Hall facilities could be phased.
2. Should the existing building be replaced by an entirely new structure, demolition of the existing building would occur after some new construction is ready for occupancy.

RECOMMENDATIONS**MAJORITY OPINION (Continued):**

3. Arrangements for use of the Saint Paul's church parking lot should be formalized through a) a land trade, b.) a land purchase, c) execution of a long term lease, or d) establishment of irrevocable and perpetual easements.

4. The existing tennis courts should be utilized for either building or parking area in the new City Hall project.

Although building a new City Hall ranks first, there is the opinion that a combination of remodeling and new construction has merit. The following conclusions accompany Scenario 1A.

5. Depending on the results of a seismic retrofit study of the existing building, the new facilities would be a combination of new construction and remodeling of the existing building; retaining as much of the original facade as possible.

6. If the project includes the remodeling of all or part of the existing building, the "essential services" component of Police Department facilities should be relocated outside of the existing structure early in the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS**MAJORITY OPINION (Continued):**

7. It may be prudent to consider rezoning with the intent to purchase the two properties that front Bello Street between the Fire Station and the Church. The acquisition would add close to a half acre for parking or future expansion.

MINORITY OPINION

The minority opinion is Scenario Number 5 - Relocate City Hall to Price Street. This scenario has complications for the selected site depending on actual land availability and manageable costs. In balance, a Price Street location offers futuristic thinking about the business district. Increased citizen traffic could revitalize an under-utilized area that has potential.

Conclusions for this scenario are as follow:

8. Property totalling at least 1.4 acres should be acquired for the project.

9. If possible, land acquisition should be accomplished through exchanges, rather than through sale and repurchase. Condemnation probably would be required.

RECOMMENDATIONS**MINORITY OPINION (Continued):**

10. Existing building on the selected Price Street site would be demolished.

11. The new City Hall could be phased construction.

12. City Hall functions would remain in the existing building until the first phase of new construction is completed and ready for occupancy.

13. The Fire Station will remain on Bello Street if the new land site is too small.

COURSE OF ACTION

Regardless of which site and development scenario is pursued, the Committee suggests establishing the following considerations when setting a course of action:

A. Any project for City Hall should maintain all City Departments in one location (Fire Station excluded).

B. Strategic and fiscal planning for a City Hall should be pursued immediately, ie. start allocating money in the General Fund.

COURSE OF ACTION (Continued)

C. Construction of a City Hall project could be phased, to reduce initial cost to the City.

D. The project size is estimated at a maximum of 28,000 square feet, to meet City needs until the year 2020.

E. The budget for the project will likely run a minimum of \$3 million.

F. Further space needs analysis should seek more balance between the space requests of the Community Development Department and Police Department, and the requests for the remainder of City Departments.

G. To establish a valid square footage requirement, a space consultant might be retained.

H. If re-use of the existing building is being considered, retain a structural engineer to prepare a detailed seismic analysis of the existing building.

I. Retain a professional programmer to provide a complete pre-architectural program.

J. Decide on the actual re-use capabilities of the existing structure.

COURSE OF ACTION (Continued)

K. Retain an architect to provide facility design.

L. Retain a financial consultant to help develop a financing program.

If the selected City Hall scenario involves NEW CONSTRUCTION either ON A NEW SITE or ON THE EXISTING SITE, the following actions are recommended:

M. Enter into preliminary negotiations for a project site.

N. Enter into preliminary negotiations to ascertain the size of City property for trade or sale.

O. Retain a professional programmer to provide a complete pre-architectural program and identify required site area.

P. Finalize site acquisition and necessary rezoning.

Q. Retain an architect to provide facility design.

R. Retain a financial consultant to help develop the funding program.

In closing, we will briefly discuss how the City Hall project is to be financed. During the research portion of our project, we found support for four different funding methods:

1. A non-profit California corporation such as the existing Pismo Beach Public Facilities Corporation secured through the General Fund.

2. A Mello Roos District levied tax, and

3. A General Obligation Bond levied tax.

4. Lease back to the City of a completed building by a private developer.

Each idea has its merits. With the knowledge and direction from a financial advisor, such as one of the groups that has submitted a proposal, a funding method can be selected. Following the completion of the pre-architectural program may be the appropriate time to focus on this aspect. In the meantime, we feel that City Department Managers need to be prudent in their requests for staff and equipment. This would demonstrate to the Citizens a good faith effort by City Management to make the best use of tax dollars.

Respectfully Submitted,

CITY HALL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tim Bittner
Bruce Fraser
Henry Myers
Nancy Stute
Kay Tavasti

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT A: Request for engineering reports and responses.
- EXHIBIT B: Facility space needs analysis
- EXHIBIT C: References
- EXHIBIT D: Scenarios and city map.
- EXHIBIT E: Map of City Hall and surrounding area.
- EXHIBIT F: Letter from Laguna Beach City Manager.
- EXHIBIT G: Letter from Rick Kirkwood to Father Parchem.
- EXHIBIT H: List of City owned properties.

EXHIBIT B

In the following exhibit, the first column lists an identifier for each space, the second column lists the name/function of the space, the third column lists the City staffs' initial area request, in square feet, and the fourth column lists a revised area, utilized by the City Hall Review Committee for the purposes of this report.

#1 SPACE	#2 NAME/FUNCTION	#3 CITY STAFF (Initial Request)	#4 COMMITTEE (Revision)
---------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	---

ADMINISTRATION

A-1	City Administrator	345 sq. ft.	200 sq. ft.
A-2	City Clerk	170	160
A-3	Deputy City Clerk	130	120
A-4	Reception/Waiting	196	200
A-5	File Storage	600	400
A-6	Law Library/Conference Room	280	250
A-7	City Attorney	300	160
A-8	Legal Secretary/ Admin. Assistant	130	120
A-9	Assistant City Administrator	200	150
A-10	Vault/Fire Safe File Storage	240	150
A-11	Mayor's Office	200	160
A-12	Council Office	200	200
A-13	Administrative Conf. Rm	500	350
A-14	Council Chambers	3,000	3,000
A-15	Mail/Copy Room	300	150
A-16	Employee Lounge	200	150
A-17	Men's Restroom	300	300
A-18	Women's Restroom	300	120
A-19	Lobby/Exhibit Space	0	800
	TOTALS	7,591 sq. ft.	6,810 sq. ft.

FINANCE

F-1	Finance Director	240	160
F-2	Accounting Assistant	130	100
F-3	Payroll/Personnel	150	120
F-4	Secretarial	80	90
F-5	Clerks	280	280
F-6	Reception/Counter	100	100

	Initial	Revision
FINANCE (Continued)		
F-7 Conference/Auditors	140	140
F-8 File Storage	140	140
F-9 Vault/Fire Safe Storage	150	150
F-10 Data Processing	430	430
F-11 Machine Room	250	200
F-12 Mail/Copy	200	100
F-13 Central Purchasing Storage	275	250
TOTALS	2,545 sq. ft.	2,220 sq. ft.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Initial	Revision
CD-1 Community Development Dir	200 sq. ft.	160 sq. ft.
CD-2 Secretarial	400	250
CD-3 Research/Data	1,200	600
CD-4 Clerical	200	120
CD-5 Reception	200	200
CD-6 Senior Planning Manager	200	120
CD-7 Principal Planners	400	240
CD-8 Associate Principal Planners	200	200
CD-9 Assistant Planner	200	120
CD-10 Planning Technician	200	100
CD-11 Redevelopment Manager	200	120
CD-12 Assoc. Redevelopment Mgrs.	400	200
CD-13 Building Official	200	160
CD-14 Building Inspectors	600	300
CD-15 Code Enforcement	200	100
CD-16 Recreation Manager	200	120
CD-17 Recreation Supervisors	400	200
CD-18 Recreation Coordinators	400	200
CD-19 Assistant Recreation Officer	200	100
CD-20 Community Promotion	400	220
CD-21 File Storage	0	400
CD-22 Copy/Mail	0	150
CD-23 Conference (2 small, 1 large)	0	120
CD-24 Men's Restroom	0	120
CD-25 Women's Restroom	0	120
CD-26 Employee Lounge	0	200
CD-27 Plan Layout	0	200
TOTALS	6,600 sq. ft.	5,520 sq. ft.

PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING

PW-1	Public Works Director	300	160
PW-2	Administrative Secretary	80	80
PW-3	Receptionist	70	100
PW-4	Assistant City Engineer	200	120
PW-5	Associate Engineer	120	120
PW-6	Assistant Civil Engineer	120	120
PW-7	Engineering Aids	200	200
PW-8	Public Works Inspector	70	90
PW-9	Public Lobby/Counter	300	200
PW-10	Files Storage	800	500
PW-11	Conference Room	240	200
PW-12	Conference Room	0	80
TOTALS		2,500 sq. ft.	1,970 sq. ft.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

P-1	Public Lobby	240 sq. ft.	240 sq. ft.
P-2	Dispatch	800	600
P-3	Record Storage	1,500	800
P-4	Records Supervisor	180	120
P-5	Records Clerks	300	200
P-6	Clerk/Typists	300	200
P-7	Detectives	750	660
P-8	Police Service Rep.	180	120
P-9	Watch Commander	180	120
P-10	Traffic Officer	300	240
P-11	Parking Enforcement	150	120
P-12	Report Room	350	350
P-13	Booking Area	150	150
P-14	Holding Cells	224	224
P-15	Evidence/Property	1,500	1,000
P-16	Interview Room	270	240
P-17	Chief of Police	256	160
P-18	Operations Commander	256	160
P-19	Patrol Commander	256	160
P-20	Administrative Secretary	180	100
P-21	Radio/Computer Room	450	300
P-22	Emergency Operation Center	400	400
P-23	Photo Lab	300	240
P-24	Men's Locker Room	550	400
P-25	Women's Locker Room	350	300
P-26	Lounge	300	200
P-27	Men's Restroom	225	240
P-28	Women's Restroom	225	240
P-29	Armory	225	150
P-30	Conference/Training	1,500	800

Initial

Revision

POLICE DEPARTMENT (Continued)

P-31	General Storage	1,500	800
P-32	Prisoner Entry	0	60
P-33	Conference	0	100
P-34	Conference	0	100
TOTALS		14,347 sq. ft.	10,294 sq. ft.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

FD-1	Fire Chief	300	160
FD-2	Library	140	120
FD-3	Fire Prevention/Hazardous Materials	140	140
FD-4	Conference Room	260	0
FD-5	Storage	190	190
FD-6	Training Officer	140	120
FD-7	Receptionist	120	120
FD-8	Fire Marshall	240	160
FD-9	Administrative Secretary	170	120
FD-10	Men's Restroom	0	0
FD-11	Women's Restroom	0	0
FD-12	Public Lobby	0	0
TOTAL		1,700 sq. ft.	1,130 sq. ft.

COMMON FACILITIES

Initial

Revision

CF-1	Mechanical Equipment		250
CF-2	Electrical Equipment		150
CF-3	Telephone Equipment		100
CF-4	Elevator/Elevator Equipment		130
CF-5	Janitorial		120
CF-6	Public Telephone		100
CF-7	Circulation (15% of total)		4,200
TOTAL			5,050 sq. ft.

TOTAL BUILDING PROGRAM

	Initial	Revision
ADMINISTRATION	7,591 sq. ft.	6,810 sq. ft.
FINANCE	2,545	2,220
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	6,600	5,520
PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING	2,500	1,970
POLICE	14,347	10,294
FIRE	1,700	1,130
COMMON FACILITIES	5,050	5,050
TOTALS	40,333 sq. ft.	32,944 sq. ft.

ADDITIONAL AREA REDUCTION

RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE (-15%): $32,944 - 4,942 = 28,002$ sf

REFERENCE LIST

Information contained in this report is drawn from the following people, publications and other sources:

Pismo Beach City Staff

Richard Kirkwood, City Administrator
Michael Swigart, Community Development Director
Margaret Vicars, Finance Director
Sharon Jones, City Clerk
Brook McMahon, Chief of Police
Paul Henlin, Fire Chief

City of Grover City

City of Morro Bay

City of San Luis Obispo

City of Laguna Beach

City of Escondido

California Polytechnic State University

Third Year Architecture Students, under the direction of
Professor Larry Loh, AIA

San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune

Five Cities Times-Press-Recorder

Fred Schott, Fred H. Schott & Associates, Civil and Structural
Engineers

John Nelson, Howard F. Stup & Associates, Consulting Engineers

Stone & Youngberg, Financial Consultants

Rauscher Pierce Refsnes, Financial Consultants

Fieldman, Rolapp & Associates, Financial Advisors

Wulff, Hansen & Co., Investment Bankers

First California Capital Markets Group

Sutro & Company, Financial Consultants

Pismo Beach R/UDAT Follow-Up Committee

Jerry Osborn Realty

Father Peter Parchem, Saint Paul the Apostle Catholic Church

Scott Lathrop, Business Manger, Lucia Mar School District

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1A

LOCATION: Bello Street and Wadsworth Avenue.
SITE AREA: Approximately 1.7 acres including the fire station.
CURRENT OWNERSHIP: City of Pismo Beach.

DISCUSSION: This scenario was developed to examine the "minimum viable project" which would meet the facility requirements listed in this report. It involves no acquisition of additional land, but assumes some formalization of the use of the Saint Paul's church parking area behind the existing City Hall building. Existing floor area is maintained by remodeling and seismically stabilizing the structure as is, with the removal of non-bearing interior wall to generate increased space efficiency. Additional space is developed with an in-fill structure in the courtyard, and with the addition of a two-story, 12,000 sq. ft. addition, alongside or behind the existing building. Police and Fire Department administration functions would be placed in the new construction to avoid bringing the existing building up to the "essential services" level of strengthening.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

Remodel 13,500 sf. @ \$50/sf.	675,000.00
Site Development Allowance	50,000.00
14,500 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	1,305,000.00
Construction Subtotal:	2,030,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf.	420,000.00
Contingency (15%)	367,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	240,000.00
Budget Total:	\$3,057,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1A (Continued)

- BENEFITS:
1. Maintaining the existing City Hall location provides continuity and familiarity for City residents.
 2. A remodel/addition is likely to provide the most project for the dollar.
 3. A remodel and restoration of the existing building maximizes what some consider to be a historic building resource.
 4. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is good and proven from this site.
 5. This scenario can be developed in a minimum of elapsed time, and can be built in two or three phases to limit disruption.
 6. Current ownership and zoning would allow this development to proceed with a minimum of procedural delays.

- DRAWBACKS:
1. The existing City Hall building could not be occupied during the remodeling process, requiring some temporary relocation of City operations.
 2. Unless the rear parking area is acquired from Saint Paul's church, ultimate future expansion on this site is limited.
 3. Surrounding residents may identify this scenario as exacerbating a land use conflict between residential and public facilities properties.
 4. The process of engineering and constructing improvements to the structural system of the existing building could reveal more extensive, and thus more costly, remodeling requirements.
 5. Use of the existing building may not allow as efficient a floor plan as all new construction could develop.
 6. Location limits access to one street only. Expanding access to Wadsworth could create a traffic hazard.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1B

LOCATION: Bello Street and Wadsworth Avenue.
SITE AREA: Approximately 1.7 acres including the fire station.
CURRENT OWNERSHIP: City of Pismo Beach.
DISCUSSION: This scenario would leave the existing fire station, but demolish the existing City Hall building.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new construction @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Demolition Allowance	100,000.00
Site Development Allowance	50,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf	420,000.00
Contingency (15%)	464,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	302,000.00
Budget Total:	\$3,856,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

BENEFITS:

1. Maintaining the existing City Hall location provides continuity and familiarity for City residents.
2. Provides additional parking.
3. Provides space for future expansion if the church parking lot can be utilized.
4. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is good and proven from this site.
5. Current ownership and zoning would allow this development to proceed with a minimum of procedural delays.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1B (Continued)

DRAWBACKS:

1. The existing City Hall building could not be occupied during the construction process, requiring some temporary relocation of City operations.
2. Unless the rear parking area is acquired from Saint Paul's church, ultimate future expansion on this site is limited.
3. Surrounding residents may identify this scenario as exacerbating a land use conflict between residential and public facilities properties.
4. We would lose this familiar and recognizable City Hall building.
5. Requires removal of tennis courts.
6. Location limits access to one street only. Expanding access to Wadsworth could create a traffic hazard.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1C

LOCATION: Bello Street and Wadsworth Avenue.
SITE AREA: Approximately 1.7 acres including the fire station.
CURRENT OWNERSHIP: City of Pismo Beach.
DISCUSSION: This scenario has three (3) parts:

1. Leave the existing fire station.
2. Build a new 16,000 sq. ft. building (50 ft x 160 ft. two-story) behind the existing building.
3. The old City Hall building would then be vacated.

This allows the necessary room for immediate expansion and provides a building that meets earthquake standards.

Additional future expansion could be had by rebuilding or replacing the original City Hall building. This would allow more time to decide the fate of the original City Hall building.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

16,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	1,440,000.00
Site Development Allowance	50,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 16,000 sf @ \$15/sf.	240,000.00
Contingency (15%)	260,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	169,000.00

Budget Total: \$2,159,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 1C (Continued):

- BENEFITS:
1. Maintaining the existing City Hall location provides continuity and familiarity for City residents.
 2. Provides space for future expansion.
 3. Possible restoration of the existing building maximizes what some consider to be a historic building resource.
 4. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is good and proven from this site.
 5. This scenario can be developed in a minimum of elapsed time, and can be built in two or three phases to limit disruption.
 6. The existing City Hall can be used until the new structure is completed.

- DRAWBACKS:
1. Parking agreement must be obtained from the church in order to have adequate parking.
 2. Surrounding residents may identify this scenario as exacerbating a land use conflict between residential and public facilities properties.
 3. Location limits access to one street only. Expanding access to Wadsworth could create a traffic hazard.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 2

LOCATION: Price Canyon Road and Bello Street.

SITE AREA: 2.5 acres, also adjacent to the Veteran's Memorial Building.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: Lucia Mar School District.

DISCUSSION: This is a very steeply sloping sight and could be very difficult (and expensive) to build.

It is one of the sites Cal Poly architecture students will be reviewing in the coming quarter. A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Site Development Allowance	600,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf.	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	354,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	331,000.00
Budget Total:	\$4,225,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

BENEFITS:

1. This site could probably be purchased from the school district at a fairly reasonable price since it is zoned Government.
2. Rezoning would not be necessary.
3. This site has unquestionably the best view of any of the sites considered, which would help provide a pleasant working environment.
4. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is comparable to the present site.
5. The existing City Hall could be retained until the new structure is completed.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 2 (Continued)

DRAWBACKS:

1. This is by no means a level site! Parking and handicap access could be a big problem.
2. A water reservoir is located on the property and would have to be dealt with.
3. This could be a costly site to build because of the topography.
4. A new house is now being built between this lot and the Veteran's Memorial building.
5. Subsoil conditions could require an elaborate, costly foundation.
6. Location limits access to one street only. Expanding access to Price Canyon Road could create a traffic hazard.
7. This is a possible archeological site.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 3

LOCATION: Five Cities Shopping Center site, northwest of the intersection of 4th Street and U.S. 101.

SITE AREA: Over 20 acres available.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: Michael Towbes, a Santa Barbara developer.

DISCUSSION: This scenario is based on the concept of a land swap. It first requires some form of exchange with Saint Paul's church, which produces a consolidated parcel approximately 3.0 acres at the corner of Bello Street and Wadsworth Avenue. This parcel would then be exchanged for land at the Five Cities site. Preliminary assumptions about the relative value of these parcels suggests the 3.0 acres on Bello Street (this includes the church parking lot) could be exchanged for about 3.7 acres at the Five Cities site. A new City Hall complex could then be built at the Five Cities site, and the existing City Hall building would be demolished for construction of multi-family housing units.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of /\$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Site Development Allowance	300,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf.	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	324,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	303,000.00
Budget Total:	\$3,867,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 3 (Continued)

- BENEFITS:
1. The new City Hall complex would be built on a "clean" flat site, increasing construction efficiency.
 2. Visibility of the site would be good from the freeway and many parts of the city.
 3. The neighborhood at Bello Street would become more consistently zoned, with the conversion to residential.
 4. Access to southbound traffic routes is excellent.
 5. The existing City Hall could be used until the new structure is completed.
 6. The transaction could be conditioned to make the newly constructed multi-family housing units more affordable than units currently on the market, meeting a number of General Plan housing goals.

- DRAWBACKS:
1. The Five Cities Shopping Center site is in an existing redevelopment agency jurisdiction, and development of non-taxed public facilities would erode the tax increment financing base.
 2. General Plan amendments and zone changes would be required.
 3. A City Hall complex is likely to be incompatible with many of the potential uses of the remainder of this site.
 4. Access to northbound traffic routes is poor, and could require expensive additional circulation improvements.
 5. The Five Cities site is less geographically central to the City.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 4

LOCATION: Ventana Del Mar Park area. Off James Way between Ventana Del Mar and 4th Street.

SITE AREA: 40 acres of City owned park land.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: City of Pismo Beach.

DISCUSSION: This site is designated as a park and recreational area, but could be shared with City Hall as well as the YMCA.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Site Development Allowance	600,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	354,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	331,000.00
Budget Total:	\$4,225,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

BENEFITS:

1. This site is owned by the City.
2. 40 acres provides room for expansion and area already has a desirable park-like setting.
3. The existing City Hall could be used until the new structure is completed.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 4 (Continued)

DRAWBACKS:

1. Access - with the traffic problems already existing at the 4th Street overpass and James Way ending at the railroad tracks this site does not seem acceptable for Police and Fire access at this time. Additional building is also already planned in this area which will make the traffic problems worse.
2. Geological and topographical conditions may require an expensive foundation.
3. Much of the level "buildable" land at this site may be in the 100 year flood plain.
4. General Plan amendments and zone changes would be required.
5. Since the traffic problems on James Way and 4th Street will not be resolved until well past our target date, if ever, the Ventana site along with other sites east of the railroad tracks seem undesirable.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 5

LOCATION: Price Street and Pomeroy, Chevron Station through the YMCA across the street, next to the City Parking lot.

SITE AREA: 1.4 acres;
Purchase price = \$3.0 million.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: Four separate owners.

DISCUSSION: This would be a compact urban site which would require demolition.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Demolition/Tank removal	50,000.00
Site Development Allowance	300,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	329,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	308,000.00
Budget Total:	\$3,927,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

- BENEFITS:**
1. Central location for all portions of the community.
 2. Would help revitalize Price Street, an area of great potential and now under-utilized.
 3. This site offers the possibility of a land swap.
 4. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is good.
 5. Excellent surface streets for bike paths and public transportation.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 5 (Continued)

6. The existing City Hall could be used until the new site is completed.
7. Good access for emergency vehicles.
8. City owned parking lot across the street on Pomeroy.

DRAWBACKS:

1. Economical building costs could be offset by expensive land acquisition.
2. Timely acquisition of land would require concurrence of affected property owners.
3. Access occasionally conflicts with Price Street special events.
4. General Plan amendments and zone changes would be required.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 6

LOCATION: Corner of Price Street and Ocean View
(Ocean Palms Motel) across Park Street to the creek.

SITE AREA: 1.4 acres;
Purchase price = \$3.0 million.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: Three owners.

DISCUSSION: Located fronting Ocean View with a vacant lot adjacent. The property runs through to Park Street offering the possibility of acquisition of additional land for parking.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Demolition allowance	30,000.00
Site Development Allowance	300,000.00
Fin./Fixt./Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	327,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	306,000.00

Budget Total: \$3,903,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

- BENEFITS:
1. Central location for all portions of the community.
 2. Would help revitalize Price Street, an area of great potential and now under-utilized.
 3. The existing City Hall could be used until the new site is completed.
 4. Site offers opportunities for additional land acquisitions, thus allowing for future expansion.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 6 (Continued)

5. Building site for three story building.
6. Can accommodate phased building.

DRAWBACKS:

1. Some complications for emergency vehicles as Ocean View has a fork in the road.
2. Possible parking drawbacks as parking is entered from Dolliver. Access from Ocean View would be needed.
3. Economical building costs could be offset by expensive land acquisition.
4. Timely acquisition of land would require concurrence of effected property owners.
5. Access sometimes conflicts with tourist traffic.
6. Some condemnation may be required.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 7

LOCATION: Price Street and Wadsworth to San Luis.

SITE AREA: 1.4 acres;
Purchase price = \$3.0 million.

CURRENT OWNERSHIP: Five owners.

DISCUSSION: A vacant lot on the corner of San Luis plus the Shangri-la Motel on the corner of Wadsworth would offer the front of the building with an L-shape. Extra parking could be available on the east side of Price Street.

A preliminary cost analysis assumes remodeling costs of \$50 per sq. ft., and new construction costs of \$90 per sq. ft. depending on the function. A rough budget would be as follows:

28,000 sf. new constr. @ \$90/sf	2,520,000.00
Demolition Allowance	30,000.00
Site Development Allowance	300,000.00
Fin./Fixt.Equip. 28,000 sf @ \$15/sf	420,000.00
Contingency (10%)	327,000.00
Professional Fees (8.5%)	306,000.00

Budget Total: \$3,903,000.00*

Additional peripheral costs could include temporary housing for City operations and financing.

* These numbers are for reference and are for comparison to other projects only! These are best guesses, actual costs may vary considerably.

BENEFITS:

1. Central location for all portions of the community.
2. Would help revitalize Price Street, an area of great potential and now under-utilized.
3. Access to north and southbound traffic routes is good.
4. Excellent surface streets for bike paths and public transportation.

SCENARIO NUMBER: 7 (Continued)

5. The existing City Hall could be used until the new site is completed.
6. Good access for emergency vehicles.
7. Can accommodate phased building.

DRAWBACKS:

1. Timely acquisition of land would be a BIG problem. Condemnation would most likely be required, and there is NO possibility of a land swap.
2. Economical building costs could be offset by expensive land acquisition. Price of land may be beyond our means.
3. Timely acquisition of land would require concurrence of affected property owners.
4. Access conflicts with Price Street special events.
5. Parking would be off site.
6. This would eliminate some badly needed low cost housing.
7. Demolition would be required.