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County Vision

The overall County Vision in providing Efficient, Effective and Responsive Government is supported by several studies currently underway:

- Natural Resources Management Plan-Adopted
- Visitors Services Strategic Operation Plan
- Maintenance Facility Optimization Study
- Countywide Office Space Study
What is MFOS: Background

What?
Maintenance Facility Optimization Study (MFOS) is a countywide needs assessment study, similar to a master plan, of Maintenance Facilities.

Why?
MFOS was prepared to support decision making for long term maintenance facility plans.

Several maintenance facility projects had been included in previous CIP budgets, but were delayed or not implemented pending the outcome and direction from this study.

Sheriff facility in Northern part of county and at Empire also included.
The Recycling Zone

The recycling zone was added to the study to complete a needs assessment for this operation and to explore if it could be combined with other maintenance facilities.

The study resulted in the conclusion that the recycling zone was best sited on its own parcel due to public access and material flows.

The recycling zone is not included in the current Requested Board Action and will be brought to the Board at a later date.
MFOS Policy Questions

1. Should the County select a new service model for siting maintenance facilities to meet current and future countywide maintenance needs?
   - Update facilities on existing land
   - New shared-use facilities

2. Should the Hastings and Farmington Transportation Shops be closed?

3. Should Parks/Grounds Maintenance Shops be located on park land or on sites outside the parks?
Should the County direct a new model for maintenance functions to meet current and future countywide maintenance needs?

Decision making criteria:

- Long-term overall cost
- Locate facilities for improved service delivery
- Department collaboration and efficiencies
- Appropriate Land Use
Should the Hastings and Farmington Transportation Shops be closed?

Considerations:

- Aging inefficient facilities
  - Farmington Shop is 44 years old
  - Hastings Shop is 53 years old
- Spaces are undersized for equipment
- Poor energy efficiency, high renovation costs
- Fuel and salt sharing agreements with other agencies
- Incompatible with local land uses
Overall Facility: D
Built in 1964, 7.4 acre site
Office area 2,300 sf
Large Vehicle storage 7,200 sf
Std. Vehicle storage 3,600 sf
Cold storage 4,200 sf
Envelope masonry, efficiency, floor slab degeneration, ventilation, electrical, egress lighting, no sprinklers ADA, no women’s restroom or locker, underutilized space.

Zoning: R-1 (SF res adjacent), floodplain, 3 Party Fuel JPA (ends July 2018)
Overall Facility: C
Built in 1973, 10 Ac.
Office area 1,500 sf
Vehicle storage 10,400 sf
Salt storage 16,000 sf
Energy efficiency, no wash bay, egress lighting, salt shed structural corrosion and electrical, ADA, no women’s restroom or locker. Close to Empire.
Updated kitchenette, work stations.

Zoning: “SPRUCE STREET COMMERCIAL”
Should Parks/Grounds Maintenance Shops be located on park land?

Considerations

- Shops are legacy farmsteads and buildings
- Lack of warm vehicle storage
- Growth of trails and greenways
- Internal park connections limited, most work is trailered even in the same park
- Poorly located (ecology, no utilities)
- Master Plans recommend relocating to less valuable locations or offsite
Maintenance Yard Alternate Locations

Lebanon Hills Regional Park
Master Plan (2015)
1) Site recommended in 2001 Master Plan (Cliff Road)
2) Linkert Farm Area (campground)
3) Camp Sacajawea
4) Or off-site locations

Spring Lake Park
Reserve Master Plan (2003)
1) Near archery range (W end)
2) Near former model airfield (E end)
Overall Facility: D

7 buildings
Maint. bldg (6,200 sf-insulated, built 1986, 2000)
2- Cold Vehicle Storage (6,600 sf, built 1990, 1995)
4- Misc Sheds (built 1951-1991)

Deficiencies: limited heated vehicle storage, no dedicated wash bay, no sanitary sewer, no storm water mgmt., 1.5 mi gravel access road/not close to park facilities, code compliance: building envelopes, energy, ADA, electrical, mech. Stairs to break/office, undersized mech.-break-office not to code, no CO detection.
Overall Facility: D

9 buildings
Maint. bldg: 6600 sf-insulated, built (1920, 1943)
Carpentry Shop: 5200 sf-insulated (1990)
2-Cold Vehicle storage 6,000 sf ea (1980, 1997)
4-Misc farm bldgs (9,900 sf, 1920-55)

Deficiencies: Envelope condition, floor ramps not to code, ramps, undersized heated bays, wash bay in work space, electrical, egress lighting, CO and ventilation, no sprinklers, not enclosed farm buildings, no sanitary sewer, visible from park facilities. Stairs, shared mech.-break-office, no CO detection, Egress lighting
Space needs were identified by department and facility, looking at existing space, current need, 2026 and 2040 projected needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Existing space</th>
<th>Current need</th>
<th>2026 need</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2040 need</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empire-Fleet</td>
<td>26,548</td>
<td>34,367</td>
<td>34,482</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39,634</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>27,408</td>
<td>28,037</td>
<td>35,035</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37,371</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation-all</td>
<td>127,082</td>
<td>130,687</td>
<td>146,705</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>167,252</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds/Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 facilities</td>
<td>51,169</td>
<td>49,822</td>
<td>57,310</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>68,556</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with shared</td>
<td>51,169</td>
<td>49,822</td>
<td>47,332</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>57,897</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New facility diagrams use 2026 space needs.
FOUR OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1-Centralized
Not enough flexibility, Longest response times, Loss of redundancy, Concentration risk exposure.

3-Localized
too many spread out facilities, loss of efficiency.

0-No Acquisitions
2-De-Centralized
Existing department service models have gaps and overlaps.

Proposed options locate facilities to improve current service levels and be positioned for the future.
OPTION ZERO: NO ACQUISITIONS

Pro:

- No land acquisition
- Less valuable park land used
- Right-sized facilities
- Least operational change (staff, salt, fuel),
- Some centralization (storage, single carpentry, sign shop)

Con:

- Shops at Hastings & Farmington need large re-investment
- No new sheriff space in north part of county (pursue lease)
- Single department uses (except Empire, fewer shared efficiencies)
- Land use concerns
Empire Campus Space Plans additions and renovations

Transportation: (office addition/renovation, Warm Vehicle Storage addition)

Sheriff (renovate East Storage Building office area)

Grounds (Parks) Maintenance (shop warm and cold storage additions)

Fleet (office addition/renovation, vehicle work bay addition)
Efficient, Effective, Responsive

OPTION 0: FACILITIES

New Lebanon Hills Shop

New Grounds (Parks) Maintenance Shop located in park: staff + support space, warm vehicle storage, cold storage.

New Spring Lake Park Shop

New Grounds (Parks) Maintenance Shop located in park: staff + support space, warm vehicle storage, cold storage.

Renovate Hastings and Farmington Shops
OPTION 2: DECENTRALIZED

ADVANTAGES
• Facilities in developed and growing parts of county
• Shared department sites for future flexibility, efficiency
• Hybrid of centralized+localized less travel and response times
• Uses park land for recreation
• Redundancy (reduce risk)

DISADVANTAGES
• High land acquisition costs
• High development costs
• Increases travel time to parks
• Longer to implement
• End fuel JPA @ Hastings
**New North Shop** (min. 4 acres, max 10)
Near LHRP or a county trail/trailhead
Grounds (Parks) Maintenance (new Staff + support space, Warm vehicle storage, Cold storage)
Sheriff (new Staff space, Warm vehicle storage) Good access to 494 boat launch
(future possible Transportation Vehicle storage)

**New South Shop** (4-10 acres)
Grounds (Parks) Maint: (Staff + support space, Warm vehicle, Cold storage)
Transportation: (Staff addition, Warm vehicle storage addition)
Fueling station
Empire Site Changes
Transportation (office addition, Warm Vehicle Storage addition)

Sheriff (renovate East Storage Building)

Grounds (Parks)
Maintenance (shop warm and cold storage additions)

Fleet (office addition, Vehicle work bay addition)
## Option Zero

**New Grounds/Parks Maintenance Facilities Relocated in LHRP and SLPR**

Estimated Cost $10,933,000

**Renovations @ Hastings + Farmington**

$3,412,000  
(no North Sheriff Facility)

**Empire Facility Changes**

Estimated Cost $9,091,000

**Total Estimated Cost** $23,436,000

**Funding**

Building Fund $23,436,000

## Option Two

**Land for North & South Satellite Shops**

Estimated Cost $1,900,000

**New North Shop (Grounds and Sheriff)**

Estimated Cost $6,246,000

**New South Shop (Grounds and Transportation)**

Estimated Cost $7,463,000

**Empire Site Changes**

Estimated Cost $12,226,000

**Subtotal** $27,835,000

**Land Disposition** $-1,600,000

**Total Estimated Cost** $26,235,000

**Funding**

Building Fund $26,235,000
Staff Recommendation:

Option 2

• Long-term overall cost
• Ideal locations for facilities
• Improved service delivery
• Department collaboration and efficiencies

Implementation would be spread over multiple years as approved in the CIP.
DISCUSSION

• Service model option

• Facility closures

• New and/or improved Facilities
Additional detail info
Facility Condition Assessment Letter Grades:
A - 4.0 Excellent; meets County Standards (DC HPBCS)
B - 3.0 Good quality and condition; does not meet County Standards, good renovation potential
C - 2.0 Fair condition; does not meet County Standards, some code compliance issues, renovation possible but costly
D - 1.0 Poor condition; does not meet County Standards multiple code compliance issues, and poor condition overall indicate replacement recommended

Existing Facility Grades:
Hastings Shop overall grade: D
Farmington Shop overall grade: C
Lebanon Hills Yard overall grade: D
Spring Lake Park Yard overall grade: D
## Grade Example: Lebanon Hills Maintenance Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>MECH</th>
<th>ELEC</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Security/Risk Mgmt</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Grade Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maint bldg</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry Shop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Shed</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Shed</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg 4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg 5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg 7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg 8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>