

WORKSHOP

Monday, October 7, 2019

1:41 pm

Board Members Present: *Chair* Tom Canute, Laurie Ho, Kurt Akamine, Ka`aina Hull

Excused: Lawrence Dill, Elesther Calipjo

Staff Present: Manager and Chief Engineer Bryan Wienand, DCA Mahealani Krafft, Mary-jane Akuna, Darrell Acob, Ryan Smith, Keith Aoki, Marites Yano, Carl Arume, Chris Nakamura, Eric Fujikawa, Brandi Ventar

Guests: Consultants Clifford Lum, PE and Sally Maddock, AIA from HDR

AGENDA

The Agenda was accepted with no objections.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Manager's Report No. 20-16 - Workshop presentation regarding the Master Plan of the Department of Water's former Administration Building, Baseyard, and Micro Lab

BACKGROUND:

Manager Wienand introduced Clifford Lum, PE and Sally Maddock, AIA from HDR consultants for the workshop presentation. The current and future uses of the baseyard, which are intended to be addressed with this Master Plan, include growth, space issues, employee parking, staff work areas, and equipment storage. During the move to the new Admin. Building in 2016, there were no plans for the old Administration building. The Department looked at potential growth, the fact that the Park & Ride area is now going to be affordable housing within the next two years and the subsequent loss of employee parking, and maximizing the use of existing space and facilities. This presentation is 70% conceptual of the master plan and is based on needs and not wants with three concepts to be presented. The magnitude for cost estimates will be shown but not discussed in detail at this time as the focus is on the concepts and not the costs.

Staff recommend Concept B: A strategy of phased demolition to develop a linear operations warehouse and garage on the east property line. This creates a large open space in the baseyard to a unified fleet vehicle parking area. The storm water retention area is leveled out using a retaining wall to accommodate additional employee parking. Manager Wienand hoped for the Board to select a concept and to move forward with the project as this potentially affects our Rate Study and is necessary to move forward with HDR's scope and future design.

Presentation by Clifford Lum, PE

Mr. Lum went over separating the needs and wants of the staff (See Attachment 1, County of Kaua'i, Department of Water Baseyard Master Plan, Board of Water Presentation).

Preliminary comments:

- Utilizing the property across the street the next 30 years
- Finding the best solution for staff to the best job based on the space
- Provided data collection
- Developed concept designs discussed with staff with directions

- Implementation tasks to follow later, then consultants will return at a final Board meeting

Department of Water (DOW) Overall Site Plan (page 9)

- Former Administration building to be repurposed
- Ingress and egress into the baseyard
- Better use of space existing and future staff projected

Presentation by Sally Maddock, AIA

WHAT? (is the problem) (pages 11-23)

- Office space is a struggle with 10 positions that do not have a place to sit (mostly senior positions)
- Parking shortfall (page 12)
- Inefficiency in the Operations warehouse for (page 13, existing spaces vs. proposed spaces)

Health and Safety (page 24)

- OSHA compliance
- Environmental compliance
- Potential reduced insurance costs

Utility Security (page 25)

- Needs an overhaul
- Security with gates and fencing
- Communications Security
- How to get the data, servers and SCADA organized

Disaster Resilience & Code Compliance (page 26)

- Maintain a fire lane throughout the baseyard with reorganization
- Preparedness with disasters and resilience
- Options – consultants are not recommending to request for additional funds for the buildings that cannot withstand a major hurricane.
- Moving forward, develop buildings that are more resilient

Future Water System Growth (page 27)

- Projects 18% population growth & 14% visitor growth over within 15-20 years
- Department will need to replace 60% of domestic water pipe lines which represents a large scale of this operation
- Numbers project the positions growth of staff with a 19% overall change (page 29)
- Reduce Excessive Costs (page 30)
- Coordinated approach with spacing
- Reducing maintenance burden on older buildings
- Efficiency in staff increases with labor costs
- Reduce materials loss through inventory controls / protection from damage
- Avoiding major reconstruction costs in planned facilities from disasters

HOW? (are we addressing it) (page 32)

Employee Engagements feedback through:

- Site visits
- Interviews
- Workshops
- Comment boxes
- Email
- In 2050, employee count would be 140 (case scenario). There are on-going vacancies, sick leave, vacations, and the ability for some staff to drive vehicles home. Out of 140 staff, 80 stalls are needed.
- Projections of the new buildings, tighter rack spaces; directional & functional

2019 Existing Baseyard (page 34)

- Building where server room is located in 2017
- Existing buildings were built in the 1970's
- Old Administration building renovated & expanded in 1992
- Operations warehouse & garage renovated & expanded in 1998 (built on original foundations)
- Microlab Building – concrete structure; needs a face lift. Would probably withstand a hurricane

2050 Vision: Concept A (page 35)

- Repurpose the vacant old Admin. building
- Phase 1 - renovates the Microlab building with a small addition which houses a new consolidated server and SCADA room. This will free up the old Admin. building for a complete gut and renovation
- Phase 2 - Old Admin. building would be converted to Operations offices
- Phase 3 - is a dramatic addition of a second floor parking in front of the old Admin. building
- Phase 4 – field will be leveled to build a vehicle maintenance garage
- Phase 5 – new Operations warehouse, then old Operations building will be taken down. All the large vehicle parking is built in an undercover area with solar power

Concept A Pros & Cons (page 36)

- Old Admin. building restoration and would have to go through the Historic Conservation in order to be taken down – Pro
- Includes new emergency generators - Pro
- Longest reconstruction duration - Con
- Extensive disruption to the new DOW building while the parking structure is built - Con
- No space for construction after 2050; all land will be used - Con
- Operations garage that will be built – Con
- Risk a deep foundation system that will be costly – Con

2050 Vision: Concept B (page 37)

- Phase 1 & 2 – Half will be demolished; other half will have the server in it
- Build a new consolidated Operations warehouse office building; includes 2nd floor for PR & IT offices. With the new consolidated server room, the second half of the old Admin. building will be built out for a new fleet vehicle parking lot
- Parking will be on grade with no structure
- The underground water retention system will need to be moved
- Will not meet the 140 parking spaces but does need 80 that is workable
- Department is seeking a long term lease for off-site parking next to the new DOW building
- Phase 3 – Relocated fuel canopy, include new emergency generators
- Phase 4 – Demolished half of existing old Operations building and will build a new plant building in its place. Then the second half of the old Admin. building for Phase 5
- Phase 5 – new vehicle maintenance building & vehicle wash room
- The old vehicle maintenance building can be demolished for more parking and for an enlarged bulk material storage
- Large vehicles and heavy equipment at this site and out to the road. Lighter vehicles will be located in a corner
- Central area are for the extra-large truck and super duty truck parking

Concept B Pros & Cons (pages 38-39)

- Second floor of Microlab will not be renovated right away because of the server room in Phase 1 & 2. Half of the floor is the old Board room w/air conditioning to be converted to office space for Operations – Pro
- IT can expand their offices in accordance with their IT plan – Pro
- Parking is on grade; no parking structure or cost - Pro

- Phased demolition time consuming & costly - Con
- 2nd elevator will be required for the warehouse building - Con

2050 Vision: Concept (page 40)

- To get much of the development in one structure to maintain space on the site & to reduce the footprint
- Phase 1 – Same as Concept A, has an addition to the Microlab building to house the new server room. This allows the server and telecom to move from the Old Admin. building. The SCADA will be moved from the existing Operations warehouse for a consolidated secured space
- Phase 2 – Take down the old Admin. building to build a 3 story parking structure that has all of the warehouse vehicles on the ground floor. The road comes through and under the structure
- Second level will have the crew support facilities (locker rooms, break room, Operations offices & accessories)
- Mix of light fleet vehicle parking and employee parking. Parking on the 2nd and 3rd level; 3 stories w/no roof
- Concept does not touch the field care with no retaining wall or relocation of the storm water retention system
- All concepts modified the roundabout for large vehicles
- Phase 5 - Fuel canopy for vehicle wash, large vehicle parking under the solar PV canopy

Concept C Pros & Cons (page 41)

- Space remains on site for future growth - Pro
- Parking structure provides shelter – Pro
- Storm water is not touched – Pro
- On ground level, all vehicles in the maintenance garage has a 14 foot ceiling height because of the parking deck - Con
- Warehouse will lose storage space - Con
- Vehicle wash difficult to access, consultants will study one of the bays; a challenge – Con

Comparisons of Concept A, B & C (page 43)

- All meet interior office spaces
- All meet 140 parking stalls in A & C
- Parking stalls in B meets the min. requirements
- All meet fleet vehicle parking
- A & B = 6 phases; C = 5 phases
- Final 30% of the Master Plan is whatever concept is selected to move forward
- Earliest construction completion is in C is July 2017 and longest construction would be by March 2030 in A, and B is July 2029
- Cost for A = \$38,025,838, B = \$31,999,627, C = \$35,669,716

Fair Assessment of a Decision Matrix on each Concept (page 43)

- Interior Space
- Vehicle Parking & Circulation
- Loading and Delivery
- Code Compliance
- Phasing
- Cost
- Total Points
- Overall Rank; B = 1; C = 2; A = 3: Concept B best meets the immediate and critical needs of the DOW allowing existing space on the second floor of the Microlab building for a temporary office (page

45). This gives six positions in the room with a shared break room. This is a temporary solution until Phase 1 is constructed that will provide new offices (page 45)

Concept B - Minimum Construction Duration

- 90 months (7 years, 6 months). Construction to start January 2022
- Average of \$4M for 8 years

WHY? (Recap, pages 48 – 49)

- To meet the current and future needs of the Department
- Improve operational efficiency
- Provide for employee safety
- Utility security
- Disaster resilience
- Overall savings
- Approach: Methodical, reasonable & justified

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Hull inquired about the parking needs for the Department, the expansion and how it will serve staff if they have shared fleet or divisions that have a dedicated car? On call outs, can staff continuously have that car? Are they taking it home? Is the car parked at the baseyard or do they drive and park in a different parking stall? Manager Wienand said only a few DOW vehicles are shared by different staff and some vehicles are assigned to a position such as certain Operations staff who are on call or on standby. For some positions, staff that are on standby can take the vehicle home. Other crew uses the vehicle but do not take it home.

Mr. Hull shared that the County has been going through parking management. A study was done by the County of Līhu'e that showed ample parking stalls in the area but are not managed effectively. He suggested the Department look at a true need for parking or what is the need if there are other management strategies for vehicle maintenance. Manager Wienand agreed and is looking at a lease agreement for parking next door to cut down on the overall Concept B costs and potentially remove the need to build new parking in the field adjacent to the DOW's parking lot down below. It is available land but costs are high to raise the grade, to address storm water retention and to put parking on top. The Department would evaluate and check if there is available long-term lease next door to compare costs and options (built on site). The affordable housing being built next door is a big challenge because the Park & Ride space will be lost in less than two years. When the Department looked at management strategies, the number of spaces that could be saved would only be in the single digits which is minimal vs. overall needs, because what Operations does is on call and will not change. By comparison, it would not make sense for the Construction Management Inspectors to take vehicles home because they have to report to work before they go out to the field anyway. For other Operations staff, they need two spaces; one for their personal vehicle and one for their work vehicle. The front lot at the new building is for the Admin's front office. Mr. Lum and Ms. Maddock added that 80 parking stalls is conservative vs. 140 parking stalls plus employee vehicles are not allowed in the baseyard.

Ms. Ho asked if it was costly for underground parking in the baseyard or new the Admin. building? Ms. Maddock said yes and there is a potential for a split level garage which is small area. Ms. Ho asked where is the storm water going to go? It may have to be taken out and compacted Ms. Maddock said and would be in the same place but in a higher elevation under the parking lot raised with the grade.

Manager Wienand reminded the Board to focus on needs but this is a huge commitment once the funding discussion will start. The master plan is long term even though the costs seem high but the cost is more manageable in the long term because it can be spread out over many years. The Water Rate Study will provide more details but overall the Department could go to the State legislature for

funding support to manage the overall cost. The State and County are working on gap housing next to the new Admin. building which has the potential to further impact the Department to meet the bottom line goal of serving our customers. Ms. Maddock confirmed that the old Admin. building in the concept will be taken down.

Chair Canute was not in favor of the second level parking in Concept A and Concept B is all grade parking. When the Department went over Concept B, it was a clear choice with alternatives for Concept A & B.

Manager Wienand added that a baseyard tour could be done later with the Board to see the cramped quarters for staff in Operations if they'd like. Manager Wienand said it would take three to five years before a new office would be ready for staff. Staff is ready to act on Concept B now to make the temporary offices without having to put out a contract.

Mr. Hull said that all of the concepts will have a hard time getting through the Planning Commission. He explained that the Planning Commission looks at how things interface with the shared space and the streets (i.e., interface with the DOW building and the affordable housing coming in). A Bill was started by the Kaua'i Chamber of Commerce for commercial districts with a strip mall to have parking located in the back which may pass. He said the Planning Commission is receiving the housing projects and that the multi-family structures are being pushed to the front of the street that creates a safe interaction zone for children. How will the concepts be discussed with the interface on the street between the affordable housing development and the new Admin. building? Which street is going to interface with the highway or the smaller street? Ms. Maddock mentioned that there will be uses for private and adjacent uses for the interface. For Concept B, the bulk material and dirt is located far away in the baseyard. The Department could choose 1) a warehouse building adjacent or 2) put trees in to push the noise far away as possible which is the challenge with the project of "Not In My Back Yard" (NIMBY). Cars are least offensive vs. heavy vehicles. Ms. Ho mentioned the affordable housing will start from the corner (Stop sign) up to the DOW Admin. parking lot. Ms. Maddock added off site there will be another State baseyard.

Various comments from the Board members and the Manager mentioned other industrial activities, fencing, incorporate additional security features, possible security guard in the front of the Admin. building (day), not all of the affordable housing are Section 8 rentals (only some), concern of children darting out while DOW vehicles are approaching. Mr. Hull mentioned to look at the assets available to reduce the land value, how to program park space, avoid unsavory activities in public space to not fence but to allow children in public spaces. The Planning Commission will ask the DOW how will this be mitigated? To insure that renters are aware they are in a light industrial area by keeping their children safe. Manager Wienand commented that the Pua Loke Arboretum will be used for gap housing according to Mayor Derek Kawakami. The County is trying to acquire this State land for temporary gap housing.

Mr. Akamine added that Concept A, B, or C will have issues and we will just have to plan accordingly. Chair Canute mentioned that Concept C would have the greatest issues related to the adjacent affordable housing. The Board can choose one concept to get to 100% completion and to stop working on the other two concepts to save on funding. Manager Wienand was ready to move forward with Concept B and the Board could make other modifications to the concept that is selected.

Mr. Akamine moved to approve Concept B; seconded by Ms. Ho.

According to DCA Krafft, Senior Clerk Ms. Ventar said if there are less than 4 Yes votes, the Motion fails.

Manager Wienand said that if there are concerns on Concept B (not funding), this could be brought back to the Regular Board meeting for Board approval on October 25. Mr. Hull had concerns voting for Concept B without vetting it with the Planning Commission. Concept B design may not have the best planning principles. Concept A would address the street interface with the planning and cost aspect. Because Mr. Hull was appointed to the Board with a planning perspective and he wants to discuss the street interface by interviewing the Planning Department's expert team. Concept B could get support from other Board members without his vote and respectfully requested for a deferral.

Chair Canute was in favor of Concept B from the grade parking and Mr. Akamine agreed but said this needs to move forward. Mr. Hull suggested that the design fit with the housing units.

Civil Engineer Mr. Eric Fujikawa added that if there were concerns on the full build out, it allows for a new structure without demolishing other structures. Phase 1 & 2 is building out of the existing footprints. Concept A & C is in tandem with the existing warehouse to get the new structures built. He added that Phase 1 & 2 could be accomplished to add space on concerns about overall funding of the project to fund the first couple of phases with future strategies on how to get the money for the remainder four phases but not commit it immediately.

Mr. Akamine and Ms. Ho withdrew their motion; with no objections after a lengthy discussion.

Private Secretary Ms. Akuna clarified that this Workshop is for information only. A vote needs to be with the full Board at the October meeting. This will be added to the October Agenda.

Manager Wienand said that he is recommending that the Board make a decision today to move forward with Concept B, but he will provide materials in the Board packet for Board members Mr. Lawrence Dill and Mr. Elesther Calipjo to include the concerns raised by Board Member Hull. He will also provide a background update in his Manager's Update Report in the October meeting packet.

In the HDR's scope, possible sites for multiple baseyards (east side/wide side) were not included which would incur additional costs. Ms. Ho added that more discussions could be made if the Board had a Public Works Ex-Officio (which they are missing) regarding adjacent baseyards next to the County baseyards. Chair Canute added if the existing space maxed out in the future, then the baseyard would have to move in another location geographically.

ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Ho moved to Adjourn the Workshop meeting at 3:16 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Hull; with no objections; motion carried with 4 ayes.

ein