



# **Comprehensive County Facilities Plan**

## **Staff Report**

November 3, 2009

<b>Index</b>	<b>Page</b>
Purpose	1
Background	1
County Strategic Plan	2
Project Organization	3
Consultant Selection	5
Scope of Services/Project Approach	6
Consultant Fees and Overall Project Budget	8
Funding	10
Schedule	11
Beneficial Outcomes	11
Recommendation	12

## **Attachments**

Attachment A – Project Organization

Attachment B – Committee Directory

Attachment C – Comparable Projects

Attachment D – Process Outline

Attachment E – Fee Comparison

Attachment F – Staff Time Estimate

## **Purpose**

The County owns a considerable amount of real estate that is not developed or used to its full potential, and as such, is not providing its full value to the County. Also, many of the County's existing facilities do not support the most effective or efficient delivery of County services to the public. The proposed Comprehensive County Facilities Plan (C.C.F.P.) will provide a comprehensive assessment of County real estate assets and service delivery needs, and a strategy for using assets to meet the needs which will provide best value to the County and allow the Board of Supervisors to make informed budget and capital investment decisions.

The purpose of this Staff Report is to inform the Board of Supervisors of the status of the C.C.F.P. and to request that the Board (1) authorize staff to prepare a Comprehensive County Facilities Plan which will lay out a non-binding road map for achieving Strategic Plan objectives for County facilities, (2) approve a consulting agreement with M. Arthur Gensler, Jr. & Associates to provide professional planning services and (3) make certain budgetary adjustments to fund the planning project.

## **Background**

The County owns a large inventory of general government facilities that provide office and operational space for County programs and services, including adult and juvenile detention. These facilities include over 90 County-owned buildings with about 1.6 million square feet of space located on almost 500 acres of real estate, and another 400,000 square feet of leased space used by County departments. Over two thirds of the owned buildings in this inventory were constructed before 1970 and are reaching the end of their useful lives. Many of these buildings are not aligned with current standards and goals for accessibility, energy efficiency and operational effectiveness. Department space is often crowded and splintered among several locations. Many County programs and services are not strategically located for public access or optimum customer service. The County Administration Center, which is the primary campus for justice and county government, is awkwardly laid out with poorly located parking and confusing circulation.

County real estate assets are, however, quite valuable because of their size and location. The County owns three major campuses in Santa Rosa: County Administration Center, Chanate Medical Complex, and Los Guilicos. The County also owns several sites throughout the County, including Veterans Buildings and others. These real estate assets are generally not developed or used to their highest and best potential. Some property could be more strategically used for County service delivery while other property may not be needed for County use and could instead provide revenue to help pay for new facilities.

**County Administration Center Study:** On April 7, 2009, staff presented the Site Evaluation and Opportunities Analysis of the County Administration Center (C.A.C.) which considered possible development scenarios for the site that would increase utilization of the property, including possible commercial development that could

generate revenue for the County. The C.A.C. is a critical and valuable part of the entire County inventory, but there were several other properties that were not evaluated in the study, such as the Chanate Complex or the Los Guilicos campus. Also, the study did not specify what County programs or services should be located at the C.A.C., nor did it recommend a specific direction or implementation plan for redeveloping the site. While this study provided valuable insights into what is possible at the C.A.C. and will inform subsequent planning, it did not provide the comprehensive service delivery, real estate, and financial plan called for in the County's Strategic Plan.

The C.A.C. study concluded by recommending several next steps, including market analysis, feasibility studies, determination of specific uses of the site, development of space needs for those uses, and other activities. These next steps have been incorporated into the scope of the proposed C.C.F.P., along with an analysis of all County assets and facility needs, in order to prepare recommendations and implementation plans for all County facilities, including redevelopment of the C.A.C.

## **County Strategic Plan**

The County's Strategic Plan recognizes that County facilities and real estate assets represent both challenges and opportunities, and concludes that the County must adopt a strategic approach in planning, providing and managing facilities. The C.C.F.P. project is a strategic implementation project that will help meet the County's Strategic Plan facilities goal as stated in Goal 4: "Plan, procure, operate, maintain and manage Sonoma County's facilities and real estate assets at their highest and best use, such that they provide the best value to the County." Goal 4 is broken down into the following objectives:

- Reduce the number of major complexes owned by the County, using the unneeded assets to generate revenue.
- More intensely develop the remaining assets, primarily the County Administration Center. Use the C.A.C. for the core government and adult justice functions and increase the heights of buildings and density of development.
- Co-locate overlapping and compatible services and departments.
- Decentralize services closer to the customer and partner with other entities to the extent feasible.

To start the process for achieving these objectives, the C.C.F.P. will analyze the County's needs and assets, and develop strategies for how the County's real estate can be developed and/or re-organized over time to improve the delivery of services, reduce carbon footprint, increase asset utilization and possibly generate additional revenue.

**Project Charter:** The Project Charter for the C.C.F.P. project was approved as part of the County Strategic Implementation Plan by the Board on July 8, 2008. The purpose of the project according to the Project Charter is to prepare a Comprehensive County Facilities Plan (the "Plan"), which lays out a roadmap for achieving the Strategic Plan objectives for County facilities.

The Plan will contain three elements:

(1) Service Delivery Plan

A written document will be delivered that includes research, analysis and recommendations relative to how and where all County services are provided. The plan will consider partnering with other government and community based entities, community/customer access to services, impact on climate and greenhouse gas, and other criteria, including centralized vs. decentralized services. Financial impact and feasibility will be key criteria for evaluating the options.

(2) Real Estate Plan

A written document that includes research and analysis of County owned real estate assets and leased facilities, and recommendations for how they will be developed and used to meet the goals established in the Service Delivery Plan. The plan will consider co-location with other entities, County goals, such as climate protection and sustainability, and other criteria. A conceptual facility approach will be described including identification of capital improvement costs and other financial impacts.

(3) Financial Plan

A written document that includes: (a) options, analysis, and recommendations for funding the capital improvements and related costs associated with the Real Estate Plan, (b) analysis of potential surplus real estate which could be leased, sold, or developed in partnership with another entity to help offset costs, and (c) a project development and delivery strategy for implementing the recommendations in the Real Estate Plan.

The C.C.F.P. is focused on general government functions and facilities, and does not include special fund or enterprise fund facilities, such as Water Agency facilities, roads and bridges, airport, fairgrounds, parks, and others. The Service Delivery element of the project is a high level evaluation that is necessary to determine broad facility needs and will not be able to investigate the specific details of any program. Criminal justice programs and facilities are being studied under separate strategic projects, the results of which will be incorporated into the C.C.F.P.

## **Project Organization**

The C.C.F.P. is a significant undertaking for the County. As envisioned in the Project Charter, the effort will essentially look at everything the County does and all real estate and facility assets it owns and leases. It will require involvement from all County departments and will incorporate their individual long term objectives. The effort extends beyond County programs to include examination of potential partnerships and co-location with other government and non-profit entities. Because of the magnitude of the effort, a project organization has been developed that includes all departments and all levels of County government combined with outside resources to provide planning, real estate and facility expertise (see Attachment A – Project Organization).

**Management and Oversight:** The General Services Department is the Project Owner with the Architecture Division assigned to manage the project and deliver the Plan. The work will be done within a management and oversight structure that includes the following (see Attachment B – Committee Directory):

1. *Board of Supervisors*: The Board will be advised of progress throughout the C.C.F.P. project and will be asked to provide policy direction and to review and accept project deliverables at key milestones.
2. *C.C.F.P. Steering Committee*: The Steering Committee is comprised of key department heads who will provide overall direction for the project, review and comment regarding the deliverables from a department management perspective. The Steering Committee will also review and approve material before it goes forward to the Board of Supervisors.
3. *C.C.F.P. Coordinating Committee*: The Coordinating Committee is comprised of senior level managers from key departments and will provide direct input to the consultant regarding the project approach, near-term and long-term objectives, and information and feedback relevant to the work, especially regarding department programs, service delivery and related facility needs. The Coordinating Committee will review and approve material before it goes forward to the Steering Committee.
4. *C.C.F.P. Finance Committee*: Provides direction, review and comment on financial aspects of the proposed project plan.

**Department Involvement:** All County departments will be involved. Many departments will have representatives on one or more of the management and oversight committees. Law enforcement and Health and Human Services in particular will participate extensively because of the distribution and importance of their services to the community. All departments will have a liaison assigned to the project to provide direct input for their specific programs. All department directors will be interviewed and their staff will provide information and feedback throughout the project.

**Architecture Division Services:** The Architecture Division is the project manager and as such will be responsible for the overall planning effort. The Division has already taken the lead in defining the project, developing the initial planning assumptions, establishing the project committees, selecting the consultant, and negotiating the contract in consultation with County Counsel. Going forward with the project, the Division will continue providing project management services including:

- Consultant contract oversight, administration and management;
- Project budget and schedule development, tracking, and management;
- Arrangement and coordination of County meetings, workshops, and data collection activities;
- Oversight, distribution and tracking of correspondence, documentation, project files, and records;
- Coordination of and communication with all internal support services and agencies, including Information Systems Department (I.S.D.), Facilities Operations, County Counsel, Risk Management, and County Administrator;
- Preparation and management of internal and external project communication;
- Review and evaluation of consultant submittals and work product;
- Evaluation, analysis and communication of data, findings and recommendations;
- Preparation and presentation of status and informational reports;
- Accounting and management of all project funding and expenditures;

- Preparation and submittal of all Board items and reports related to the project; and
- Assessment and management of project risks and changes.

**Consultant Services:** The breadth and complexity of the C.C.F.P. planning effort requires the attention of a multi-disciplinary project team with extensive experience and capabilities in service delivery, facilities planning, real estate assessment, financial evaluation, and property development. In general, the work includes collecting, evaluating and synthesizing specific information into useful and relevant findings and conclusions; developing and proposing options and alternatives for improving the utilization and efficiency of County facility and real estate assets in meeting service delivery objectives; developing and preparing the final report including an implementation guide for the proposed solutions.

While County staff has experience and knowledge in some of these areas, it does not have the full scope of expertise needed for this project. To become expert in these areas would require a significant learning curve that would delay the project and end up costing the County more than what is proposed in this report. Some expertise does not exist at all in-house, such as real estate appraisal. Also, there are not enough in-house resources available to do the C.C.F.P. work along with the current workload. An outside consultant can provide the needed expert professional services. Additionally, a consultant team which is specialized in this type of planning can provide state of the art knowledge and expertise in workforce mobility, sustainability strategies, and best practices, which are needed to develop the most effective options and implementation strategies. The Project Charter, therefore, proposes using an expert outside consultant team to facilitate and support the planning effort.

## **Consultant Selection**

The underlying objective for selecting the consultant was to identify a team of individuals which has best experience and expertise in this type of comprehensive, strategic facility planning.

A formal selection process was used to identify a preferred consultant for this project. The process began with the issuance of the Request for Qualifications (R.F.Q.). Detailed Statements of Qualifications (S.O.Q.) were received from ten highly qualified teams. All responding teams were headed by out-of-County lead firms, with County-based sub-consultants on several of the teams.

The Request for Qualifications issued to prospective consultant teams for the C.C.F.P. contained specific criteria for evaluating and selecting the preferred expert consultant:

1. Overall clarity of S.O.Q. and general responsiveness to the R.F.Q.
2. Firm and Team Qualifications – Relevant qualifications and experience of the lead Consulting firm and primary Sub-Consultants and the team members with similar governmental/civic strategic planning
3. Ability to correlate Firm and Team experience and capabilities to the specific objectives and challenges of this project
4. Clarity and thoroughness of description of the Project Approach

5. Quality level and performance level on previous relevant governmental/civic planning projects in terms of processes, documentation and verifiable outcomes
6. Financial stability
7. Technical competence
8. Comparison of billing rates
9. Any other criteria to selection deemed relevant by the County.

Based on the content and quality of the written responses, the Coordinating Committee narrowed the list down to five for interviews. Following the interviews, references and completed planning projects were checked and the five short-listed teams were ranked in order of preference. M. Arthur Gensler, Jr. and Associates (Gensler) was selected as the overall first ranked lead Consultant by the Coordinating Committee on the basis of objective evaluation criteria using a consistent, documented selection process. Gensler was found to have superior qualifications in areas that are critical to the success of this project including service delivery visioning, facility planning, engagement with the public, communication skills, and sustainability expertise.

Gensler is a world-wide planning, consulting and facility design firm which has vast experience and expertise in service delivery, real estate and financial/implementation planning (see [www.gensler.com](http://www.gensler.com), Service – Consulting, Planning and Urban Design). It is an industry leader in strategic facility planning and space utilization. Gensler’s relevant experience includes work with numerous California counties, agencies and cities on strategic facility and real estate-related plans similar to the C.C.F.P. including (see Attachment C – Comparable Projects):

- County of Orange Facilities Master Plan
- County of Alameda Real Estate Master Plan
- County of Los Angeles Social Services Space Study
- County of San Bernardino Master Space Plan
- City of San Diego Civic Center Facilities Needs Assessment
- California Department of Motor Vehicles Strategic Facilities Plan.

Gensler will lead and coordinate a team of sub-consultants that will address the broad objectives of the C.C.F.P. project. The team includes six sub-consultants assisting in appraising, evaluating and analyzing assets, financial feasibility and market conditions, and participating in developing options and strategies. Included is Santa Rosa-based Hornsby Levy Appraisal Group, which will provide appraisals of County real estate. Gensler will lead the team and do the bulk of the data collection, and develop service delivery, facility/real estate options, and prepare the final reports.

### **Scope of Services/Project Approach**

Several discussions were held with Gensler to determine the scope of services and approach that would best meet the objectives of the project. The proposed approach is an iterative process in which data is gathered and analyzed, options are developed and evaluated, and concepts are finalized and documented in a report.

The Board of Supervisors will be integral to the process and preparation of the C.C.F.P. through meetings, workshops, and review and approval of deliverables at key milestones to make sure the various visions are aligned with policy directions.

The project will have five phases (see Attachment D – Process Outline) and each phase has specific deliverables – written reports, research summaries, guidelines, data tables and other documents. The total work effort will be compiled into a final report that includes an implementation plan. The following is a summary of the project phases and services – a more detailed description of the services is attached to the Professional Services Agreement.

**Phase 1 - Project Start-Up:** This phase will establish and confirm the project objectives, the roles and responsibilities of the consultant and County staff, and the logistics and process for the project, including data collection methodology and time line. Meetings and public workshops will be held with the project team, Steering Committee, Coordinating Committee, and Board of Supervisors to establish project goals and organizational priorities.

- *Deliverables include: Documentation of the project process, objectives, collection activities and tools, and synthesis of meetings and interviews.*

**Phase 2 - Data Collection:** There is a substantial amount of data that must be gathered, including information about County programs and services, existing facilities, real estate and financial assets, market conditions and trends, and County constraints and requirements. The consultant will use several different methods to gather the data, including interviews with department directors and staff, focus group meetings, surveys, observation, and research. Department liaisons play a key role during this phase to make sure the Consultant fully understands individual department needs and objectives. This phase will also review the County’s financial situation, including lease analysis, occupancy cost analysis, and debt analysis.

- *Deliverables include: Documentation of appraisals, findings and analysis, including synthesis of meetings, interviews, surveys, and research.*

**Phase 3 - Analysis and Preliminary Vision Creation:** This phase will analyze the data and develop preliminary visions for service delivery, real estate, and finances through a variety of meetings and workshops. A public workshop will be held with the Board of Supervisors to review and confirm the proposed Service Delivery Vision. The Consultant will compare the objectives of service delivery vision with the inventory of existing real estate to identify any gaps and any surplus resources.

- *Deliverables include: Documentation of the Service Delivery Vision including Board policy direction, and the supply, demand and gap analysis findings.*

**Phase 4 - Options Development:** The Consultant will develop a variety of options for using County real estate to meet the service delivery and financial objectives. The Consultant will work with the County committees, staff, and Board of Supervisors as necessary to evaluate the options and determine the best approach, and to define the business case that supports it.

- *Deliverables include: Documentation of evaluation process and findings, “highest and best use” recommendations, and business case write up for the selected option.*

**Phase 5 - Final Vision and Facilities Plan:** Once there is agreement on the preferred option, the Consultant will document the three visions, including a financial and implementation strategy, into a combined report. Two Board workshops are included in this phase: one to review and confirm the real estate and finance visions and another to receive the final C.C.F.P.

- *Deliverables include: Final Comprehensive County Facilities Plan, including an implementation guide.*

### **Consultant Fees and Overall Project Budget**

The C.C.F.P. represents a significant scope of work. It is the most comprehensive facility assessment and planning effort the County has ever undertaken. In the process, the entire inventory of general government facilities, real estate assets and lease holdings will be considered (over 90 owned buildings with 1.6 million square feet on almost 500 acres of property; 400,000 square feet of leased space), all general government departments and programs will be studied (23 departments, hundreds of programs) and options will be developed and evaluated to determine the best and highest use of all the assets in meeting all of the identified service delivery and financial objectives. Staff worked with Gensler to develop a work plan and budget to implement this mammoth undertaking.

**Proposed Fee:** The Consultant’s fee proposal is based on a tabulated break-down of estimated hours involved with the C.C.F.P. Scope of Services. The breakdown accounts for all five phases of the project and includes 43 identified tasks and their deliverables. The breakdown also accounts for all of the work provided by the six sub-consultants. The fee breakdown has been reviewed in detail by staff, and found to be commensurate with the project tasks.

An overall Consultant fee of \$805,859, which includes reimbursable expenses such as printing and delivery costs, is proposed for the C.C.F.P. project. The fee will pay for consultant services over the project’s duration starting upon Board approval of the contract and finishing in 2011. Each Phase has a distinct set of tasks and deliverables, and the fees have been broken down by Phase. The proposed fee is broken down by phase as follows:

Phase	Gensler	Consultants	Expenses	Total
1. Start Up	\$ 31,920	\$ 13,882	\$ 2,227	\$ 48,029
2. Data	\$159,685	\$157,740	\$15,154	\$332,579
3. Analysis	\$ 91,400	\$ 21,120	\$ 5,530	\$118,050
4. Options	\$ 92,040	\$ 81,818	\$ 8,321	\$182,179
5. Final	\$ 89,480	\$ 29,717	\$ 5,825	\$125,021
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$464,525</b>	<b>\$304,277</b>	<b>\$37,057</b>	<b>\$805,859</b>

**Analysis of Fee Proposal:** Staff reviewed and evaluated the overall fee for this project to confirm that the fees were fair and reasonable for the work. Prior to negotiating the fee

with Gensler, staff discussed the likely consultant fee range for the C.C.F.P. with other consultants and concluded that the likely range would be between \$670,000 and \$850,000, not including the allowance for reimbursable expenses. The Gensler proposal almost matches the median of this range (median = \$760,000; Gensler proposal minus reimbursable expenses= \$768,802).

The fees are primarily a product of estimated time for the work multiplied by the applicable billing rates. Hourly billing rates were required of all candidate firms competing for this project, so staff compared Gensler's billing rates to those of the other consultants that submitted qualifications. Gensler's hourly rates are largely consistent with those of the other firms, and, on average, are lower than those of the second-ranked candidate firm.

The fee proposed by Gensler was also compared with scopes of work and corresponding fees on similar projects for other public clients. Because the C.C.F.P. Scope of Work is tailored to the specific process, goals and objectives of Sonoma County, a direct "apples-to-apples" comparison was not possible. In general, staff found that other similar projects did not include the breadth and depth of scope that the C.C.F.P. includes. The C.C.F.P. will include all County services of all general government departments and will consider all County property. Many of the "similar" projects did not include the full spectrum of County services or County assets and most of them did not include the service delivery component at all, but were focused exclusively on facility planning. By comparison, the C.C.F.P. is taking a much more comprehensive approach than the compared projects. Some of these similar projects were done years ago and the fees for the same efforts today would be higher due to cost of living adjustments. A table that summarizes the comparison of the C.C.F.P. to other similar planning projects is included as Attachment E – Fee Comparison.

While it is not possible to make a direct "apples to apples" comparison, fees for the similar projects that staff researched indicate that the negotiated fees for the C.F.F.P. are in-line with the effort required, considering the C.C.F.P. seems to be a much broader undertaking than these other efforts.

Value for the cost is also a concern. Staff contacted five prior city and county reference clients for Gensler, asking whether they perceived good value in the work products developed by Gensler, considering the fees paid. The responses were all positive and these previous clients confirmed that the value of Gensler's product was worth the price.

Based on the evaluation of the fee and comparison to other similar planning efforts, staff concluded that the proposed fee was fair and reasonable for the scope and complexity of the work and that, based on prior history, we expect to receive a product that is worth the price.

**Project Budget:** A project budget has been developed which includes the Gensler fee and the other project costs associated with this effort, including the estimated cost of Architecture Division Services. The Architecture Division budget is paid from project budgets. Overall the Division is a "zero net cost" to the County because the services it provides are direct costs to the projects. Therefore, Architecture Division staff time and

expenses directly related to the C.C.F.P. must be billed to the project budget. The costs are based on estimated staff time and the associated billing rates for each position involved. All together, it is estimated that staff will spend over 2,100 hours over 17 months at a cost of \$278,000 over the course of this project (see Attachment F - Staff Time Estimate). Direct administrative expenses, such as reproduction and other expenses are estimated separately and included in the budget.

Finally, the budget estimate includes a 10% contingency to cover unexpected costs and changes that may occur during this project. Including a contingency in the budget is a best practice that allows the project to continue uninterrupted in the event additional work is encountered. At this point, it is uncertain what this additional work might be (if it is known, it is included in the estimated fees and costs), but it is normal to run into additional work as details and more information are developed. Possible additional work may come from a need to make more presentations or perform more analysis than is anticipated. Special focused studies may become apparent as the project proceeds, such as more in-depth planning for State Courts at the C.A.C. or evaluation of a real estate opportunity that is currently unknown. At the end of the project, any unspent contingency will be returned to the Capital Budget for other use. All together, the recommended project budget is as follows:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Consultant Fees (includes reimbursables)	\$ 805,859
Architecture Division Service	\$ 278,000
Other project expenses*	\$ 15,000
Contingency (10%)*	\$ 109,886
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$1,208,745</b>

\*The “Other project expenses” category includes internal support from County Counsel and others, as well as miscellaneous internal printing or other presentation media expenses. The project “Contingency” allows for as-yet unplanned additional project research, meetings or reviews, or other additional or unanticipated presentations or workshops.

## **Funding**

A project in the approved FY 09/10 Capital Budget (County Center Planning, Index 102160) has been identified as a possible funding source for the C.C.F.P. The funding in this index came from fund balances from several completed capital projects. The Budget document notes that this capital project is an “option to finance the implementation of the strategic plan Comprehensive County Facilities Plan (C.C.F.P.)” The County Center Planning project also includes funding for the Hazard Mitigation Plan project which includes hazard assessment and mitigation design for county facilities as required by the Sonoma County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

There is sufficient funding appropriated in this capital project index to pay for the entire C.C.F.P. project. However, initial FY 09-10 funding is requested to cover the full cost of the consultant contract, plus necessary Architecture Division project staff support to the end of FY 09-10 only, for a total of \$1,013,254 in FY 09-10. FY 10-11 Architecture Funding for the balance of the project budget shall be determined during the subsequent

development of the FY 10-11 capital budget. Nevertheless, staff requests that a new capital project index be established for the C.C.F.P. and that its current budget be transferred to the new index. The purpose of the new index and transfer of funds is to establish a separate index exclusively for the C.C.F.P. budget which will allow staff to track the expenditures separately and avoid confusion regarding other project accounting currently in the existing indexes.

## **Schedule**

The Project Charter commits to a November 1, 2011, completion date. The proposed project approach allows independent data collection and findings activities to run in parallel, which will expedite the schedule such that the project will be completed in 2011 - possibly sooner than planned. The project will begin immediately upon final Board approval with the following schedule of completions:

- Phases 1 (Project Start-Up) and 2 (Data Collection) to occur over a four-month period from the last quarter of 2009 into early 2010,
- Phases 3 (Analysis and Preliminary Vision Creation), 4 (Options Development), and 5 (Final Vision and Plan) will be done over a subsequent twelve- to thirteen-month period, finishing in 2011.

## **Beneficial Outcomes**

The proposed project budget represents a substantial investment by the County at the same time it faces very difficult financial challenges. However, this planning effort offers significant benefits to the County as it prepares for the future. In particular, there are several compelling reasons to embark on this effort:

1. As mentioned before, the County owns a considerable amount of valuable real estate which is generally underdeveloped and underutilized. One of the key elements of the C.C.F.P. is to determine how best to use these assets to help meet service delivery goals and to generate revenue to help pay for the badly needed facility improvements, so that the true value of these assets can be realized. The C.C.F.P. will inform the Board of the value of the County's assets and present options for their use or disposition. This information is critical for making the best financial decisions for the future.
2. The current fiscal crisis is caused by an economic situation that will eventually change. Committing the funds and staff time to support strategic projects, such as the C.C.F.P., is essential for positioning the organization for the long-term. It is expected that the C.C.F.P. will develop service delivery and facility solutions that will serve County residents for generations to come. Investing in the C.C.F.P. is consistent with the original intent of the Strategic Planning process – making difficult choices to address long-term challenges with meaningful action.
3. The C.C.F.P. will develop, evaluate, and recommend options for service delivery with the objective of finding more cost effective service delivery methods that are financially sustainable for the future.
4. The County is in the community service business. Success is measured on how well services are delivered to the community. While County departments do a

commendable job in meeting their missions, facilities often stand in the way of more efficient and effective performance. If facilities are better aligned with the County mission, services will be delivered in a more effective manner and the community overall will benefit.

5. Facilities play a key role in meeting County objectives for climate protection. Efforts are underway to make the existing facilities more energy efficient and more protective of the climate. However, to achieve the ambitious goals for reducing greenhouse gas, more dramatic changes may be necessary, including using new ways and new locations to provide County services. The C.C.F.P. offers a comprehensive approach for meeting these goals.

## **Recommendation**

In conclusion, it is recommended that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to proceed with the C.C.F.P. as planned and take certain actions to enable the development of a plan including budgetary adjustment and approval of the consultant contract.

The following alternatives to the planned approach were reviewed for their potential to reduce or postpone project cost, but are not recommended:

- Delay starting the C.C.F.P. until a later year. This approach is not recommended because there may be unique opportunities within the current conditions the County should be informed of in order to plan effectively for future asset management. Additionally, the County would continue to invest millions of dollars on an annual basis in its capital assets without clear strategic direction (over \$44,000,000 of General Fund, not including grants, special funds, and other funding sources, has been invested on capital assets in the past decade).
- Proceed with certain early phases, and wait to proceed with later phases of the project. This approach is not recommended because it would disrupt the process and delay overall completion without providing actionable recommendations in the meantime. Also, based on prior experience, this would likely result in an increase in the ultimate expense to the county in completing the overall effort.
- Reduce the level of detail in data collection regarding service delivery and corresponding evaluation and study, while putting more emphasis on real estate evaluation. This is not recommended because, while it could lower the project cost, it will not provide as meaningful a picture of County needs in terms of services delivered, likely resulting in a less effective plan.
- Focus the study on limited individual campuses, or departments, or some combination thereof, and not study them all at once. This is not recommended because it would delay the completion of a complete and comprehensive evaluation of County needs and assets, would cost more in the long run, and would likely miss important linkages and relationships between programs and facilities.

**Comprehensive County Facilities Plan  
Strategic Project 28 / Architect Project #7010  
Proposed Committee Directory  
Updated 10/21/09**

Name	Department
<b>Steering Committee</b>	
José Obregón (Chair)	General Services
Jennifer Murray	County Administrator's Office
Janice Atkinson	Clerk/Recorder/Assessor
John Abrahams	Public Defender
Rita Scardaci	Health Services
Jo Weber	Human Services
Pete Parkinson	Permits and Resource Management
Rich Sweeting	Sheriff
<b>Coordinating Committee</b>	
Robert Kambak (Chair)	General Services
Mike Wagner	General Services
Christina Rivera	County Administrator's Office
Tim Pudoff	Information Systems (GIS)
Jon Martens	Facilities Operations
Tom Coleman	Probation
Benita McLarin	Health Services
Susan Chestnut	Human Services
Jennifer Barrett	Permits and Resource Management
Dave Edmonds	Sheriff
Mark Hummel (PM)	General Services
<b>Finance Committee</b>	
José Obregón(Chair)	General Services
Assistant CAO (TBD)	County Administrator's Office
Rod Dole	Auditor/Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector
Jennifer Murray	County Administrator's Office
Paula Shimizu	General Services
Mike Wagner	General Services
Jonathan Kadlec	Auditor/Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector
TBD	DHS/HSD re: reimbursement funding
<b>CCFP Staff Report Attachment B</b>	

## **Comprehensive County Facilities Plan**

### **Criteria for selecting committee members**

- 1 Larger users of County space
- 2 Representative for a particular system or functional group, such as justice
  
- 3 Programs or Departments that are likely to have a mix of centralized and decentralized services
- 4 Steering Committee members should have high level of authority to make policy recommendations (Department Head or their designee)
- 5 Coordinating Committee members should be in senior management with a comprehensive understanding of their department programs and other programs in their functional groups.
- 6 Members should have an understanding of overall County organization

# Comparable Projects

- California Department of Motor Vehicles Strategic Facilities Plan
- City of Long Beach Schroeder Hall BRAC Process Facilitation
- City of Los Angeles Office Facilities Master Plan
- City of Sacramento Real Property Inventory
- City of San Clemente Civic Center Needs Assessment
- City of San Diego Civic Center Needs Assessment
- County of Alameda Real Estate Master Plan
- County of Los Angeles Data Center
- County of Los Angeles DMH Space Needs Study
- County of Los Angeles Health and Human Services Study
- County of Los Angeles Social Services Administration Building
- County of Los Angeles Social Services Space Needs Study
- County of Marin Facilities Master Plan
- County of Monterey Facilities Master Plan
- County of Orange Facilities Master Plan
- County of Orange Social Services Agency Facilitation
- County of San Bernardino Master Space Plan
- County of Stanislaus Real Estate/Asset Management Evaluation & Planning Services
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Payment Office Consolidation Study
- Port of Long Beach Administrative Headquarters Building
- Water Replenishment District LEED EB Evaluation

**Attachment E**

**Consultant fee comparison for planning projects similar scale to Sonoma CCFP**

<b>Planning project</b>	<b>Fee: Consultant(s)</b>	<b>Scope</b>
<b>County of Sonoma Comprehensive Facilities Plan 2009-2011</b>	\$805,859: Gensler	24 departments, 830,000 sf General Govt. facilities, almost 500 acres; service delivery, real estate and finance data collection and analysis; options development, evaluation and recommendations; sustainability strategies; implementation guide.
<b>Napa County Strategic Space Mgt. Plan, 2007-09</b>	\$495,200: Jones Lang LaSalle, HOK	Approx. 250,000 sf; facility needs assessment/resources alignment of Health & Human Services campus and downtown offices; options development, financial analysis and recommendations; potential sites identification, site renderings.
<b>Alameda County RE Master Plan, 2008-09</b>	\$699,000, Gensler	Approx. ½ county workforce; full portfolio not analyzed; 1.4 million sf real estate master plans for downtown Oakland and Hayward service centers; existing conditions audit; space utilization, department operations and current needs assessment; space need projections, options development.
<b>San Bernardino County Master Space Plan, 2002</b>	\$350,000: Gensler	2.2 million sf; restacking/consolidation scenarios; no site-specific options development, evaluation or financial analysis; no focused service delivery analysis.
<b>Orange County Facilities Master Plan, 2005</b>	\$622,570: Gensler*	County-wide portfolio review including 17 priority sites and 4 million sf; not all departments involved – 12 interviewed; focus on real estate, less on service delivery; long term recommendations for disposition.
<b>City of San Diego, Civic Center Needs Assessment/Analysis, 2007-2008</b>	\$1,050,000: Gensler, Jones Lang LaSalle	44 departments, 3,000 personnel; exploration of consolidated planning model for all city functions in downtown 700,000 sf City Hall on four city blocks versus decentralized owned/leased-space scenarios; operational assessment, options development, evaluation and recommendations; cost model/financial analysis.
<b>County of Sonoma Criminal Justice Master Plan, Phase 1 2006-2007</b>	\$655,386: Bennett, VRJS, HOK	Jail expansion/consolidation, Criminal Justice Master Plan
<b>County of Sonoma Criminal Justice Master Plan, Phase 2 2007-2010</b>	\$1,218,448: Bennett, HOK, VRJS	Criminal Justice Master Plan, Pretrial Services facility plan, Community Correction Center, Jail expansion/consolidation Plan B
<b>County of Sonoma ADA Self Evaluation &amp; Transition Plan, 2007-2009</b>	\$667,000: MIG	County-wide physical barrier survey and evaluation, data base development and prioritized transition plan formulation.

*\*Other consultant fee proposals for same Orange County Facilities Master Plan project: \$551,759, DMJM; \$595,000, Equis Corp.; \$780,140, Gafcon, Inc.; \$781,000, Jacobs Facilities, Inc.*

**Attachment F –  
CCFP Staff Time Estimate**

**Staff time estimating worksheet summary: CCFP**

Start: 12/01/2009

End: 4/30/2011

Weeks: 73.6

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Hrs/wk</b>	<b>Hours total</b>	<b>Dollars</b>
MHummel	Major Project Architect	16.0	1184.0	\$158,321
RKambak	County Architect	4.0	296.0	\$ 44,605
RLoehr	Dept Information System Specialist	4.0	296.0	\$ 34,193
YMiller	Administrative Aide	2.0	148.0	\$ 14,592
WHovey	Associate Architect	1.0	74.0	\$ 10,641
RVanAnda	Associate Architect	1.0	74.0	\$ 10,641
CLatchaw	Secretary	1.0	74.0	\$ 6,251
<b>Phase totals</b>		29.0	2146.0	<b>\$279,244</b>

*Note: Staff hours calculation has been rounded to conform to the index budget limit.*

Background information is on file at:

County of Sonoma Board of Supervisors Office  
575 Administration Drive, Room 100A  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

It can be viewed and/or copies requested during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Call (707) 565-2241 for more information.