



COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 21-881 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Informational Report **Status:** Passed
File created: 6/22/2021 **In control:** Public Works
On agenda: 6/29/2021 **Final action:** 6/29/2021
Title: Garberville Veterans Memorial Hall Project

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. Staff Report, 2. Attachment No. 1 - Mold Sampling.pdf, 3. Attachment No. 2 - Hazardous Materials Assessment.pdf, 4. Attachment No. 3 - Structural Assessment.pdf, 5. Attachment No. 4 - Building Envelope Evaluation Report.pdf, 6. Attachment No. 5 - Accessibility Compliance Survey Report.pdf, 7. Public Comment.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
6/29/2021	1	Board of Supervisors	approved as amended	Pass

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Public Works

Agenda Section: Departmental

SUBJECT:
Garberville Veterans Memorial Hall Project

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Receive a report on the status of the Garberville Veterans Memorial Hall;
2. Review and accept five (5) professional evaluations of the current condition of the building;
3. Review and consider three (3) project options for the facility;
4. Review and consider the option to notify the courts of the county's desire to invoke the court facilities payment; and
5. Direct Public Works to proceed with a project option, allocating funding as necessary.

SOURCE OF FUNDING:

General Fund (1100)

DISCUSSION:

In 1958, the county acquired lands at 483 Conger St, Garberville for construction and use of a new Veterans Memorial Hall ("Hall"), commonly known as the John Hayes Memorial Building. The building was constructed and completed in 1960, with veterans' use commencing on Nov. 12, 1960. The building is approximately 5,150 square feet in size.

In 2016, Public Works closed the Garberville Veterans Memorial Hall Building due to a significant amount of mold in the building and associated structural deficiencies.

On Oct. 20, 2020, your Board adopted the 2020 County of Humboldt Facilities Master Plan, directing staff to prioritize an assessment of the value of the property; prioritize a structural assessment of the property; explore transferring the property to the veterans organization; appoint Supervisor Bohn and Supervisor Fennell to an ad hoc committee to work with the community; and direct staff to come back with a budget adjustment.

Subsequently, Supervisor Bushnell replaced Supervisor Fennell on the ad hoc committee. Working closely with the ad hoc committee, staff explored both property transfer as well as construction options that could address the needs of the facility. Staff are focused on construction options as the most viable way to improve the facility at this time.

Public Works worked with several professional design and evaluation firms to obtain current and objective opinions of the condition of the facility. The attached facility condition reports assess the following five (5) components of the facility: Mold, Hazardous Materials, Structural System, Building Envelope (roof membrane, exterior walls, floor, & insulation), and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. Detailed discussion of these reports is as follows:

1. Mold - Numerous mold types were detected and for certain mold types of concern, in elevated levels that constitute a potential hazard to occupants. Due to the porous construction assembly of the existing ceilings throughout, appropriate mold remediation would likely include removal of the existing roof sheathing. This is similar to the conditions reported in 2016.
2. Hazardous Materials - The building contains both asbestos and lead paint in various construction materials, all of which will require professional abatement to remate.
3. Structural System - The building was evaluated using a Tier 1 structural screening in accordance with ASCE 41-17. The screening identified multiple potential deficiencies throughout the building. In summary, their recommendations include obtaining a soils report, replacing the roof diaphragm, replacing various structural members, creating exterior shear walls on each side of the building, and adding drainage at the foundations.
4. Building Envelope - This consultant identified numerous deficiencies and failures in the roof, exterior walls, and windows. Their recommendations include a complete roof replacement, complete replacement of both interior and exterior sheathing of perimeter walls, and the evaluation suggested numerous other water infiltration deficiencies that may be encountered upon said replacement efforts.
5. ADA Compliance - Well over 100 accessibility barriers were identified during this evaluation. The consultant estimated the cost to remediate these barriers to be well in excess of \$500,000.

With these evaluations in mind, Public Works has identified and prepared conceptual cost estimates for three (3) project approaches:

- A. Replace - Demolition of the existing facility followed by design and construction of a completely new building of approximately the same size (approximately 5,150 square feet) and configuration as the existing, utilizing the existing foundations if possible. The anticipated total project cost for this option is \$4,416,589.
- B. Repair - Demolition of the majority of the building, with the exception of the functional components of the structural system, followed by further study, structural modifications, and re-construction of the existing facility. The re-construction would utilize new construction materials and minor enhancements as may be possible within the existing footprint of the building. The anticipated project budget for this option totals \$3,584,342. This option has the greatest likelihood for additional costs, due to unforeseen conditions that may be encountered in trying to salvage components of a structure beyond its useful life.
- C. Replace/Reduce Size - Demolition of the existing facility followed by design and construction of a completely new, but smaller building that does not provide space for use by the State Courts. The proposed building would be approximately 3,600 square feet and include an assembly hall for approximately 150 persons, an office, smaller meeting room, kitchen and restrooms as required per Code. The anticipated cost of this option is \$3,087,325. However, considering that this option is the most conceptual of the three (3), the cost may be able to be reduced through the design decision making process.

Considering the age of the facility and the substantial condition issues, Public Works' recommendation is to elect either Option A. (Replace) or C. (Replace/Reduce Size) above. The primary consideration between the two (2) options is the 35% (\$1,329,264) higher initial cost of Option A., vs. an ongoing court facility payment (CFP) due to the courts payable under Option C.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated Jun. 26, 2007, with the Court, Section 4.a. County Facilities Payment states:

“In the event that either the County ceases to provide the Court Facility to the Court for part-time use consistent with the Court's historical use of the Court Facility, or the AOC relocates the Court Facility from the Building to a replacement facility, the County will then begin to pay a CFP to the California State Controller's Office, on a quarterly basis, under section 70353 of the Act. As the AOC has not appropriated any funding for a replacement Court Facility, the Parties do not expect that the AOC and Court will vacate the building in the near future. The CFP will provide a source of funding for the ongoing operations and maintenance of future Court Facilities consistent with the intent of the Legislature in enacting section 7.0351 of the Act.”

Per the MOU the county could provide an ongoing Court Facility Payment to the Courts in an estimated amount of \$310.17 quarterly that would satisfy the county's obligation to provide space for the courts in Garberville/Southern Humboldt. This quarterly payment would be due should your Board elect Option C. (Replace/Reduce Size) or another option that does not include a facility for use by the courts.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The financial impact of repairing or replacing the building varies between \$3,087,325 to \$4,416,589, depending on the option considered. These are conceptual estimates, inclusive of construction as well as design, administration and permitting costs. Please be advised that construction cost indices are currently rising and that construction costs may be volatile for the near future. Option C. would include an additional estimated ongoing quarterly payment of \$310.17.

Staff plans to come back to your Board at a later date with a supplemental budget after project direction is determined.

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK:

This action supports your Board's Strategic Framework by providing for and maintaining infrastructure .

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

None

ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Board's discretion

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment No. 1 - Mold Sampling

Attachment No. 2 - Hazardous Materials Assessment

Attachment No. 3 - Structural Assessment

Attachment No. 4 - Building Envelope Evaluation Report

Attachment No. 5 - Accessibility Compliance Survey Report

PREVIOUS ACTION/REFERRAL:

Board Order No.: K-2

Meeting of: 10/20/20

File No.: 20-1318