

City Council Workshop Agenda Monday, March 07, 2022, 4:30 PM REMOTE MEETING PARTICIPATION

NOTE: The City welcomes public meeting citizen participation. TTY Relay Service: 711. In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in a meeting, contact the City Clerk's office at (360) 834-6864, 72 hours prior to the meeting so reasonable accommodations can be made (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title 1)

To Participate Remotely:

OPTION 1 – Video & Audio (able to public comment) Use Zoom app and Meeting ID – 996 2299 7295; or click https://zoom.us/j/99622997295

OPTION 2 – Audio-only (*able to public comment*) By phone: 877-853-5257, Meeting ID – 996 2299 7295

OPTION 3 – Observe video & audio (no public comment)

Go to www.cityofcamas.us/meetings and click "Watch Livestream" (left on page)

For Public Comment:

- 1. On Zoom app click Raise Hand icon
- 2. On phone hit *9 to "raise hand"
- 3. Or, email publiccomments@cityofcamas.us (400 word limit); routes to Council

If you have difficulty accessing the meeting, please call 360-817-7900 for assistance.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENTS

WORKSHOP TOPICS

- Recognition of 25-Year Anniversary for Rebel Martin, Library Associate Presenter: Connie Urquhart, Library Director Time Estimate: 5 minutes
- 2. <u>Public Works Operations Center Analysis Presentation</u> <u>Presenter: Steve Wall, Public Works Director</u> <u>Time Estimate: 20 min</u>
- 3. <u>City of Camas 2023-2024 Budget Preparation Data Program Relaunch</u> <u>Presenter: Cathy Huber Nickerson, Finance Director and Debra Brooks, Financial</u> <u>Analyst</u> <u>Time Estimate: 15 minutes</u>
- 4. <u>American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Status Presentation</u> <u>Presenter: Cathy Huber Nickerson, Finance Director</u> <u>Time Estimate: 20 minutes</u>

These materials are archived electronically by the City of Camas. DESTROY AFTER USE.

- 5. <u>Camas Ward Boundary Updates</u> <u>Presenters: Jeff Swanson, Interim City Administrator and Shawn MacPherson, City</u> <u>Attorney</u> <u>Time Estimate: 10 minutes</u>
- Staff Miscellaneous Updates Presenter: Jeff Swanson, Interim City Administrator Time Estimate: 10 minutes

COUNCIL COMMENTS AND REPORTS

PUBLIC COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT



Staff Report

March 7, 2022 Council Workshop Meeting

Public Works Operations Center Analysis Presentation Presenter: Steve Wall, Public Works Director Time Estimate: 20 min

Phone	Email
360.817.7899	swall@cityofcamas.us

BACKGROUND: The City Council authorized a contract with TCF Architecture in 2021 to assist the City in analyzing the current Public Works Operations Center as it relates to adequate space and function to serve the department. TCF developed the attached report based on the work completed and coordination with staff.

SUMMARY: Staff will present the findings of the TCF analysis. In summary, the existing Operations Center is not adequate to continue serving the City's existing or future needs; especially given the continued growth in population and staff. This high-level effort recommends finding a site (or combination of sites) that are 10-15 acres in size and provides budgetary level cost estimates to expand existing facilities and/or construct all new facilities. The budgetary level cost estimates are in the range of \$55 to \$60 million.

This effort with TCF included just an initial phase of the overall work effort to move towards a new Operations Facility. Staff worked with TCF to develop a scope of work for the second phase which is proposed to include determining which option, split facilities or all one facility, will best fit our needs in both the near-term and long-term, and to begin looking at potential sites for a future facility. The draft scope of work is included for Council's review and staff will briefly cover it at the end of the presentation.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS:

What are the desired results and outcomes for this agenda item?

Educate the City Council on our current constraints and needs at the Public Works Operations Center facility.

What's the data? What does the data tell us?

Based on the TCF analysis, the current site is not adequate to efficiently serve today's operational needs or those that will be required to serve future growth.

How have communities been engaged? Are there opportunities to expand engagement?

N/A

Who will benefit from, or be burdened by this agenda item?

Public Works Operations and the general public would ultimately benefit from the improved efficiencies associated with a larger facility.

What are the strategies to mitigate any unintended consequences?

A thoughtful process to evaluate the City's needs and check-ins with the City Council will help to mitigate any unintended consequences.

Does this agenda item have a differential impact on underserved populations, people living with disabilities, and/or communities of color? Please provide available data to illustrate this impact.

N/A

Will this agenda item improve ADA accessibilities for people with disabilities?

N/A

What potential hurdles exists in implementing this proposal (include both operational and political)?

Cost is a significant hurdle as the City looks towards design and construction of a new facility. Additionally, finding suitable land for a new or additional facility will likely be difficult.

How will you ensure accountabilities, communicate, and evaluate results?

Staff will provide updates to Council as the study and project progresses.

How does this item support a comprehensive plan goal, policy or other adopted resolution?

This item supports multiple goals and policies regarding providing maintenance and operations services to the community.

BUDGET IMPACT: The cost estimate for the scope of work for Phase 2 is estimated to cost \$112,265. Funds for this effort will be included in the Spring Omnibus should Council approve.

RECOMMENDATION: This item is for Council's information only. Staff is planning on having the Phase 2 contract with TCF on the March 21, 2022 Consent Agenda for Council's consideration.



City Council Workshop

March 7, 2022

"...essential planning-level Item 2. information for understanding present realities faced by PW Operations..."

SCOPE OF WORK

TCF Architecture – Consultant Team Lead

• Randy Cook, Principal

Scope:

- Quantify and assess existing use of space
- Analyze future needs
- Develop concepts for building and site area needs to serve existing and future
 - Scenario 1 Combination of Existing and New sites
 - Scenario 2 New Site
- Develop budgetary level cost estimates for each option





EXISTING FACILITY

3.2+/- acres (**including Work Crew)

Main building constructed in 1994. 13,000+/- sf. Designed larger, but never completed

Modular building to support crew facilities

3-sided covered pole barn on north side for equipment

Millions of dollars of equipment stored outside

Extremely inadequate for continued use as Operations Facility to support all needs

Not enough room for personal vehicle parking (47 FTE plus seasonal employees)

Work Crew!!





What did we use? - Best Practices and Development Standards of peer agencies

Administrative and Crew Facilities

• Restrooms, locker rooms, showers, meeting spaces, break spaces, technical workspaces and public spaces

Climate Controlled Shop Facilities

• Mechanics bays, metal fabrication, wood working, painting, and sign-making

Covered Vehicle and Equipment Storage

- Protects investment in vehicles/equipment
- Provides crews safe, dry space for immediate use of vehicles/equipment

Covered Materials Storage

• Salt, sand, storm and sewer decant, etc.



TCF Architecture – Pierce County Sewer-Traffic Operations Center

SCENARIO ONE - MAXIMIZE EXISTING SPACE

- Concept based on maximizing space
- General Overview
 - Expand Building (+12,000 sf)
 - Crew Space, Mechanics Bays, Warehouse Space, etc.
 - Add second floor (+8,000 sf)
 - Add covered storage (+20,500 sf)
- Assumptions:
 - Underground Stormwater Facility
 - Work Crew moves off site



"SCENARIO ONE" – NEW SITE FOR REMAINDER

- Additional 4 to 5 acre site (minimum)
- Decant Facility
- Material Bulk Storage
 - Sand, gravel, deicer, large equipment, etc.
- No office space assumed





SCENARIO 1 — EXISTING SITE REDEVELOPMENT



Acquisition of new site for new facility – 10 acre minimum, 12-15 for future expansion

Administrative Crew Building, climatecontrolled Shops Building, Canopy Covered Vehicle/Equipment Storage Areas, Bulk Storage, etc.

No location or specific site configuration selected in this current work effort

SCENARIO TWO-CONSOLIDATED SITE

Description	Scenario 1 Split Operations	Scenario 2 Consolidated		
		Operations		
Site Acquisition	\$3,000,000	\$9,000,000		
Site Development/Off-Site	\$10,571,089	\$11,400,000		
Buildings and Equipment	\$25,603,774	\$25,962,650		
GC/CM Delivery	\$835,141	\$0		
Subtotal Site and Bldgs	\$40,010,004	\$46,362,650		
Soft Costs and FF&E	\$11,395,122	\$11,884,619		
Subtotals Project Cost	\$51,405,126	\$58,247,269		
Management Reserve (5%)	\$2,570,256	\$2,802,363		
Potential Land Sale	\$0	(\$2,200,000)		
Grand Totals	\$53,975,382	\$58,849,632		

SUMMARY OF COSTS



Item 2.

MOVING FORWARD

- Good base to start from "Understanding realities..."
- Next Steps (Phase 2)
 - Evaluate Scenarios further
 - Existing City-owned properties and facilities
 - Windshield Time analysis
 - Select Preferred Scenario
 - Identify preferred sites
 - DRAFT Scope of Work attached \$112,265
- Future
 - Site(s) Acquisition
 - Value Engineering
 - Design/Construction



CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS FACILITY

Part 1: Public Works Operations Site & Space Needs Analysis

FEBRUARY 3, 2022





TABLE OF CONTENTS

Participants

Executive Report

Section 1 – Preliminary Program

- Preliminary Space Program
- Equipment Storage Summary
- Existing Off-Site Storage Summary
- Personnel Analysis
- Vehicle / Parking Analysis
- Preliminary Equipment List
- Programming Agendas
- Programming Workshop Notes
- Programming Workshop Flip Chart Images
- Existing Operations Facility Photos

Section 2 – Drawings

- Existing Operations Facility Site Plan
- Existing Operations Facility Main Building Plan
- Conceptual Redevelopment Plan for Existing Operations Site

Section 3 – Budgetary Cost Estimates

- Budgetary Summaries for Estimated Total Project Costs
- Detailed Budgetary Estimate for Scenario 1

PARTICIPANTS

The following people participated in the development of this initial work scope including engagement with the Design Team during the Programming Workshops.

City of Camas

Steve Wall Denis Ryan Sam Adams **Richard Copsey** Scott Purkeypyle Garry Reed Susan Wilde Tara Carlin TJ Crawford Steve Klopman Michael Katzer Brandon Prather Derek Engler Matt Golphenee Nick MacQuarrie Sean Alix **Ryan Hickey**

Public Works Director **Public Works Supervisor Utilities Manager** Streets Streets Solid Waste **Operations Administration Operations Administration** Stormwater Stormwater Water & Sewer Water & Sewer Water & Sewer Water & Sewer Parks Maintenance Parks Maintenance Facilities

TCF Design Team

Principal

Designer

Principal

Principal

Engineer

Principal

Randy Cook Coreen Van Ausdell Mike Frei Steve Fisher Danielle Pruit Andy Cluness TCF Architecture TCF Architecture Facilities Planning Services Facilities Planning Services KPFF (Civil) RC Cost Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION – PROJECT PURPOSE

In September 2021, City of Camas retained TCF Architecture to assist in a process of determining the City's current and future needs and solutions for facilities supporting Public Works Operations. The title of this current study is *"Public Works Operations Site and Space Needs Analysis"*. As a first step towards any future decision regarding facilities investments, this study is intended to initiate the fact-finding stage of a broader strategic process, establishing essential data, operational considerations, and preliminary "orders of magnitude" for alternative approaches to investing in long-term facility solutions.

Presently, Public Works operates primarily from an existing Operations Facility, a 3.7-acre site located at 8th Avenue and Polk Street on the south edge of the city. Additionally, due to inadequate available site and building area at the existing facility, Public Works also stores materials and equipment at several other locations throughout the city. Recognizing the mounting challenges of serving the needs of a growing city from a finite site—strained to accommodate the needs of its Public Works department—long-term solutions are needed. This initial study approaches the preliminary stage of investigation with the following steps:

- Quantify and assess existing site and facility space allocation and functional operations.
- Determine space needs tied to current and projected Public Works services and personnel & equipment needs.
- Explore potential for existing Operations Facility to accommodate the full projected site and space needs.
- Consider potential options for accommodating the full program of site and space needs with alternative locations, either splitting operations between the existing operations and satellite facilities, or consolidating all operations on a new, single site.
- Assess and compare "Order-of-Magnitude" costs between options, sufficient to initiate discussions and determine next steps.



Existing City of Camas Operation Facility

From the Perspective of Operations Personnel

At the outset of the programming engagement process, City Operations personnel offered the following thoughts regarding the positive and negative

Table 1 – General Comments from Staff and Crew

Positive Negative Service is #1. We pride ourselves on going above and beyond to help Work operations tend to be reactive vs. pro-active. This is partially due . to responding to public orders, and partially due to inherent constraints our community. Staff are engaged in greater community events. of equipment and facilities. We have a "Friends and Family" atmosphere and a sense of comradery Major effort to keep Downtown Core pristine and collaborate with • other city agencies and outside groups to keep City of Camas nice. among the crew. We have interdependent cooperation among departments Inadequate Crew Facilities including locker quantities and locations. . Staff within individual departments and across different departments Wash rack is not functional. are cross trained on equipment, with no assigned operators within Location is not central to our service areas. departments, everyone runs everything. Significant "windshield" time is currently required for a variety of functions to transport materials due to inadequate space or available locations. Parking is inadequate as staff must park on the adjacent streets. Dirt, dust, and mud in vard affects equipment, storage, maintenance. Admin needs acoustic privacy for zoom and other meetings. Work often interrupted by flow of staff pedestrian traffic. Major security issues and theft problems. There is a high rate of theft and improvements are needed for site security. This includes the service vard gates which are manual and stay open, contributing to site security issues. Existing camera set-up is inadequate. Inadequate site lighting for safety and security camera visibility Multiple locations around the city are needed for storing various materials and equipment due to inadequate space at Operations. This creates inefficiencies.

EXISTING SPACE AND FUNCTIONAL OPERATIONS

The TCF Design Team reviewed and documented the City's existing Operations facilities and site for space size and functionality and documented existing personnel and city-owned vehicles & equipment. Concurrently, the City is contracting for a separate study to assess the physical conditions of the existing buildings and site. This information is used for comparative purposes as each operational function is reviewed for actual and future projected needs. The Tables provided under the Preliminary Programming Section provide existing data compared with projected and proposed quantities for facility space, personnel, and vehicles.

Existing Operations Facility

The City's current Operations facility has served the city as far back as the 1980's and constructed in 1994, the main building supports most operations staff and crew members, fleet services and heated storage. Other structures include a three-sided canopy building used for storing a variety of vehicles, equipment, and materials, and a separate canopy covering decanting and vehicle wash functions. In addition, some personnel reside in a separate modular building and a Clark County Work Crew is housed on-site in a modular structure.

The 3.7-acre site is bordered and land-locked by Polk Street to the east, SE 8th Avenue to the north, Oak Park to the west, and Highway 14 to the south. While it appears that the west property line extends well into Oak Park (also owned by the City of Camas), indications are that this area will remain as park property in perpetuity. As exhibited in the Preliminary Programming Section to follow, the existing site and buildings are substantially inadequate for safe and efficient operational functions today and cannot support the future projected needs and growth of Public Works. Further, the physical condition of existing facilities continues to deteriorate. Operations personnel have improvised, accommodating staff in temporary modular buildings, storing materials in shipping containers and offsite locations, and building low quality lean-to structures; a lack of solid surfacing and limited canopy covering of vehicles, materials and equipment creates messy and inefficient operations throughout the site. (See Figure 1 for existing site plan).









PRELIMINARY PROGRAMMING

TCF and consultant, FPS, conducted a series of workshops over a two-day period, engaging representatives from each of the City's Public Works departments to understand how each currently functions, assess current and future workforce (personnel) projections, and discuss how specific facility design approaches could optimize work functions.

Section 1 provides a Preliminary Space Program capturing all Operations functions and recommended square footage areas. The areas indicated reflect best practices and development standards implemented by other peer agencies that have constructed Maintenance, Operations, and Administrative (MOA) facilities over the past decade. Determining appropriate space for any given function is a process that considers multiple factors of human and equipment maneuverability, critical and optimum dimensions for access and safety, adjacencies between functions for best workflow efficiency, weather implications for productivity and protection of assets, and code-driven space requirements.

Table 1 summarizes the current square footage occupied by Public Works at the Operations Facility and the 20-year recommended area. Below is a summary of the four primary programmatic space types included in the Preliminary Program, the current conditions, and recommended program approach.

Administrative and Crew Facilities

While common in older MOA facilities, "people space" is often deficient in terms of both adequacy and quality of space. Well-designed administrative and crew facilities—including restrooms, locker rooms, showers, meeting and collaborative spaces, break spaces, technical workspaces and even public spaces—promote high performance, professionalism, and help to build healthy and sustainable organizational cultures. The existing people spaces in the current Operations Facility are undersized, spread out, and do not provide capacity for the projected workforce growth. The recommended program areas consider a collaborative, professional, practical, and highly [CVA2]productive work environment.

Table 1 - Current and Recommended Building Program Area

Space of Function Type	Existing SF	20 Yr Program
Administrative / Crew	4,283 SF	20,712 SF
Heated Shops & Storage	8,830 SF	21,012 SF
Covered Vehicle/Equip Storage	8,160 SF	50,777 SF
Covered Materials/Decant/Wash	5,480 SF	23,320 SF
Totals	26,753 SF	115, 821 SF

Climate Controlled Shop Facilities

Shop facilities at the existing Operations Facility are undersized or inadequate for the work to be accomplished. In particular, shop facilities for the Fleet Division constrain operations, especially with regard to vehicle work bays which are inadequate in size, height, and quantity for the fleet mix now maintained by the City. Properly designed specialty shop facilities that can be shared by the various work groups are also needed, including metal fabrication, wood working, painting, and sign-making.

Canopy-Covered Vehicle and Equipment Storage

Canopy-covering over City-owned vehicles and equipment. Covering vehicles in our northwest climate protects assets, increases productivity and safety, and promotes professionalism and cultural morale. Well-designed vehicle and equipment storage canopies offer Public Works crews the ability to safely prepare for and end their workday with increased efficiency and work satisfaction, taking advantage of good lighting in the dark winter months, dry space to load or unload their work trucks, hitch trailers, or leave trailers hitched and out of the weather for immediate access the following day.

Canopy-Covered Material Storage

As the City has grown over the past two decades, its generated volume of bulk materials has increased substantially. While not all bulk materials and products require canopy covering, certain items must be covered, and others should be as a best practice. Storm and Sewer system decant material (not including effluent), salt, and sand are all shown to be covered.

Item 2.

For the purposes of this study, "Options" will be referred to as "Scenarios", recognizing that the comparative approaches to accommodating a long-term solution require potential grouping of various strategies like different approaches to split operations. For this initial Part 1 work scope, two primary Scenarios are considered: 1) Split Operations (Existing Facility + a Satellite Facility) and 2) A Consolidated Facility on a new site. Actual satellite or consolidated sites have not yet been identified for specific study.

Additional study and evaluation under a future "Part 2" work scope will consider specific candidate properties for a more detailed analysis to determine the feasibility of each scenario.

Scenario 1 – Split Operations

Under this scenario, the existing Operations Facility would be expanded and renovated to accommodate as much of the recommended program as possible. A satellite site would be acquired and developed for the program area that cannot be accommodated at the existing facility. Figure 2 illustrates a conceptual approach to maximizing the redevelopment potential of the existing site and facilities. Square footage and parking data are included in this figure. This approach assumes that the existing storm pond is covered with surface area and stormwater managed subsurface. The plan also expands the site to the Southwest corner, utilizing the remaining triangular shaped site area.

Paired with the redevelopment of the existing Operations facility would be a 4-5-acre satellite site [CVA3] to accommodate the remaining program area that cannot be accommodated on the existing site. No specific site has been identified at this stage of the analysis. Rough "order of magnitude" costs for potential site development of a commercial property are estimated for initial comparative purposes as indicated in Table 3. Refer to the Preliminary Space Program in Section 1 for a summary of the program area identified for a satellite site.

Operations Personnel

As part of the programming workshop discussions, representatives from each work group were asked to consider the future delivery of services and what staffing levels may be necessary. Projections shown in Table 2 serve to highlight the potential future personnel growth necessary for Public Works Operations to not only maintain current service levels but continue responding to City growth and changes in regulations. While improved technology and equipment help to increase work productivity, planning ahead for reasonable growth in personnel is highly recommended. Programmatic implications particularly influence sizing of restroom and locker rooms, meeting spaces, and personal vehicle parking.

Table 2 – Current and 20-year Personnel Projections

2021	2041
7.43	11.43
4.61	6.86
2.93	11.18
4.43	12.43
8.11	18.86
6.11	17.86
14.43	20.43
2.43	6.43
4.43	6.43
55	112
	2021 7.43 4.61 2.93 4.43 8.11 6.11 14.43 2.43 4.43 55

Note: Fractions reflect the shared nature of positions across work groups

Development Scenarios

As noted in the Introduction, this initial study (Part 1) is intended to consider the expansion and renovation of the existing Operations Facility to accommodate recommended programmatic area and the potential order of magnitude cost delta for a consolidated facility on a new site. With this comparative data available, decisions can be made for taking future steps towards a long-range plan for facilities. (See Next Steps at the conclusion of this Executive Report).



Figure 2 - Conceptual Redevelopment of Existing Operations Facility Site

BUILDING NAME	AREA	PROGRAM
BUILING A.T	4.000 SH	ADMIN FACILITIES
RUE NING ALLS	8,000 SF	ADMIN & CREW SUPPORT SPACES
RUE SING A.2	6,000 SF	CREW FACTIMES
RULE DING A.3	10,000 SF	FIFFT SIGP
3011 DING A.4	1,920 57	CHASSS WASH & FOUPMENT ROOM
1011 DING A.5	3,000 SF	SLARTE SLOP SPACE & CENTRAL WARFLIGHS
300 NNG 3.1	4,320 51	COVIRID VEHC 1 SARKING & STORAGE
SUILDING 3.1d	960 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
PUILDING 9.2	2.850 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING C	10.975 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
PUILANG D	5.760 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
SUILANG :	3.840.5F	DEDICATED DEPARTMENT STORAGE 8 SHOPS
TOTAL BUILDING		

PROVIDED UNCOVERED PARKING

VISITOR	7	
CREW & STAFF	62	
CITY VEHICLE	9	

LEGEND

- ECCEND
 BUILDING A.1 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR FOR CREW & ADMIN TO BE REMODELED
 (4,000 SF)
 BUILDING A.2 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR FOR CREW & ADMIN TO BE REMODELED
 (6,000 SF)
 BUILDING A.1 HEW ARED SHOP (10,000 SF)
 BUILDING A.1 KISTING FLEET SHOP TO BE REMODELED FOR WAREHOUSE SPACE
 (2,000 SF)
 BUILDING S.1 EXISTING CAMOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING S.1 EXISTING CAMOPY (10,205 SF)
 BUILDING G.2 REW CAMOPY (10,205 SF)
 BUILDING G. NEW CAMOPY (10,205 SF)
 BUILDING G.1 EXTING FLEET FOR DEVELOPMENT
 LEVELOPMENT FOM (10,205 SF)
 ADDITIONAL SITE AREA TO INCLUDE IN OFS YARD DEVELOPMENT
 LDI-GLIEG STAIROM
 (2) STAFE & CERW PARKING
 AUTOMIC FLEES FARKING
 AUTOMIC FLEES FARKING
 AUTOMIC FLEES FARKING
 AUTOMIC FARKING
 AUTOMIC FARKING
 AUTOMIC FARKING
 AUTOMIC FARKING FARE
 AUTO

CITY OF CAMAS - EXISTING OPERATIONS FACILITY CONCEPTUAL REDEVELOPMENT TCF ARCHITECTURE DECEMBER 23, 2021



Scenario 2 – Consolidated Facility

Under this scenario, the City would acquire a site sufficient in size to accommodate the full recommended program, with room for future growth, and in a location that seeks to optimize the operational deployment of city maintenance services.

Based on the full recommended program for building and site operations, plus assumptions for site circulation, stormwater management, landscaping setbacks, etc., a site of at least 10 acres is anticipated for development Allowing for potential future expansion and areas of a particular site that may undevelopable, 12-15 acres should be considered.

Costs included in the budgetary estimate assume separate structures that group program types—including an administrative/crew building, heated shops building, and canopy structures—within particular building types.

If the City elects to proceed with additional study for this scenario, a site selection process will be conducted to identify potential site candidates, analyze the sites within established criteria, and determine a preferred site alternative for further evaluation and cost estimating.

Scenario Cost Comparison

Section 3 provides budgetary cost estimates for each scenario based on the Preliminary Program, conceptual redevelopment plan for the existing Operations Facility, and assumed acreage and development for new sites. The estimates are generated using current dollars (December 2021) and escalated two years to provide a baseline budgetary cost. This period represents the minimum time necessary for project implementation if decisions were to be made in early 2022 to pursue a particular development scenario.

Many assumptions are necessary at this early stage of strategic planning and analysis. Variables in scope and cost can be further reduced and clarified in subsequent stages of the alternatives analysis process. Table 3 provides a summary of the major budgetary categories and ROM grand totals for the two primary scenarios.

		Operations
Site Acquisition	\$3,000,000	\$9,000,000
Site Development/Off-Site	\$10,571,089	\$11,400,000
Buildings and Equipment	\$25,603,774	\$25,962,650
GC/CM Delivery	\$835,141	\$0
Subtotal Site and Bldgs	\$40,010,004	\$46,362,650
Soft Costs and FF&E	\$11,395,122	\$11,884,619
Subtotals Project Cost	\$51,405,126	\$58,247,269
Management Reserve (5%)	\$2,570,256	\$2,802,363
(1) Potential Land Sale	\$0	(\$2,200,000)
Crond Totala	\$53 975 382	\$58 849 632

Table 3 – Comparison of Estimated Scenario Costs

Scenario 1

Split Operations

Scenario 2

Consolidated

NEXT STEPS

Description

As indicated in the Introduction, the scope and cost information developed and presented in this initial study are intended to provide the City with essential planning-level information for understanding present realities faced by Public Works Operations, and the comparison of possible alternatives for facilities solutions. As internal discussions are held to consider the information presented herein, many additional questions are expected to arise. These questions will form the basis for follow-up work that will provide greater clarity and direction.

Additionally, although the Programming Workshops provided valuable input from Operations personnel, further definition of City goals, objectives, and vision for Public Works Operations is needed. Any subsequent planning work should include a focused process to articulate a vision statement supported by specific goals and metrics that will form the basis for all future decision making and solution implementation.

25



Section 1 – Preliminary Program

- Preliminary Space Program
- Equipment Storage Summary
- Existing Off-Site Storage Summary
- Personnel Analysis
- Vehicle / Parking Analysis
- Preliminary Equipment List
- Programming Agendas
- Programming Workshop Notes
- Programming Workshop Flip Chart Images
- Existing Operations Facility Photos

INTRODUCTION - PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Creation and development of the preliminary project program came together over several months of communication and exchanging of information between the City of Camas staff and TCF Design team throughout the Fall of 2021. To better facilitate productive discussion at future development workshops, a series of questionnaires were distributed to City of Camas management personnel. Filled out collectively by a representative sample of Operations and Management staff from each of the nine departments (Operations Admin, Streets, Solid Waste, Stormwater, Water, Sewer, Parks, Facilities, and Fleet), these provided a starting point to initiate more in-depth discussions.

TCF and consultant, FPS, then conducted a series of workshops over a twoday period on October 26th & 27th, extensively documenting existing material and equipment storage spread over several sites throughout the city and interviewing small groups from each department about day-to-day workflows, inefficiencies, and projections for future growth over a 20-year period. Utilizing knowledge of past projects of similar size and scope, TCF proposed some general organizational and diagrammatic solutions to address voiced program needs. These are documented along with meeting minutes from the Workshops in the latter pages of Section 1 of this report.

Utilizing the data collected in the workshops, TCF and FPS moved to translate this information into quantifiable square footages within a series of programming spreadsheets in the following pages. These breakdown size and scope of various types of spaces (Administrative, Maintenance, Fleet, Storage, and Parking), type of building needed (Heated, Canopy-Covered, Uncovered), and storage requirements for all materials and vehicles to be stored within them.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Item 2.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMMING

This space program was developed during a two-day (Oct 26-27/2021) series of workshops at the City of Camas Operations Center. The purpose of the programming workshops is to review all functions supporting City maintenance operations and develop a program of current and projected space needs tied to projections for anticipated City growth over a 20 year planning horizon. This program is intended for use in establishing a recommended minimum facility size and for evaluating the potential of the existing Operations Center and property to accommodate the recommended program.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The following City staff participated in the workshop with TCF:

Denis Ryan/Public Works Supervisor	Steve Klopman / Stormwater
Sam Adams / Utilities Manager	Michael Katzer / Water & Sewer
Richard Copsey / Streets	Brandon Prather / Water & Sewer
Scott Purkeypyle / Streets	Derek Engler / Water & Sewer
Garry Reed / Solid Waste	Matt Golphenee / Water & Sewer
Susan Wilde / Operations Administration	Nick MacQuarrie / Parks Maintenance
Tara Carlin / Operations Administration	Sean Alix / Parks Maintenance
TJ Crawford / Stormwater	Ryan Hickey / Facilities

TCF DESIGN TEAM

Randy Cook, Principal, TCF Architecture Coreen Van Asdell, TCF Architecture Mike Frei, Pricipal, Facilities Planning Services (FPS) Steve Fisher, Facilities Planning Services

PROGRAM AREA SUMMARY

SF The summary below provides the total building and site program areas (square footage) derived from the breakdown of all programmed spaces included in this document. The summary also indicated minumum recommended area for an Operations Facility Site if a new site is pursued.

Proposed Building Program Area			Existing Building Program Area		
Enclosed and Heated Program Area			Enclosed and Heated Program Area		
Admin / Crew Facilities 20.712		Admin / Crew Facilities	4,283	*Includes Ops staff trailer, excludes Police Work Group trailer & storage	
General Shops and Storage 10,631		General Shops and Storage	5,730	-	
Fleet Shops		10,381	Fleet Shops	3,100	
Total Enclosed / Heated Area		41,724	Total Enclosed / Heated Area	13,113	
Proposed Covered/Unheated Program Area			Existing Covered/Unheated Program Area		
Wash Bay / Vehicles / Miscellaneous		7,924	Covered Storage (Bldg B1, B1a, B2)	8,160	
Covered Bulk Materials Storage		66,173	Decant Station/Wash Bay	5,480	
Total Covered / Unheated Area		74,097	Total Covered / Unheated Area	13,640	
Total Building Program Area		115,821	Total Existing Ops Facility Bldg Area	26,753	
Proposed Site Program Area			Existing Site Program Area		
Uncovered Parking		48,864	Uncovered Parking	27,904	L = 10 (4,800), M = 57 (20,520), S = 11 (2,200), XS = 6 (384)
Uncovered Bulk Materials Storage		18,000	Uncovered Bulk Materials Storage	4,170	
Total Proposed Site Program Area		66,864	Total Existing Site Program Area	32,074	
Total Proposed Building Structure and Site Program		182,685	Total Existing Building Structure and Site Program	58,827	
Proposed Miss. Site Area			Existing Miss Site Area		
General Vard Circulation	100%	182 685	Ceneral Vard Circulation	56 775	
Stormwater and Landscape Area / Setbacks	50%	91 343	Police Work Group	3 225	
Total Proposed Misc. Minimum Recommended Site Area	5070	274.028	Stormwater and Landscape Area / Setbacks	43.643	
			Total Other Existing Site Area	103.643	
			TOTAL EXISTING SITE AREA	162.470	
			Existing Operations Facility Acreage (162,470 sf)	3.72	
			Existing Offsite Storage Area*	480	
			*Square footage of items currently stored at other City properties.		
TOTAL PROPOSED MINIMUM RECOMMENDED SITE AREA		456,713	Proposed Minimum Required Acreage	10.48	

PROGRAM SPLIT

Summary of Areas for				
Portions of Program to locate at Satellite Site				
Covered/Unheated		51,596		
Uncovered Program Area		4,375		
Subtotal Program Area		55,971		
General Yard Circulation	100%	55,971		
Landscape/StormSetbacks/Etc	50%	27,986		
Total Proposed Minimum Satellite Area		139,928	Proposed Minimum Required Acreage	3.21

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS STAFFING AND FUTURE GROWTH

The workshop participants discussed the current staffing levels and developed the following assessment and projections for the 20 year planning horizon. The program is based on a facility supporting 56 staff and crew with projected growth to 88 within 20 years. See below for a full breakdown.

Department	2021 Count	2041 Count
Streets	7.43	11.43
Solid Waste	4.61	6.86
Operations Admin.	2.93	11.18
Stormwater	4.43	12.43
Water	8.11	18.86
Sewer	6.11	17.86
Parks	14.43	20.43
Facilities	2.43	6.43
Fleet	4.43	6.43
Total Personnel	55	112

SUMMARY OF VEHICLES AND ROLLING STOCK EQUIPMENT

Vehicles and Rolling stock are categorized by several different sizes totaling **115** pieces currently with projected growth in 20 years to **153**. All items are expected to be canopy covered at a minimum, vehicles and equipment with weather sensitivity will be enclosed and heated. In addition to the programmed parking for city-owned maintenance vehicles, plan for **112** employee parking stalls plus **4** visitor stalls. See detailed vehicle parking analysis document for a full break down of vehicles and equipment.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Program Location

A = Program Area can be accommodated at a reconfigured Existing Operations Facility. (See conceptual layout plan) B = Program Area will be located at a Satellite Site * Indicates that, unless a single, cosolidated site is selected for all Operations, this program area should be located towards the north portion of the City.

Dont	atior	Space Description	No	Proposed	20 Year Program		General Space Purpose and	General Space Purpose and		ear ght	Other Criterie / Fruin / Frunishing Meede
Dept	Flo	Space Description	NO.	Standard	Area (SF) Qty. Tota	tal Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies	Hei Hei	Other Criteria / Equip. / Furnishing Needs	

ENCLOSED / HEATED FACILITIES

ADMINIS	TRA	FION	I / CREW / SHARED									
Shared	A	1	Lobby / Waiting Room	A1	10 x 12	120	1	120	Assume the building will require occasional access by public visitors & services	Visitor and crew parking, Reception	9+	(2-3) guest chairs and side table. Secure access to facility
Shared	A	1	Entry Vestibule	A2	8 x 10	80	1	80	Entrace vestibule for weather protection and additional security stage. Code-required	Lobby / Reception	9+	Walk-off mat material
Shared	A	1	Reception / Admin Asst.	A3	16 x 16	256	2	512	Open workstation with counter for public and vendor interaction	Lobby, PPE Storage	9+	Built-in reception counter / workstation for (4) employees, including (2) senior admins. Provide line of sight from reception desk to lobby and to entry area, parking, and crew yard if possible
Shared	A	1	PPE Storage/Office Work Room	A4	16 x 12	192	1	192	Storage for PPE Consumables & General Office Supplies. Area for printer/copier & Layout space.	Reception, Crew Areas	9'	Room or Alcove with cabinets & shelves, copier/printer, shelves for paper storage, 6-8 foot linear counter, recycle bins. Includes safety storage & Library. Accessible to Crew & Admin
Shared	A	1	Crew Entry Vestibule	A5	10 x 10	100	1	100	Secondary Access to building from Yard	Main circulation	9+	Controlled access/checkpoint. At current site w/ increased security (gates closed) foot traffic would increase through front desk area.
Shared	А	1	Public Restroom	A6	8 x 8	64	1	64	Unisex restroom serving public	Lobby, Reception	9'	Toilet, sink, floor drain, lockable with occupancy sensor
Shared	A	2	EOC/Resource Room/Conference Room	A7	24 x 34	816	1	816	Space for meetings up to (25) people & large map layout space + Map storage	Admin & Lead Office space	9'	Table with up to (15) chairs, white board, TV wall for emergency ops use and/or projectors, & full height cabinet storage & Layout table/alcove for map storage. Built-in shelving to store maps rolled, flat, and/or hanging. Confirm quantity of drawings and maps.
Shared	A	2	Crew Room	A8	25 x 70	1,750	1	1,750	Secure room for crew to work on laptops or do paperwork. Sized for (69) people	Supervisor offices; adjacent to Resource Room/EOC	12'	(69) 4' wide sit down workstations with 5' high partitions, with stool seating & drawer storage, work table with (4) chairs, white board and TV, copier/printer, bookshelf & tall cabinet storage, resource library, plotter,(1) computer station. Assumed 69 crew staff between Ops and Utilities by 2041, multiplied by 25sf/person. Could maybe split into (2) rooms?
Shared	A	2	Director Office	A9	12 x 16	192	1	192	Private office for director	Lobby, Crew Areas	9'	Prefer views to yard. Workstation with small conference table & up to (3) chairs, bookshelves, white board. Should this office be bigger than Supervisor Offices even though Director isn't present all the time?
Shared	A	2	Supervisor Office	A10	12 x 16	192	2	384	Private office for O&M Supervisor & (Future)Utilities Supervisor	Lobby, Crew Areas	9'	Prefer views to yard. Workstation with (2) additional chairs at desk, bookshelves, white board

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dent	ation	Snace Description	No.	Proposed Space Standard	20 Year Program			General Space Purpose and	Adiacencies	ear abt	본 역 Other Criteria / Equip. / Furnishing Needs
Dept	Loc				Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies		j Other Criteria / Equip. / Turnishing Neeus
Shared	A	2 Manager Office	A11	10 x 12	120	2	240	Private office for Utilities Manager + (1) flex office	Lobby, Crew areas	9'	Prefer views to yard. Workstation with (2) additional chairs at desk, bookshelves, white board
Shared	A	2 Lead/Senior Open Office	A12	40 x 40	1,600	1	1,600	Open workstation space for (14) Lead & Senior Positions	Lobby, Crew Areas		small workstation space (5' linear?) for (23) Lead & Senior positions + 8x8 desk module. Possibly oversized?
Shared	А	2 Stormwater Engineering	A13	14 x 14	196	1	196	Shared private office for Stormwater engineer & (2) stormwater tech support	Lobby, Crew areas	9'	(3) workstations, bookshelves, white board
Shared	А	2 Tech Support/GIS Office	A14	10 x 12	120	3	360	Private office for (Future) Tech Support/GIS position	Lobby, Crew Areas		Workstation, bookshelves
Shared	Α :	&2 Small Conference Room	A15	10 x 12	120	2	240	Small conference room for vendor's/private phone calls	Offices	9'	Small conference table with up to (4) chairs, white board
Shared	A	2 Large Conference Room	A16	20 x 34	680	1	680	Large Conference Room for (20) people	Offices, Resource Room/EOC	9'	Large conference table with up to (20) chairs, white board. Side credenza/casework, TV/Projector
Shared	A	2 Personal Conf/Mother's Room	A17	10 x 10	100	1	100	Private room w/ Occupancy Sensor	Offices, Crew areas	9'	Microwave, sink, & undercounter fridge, personal storage space. (1) Lounge chair + adjacent side table & outlets.
Shared	A	1 Large Multipurpose Room	A18	36 x 72	2592	1	2,592	Meeting area for all departments. Water/Sewer crews use for morning tailgate. Sized for roughly (40) people, each bay.	Supervisor offices; adjacent to Ops Crew Resource Room	12'	Operable dividing wall subdivides space into (3) separate rooms. Total room occupancy for (120) people when combined. TV and/or projector, white boards & AV equipment in each of (3). Counter with sink. This space is oversized to account for the larger meeting space needs
Shared	А	1 Table & Chair Storage	A19	8 x 10	80	1	80	Storage room for tables & chairs in Crew meeting rooms	Large Multipurpose Room	9'	Double door
Shared	А	2 Unisex Restroom	A20	8 x 8	64	2	128	Unisex restroom	Office Areas	9'	Toilet, sink, floor drain, lockable with occupancy sensor
Shared	A	1 Break Room/Kitchen	A21	28 x 30	840	1	840	Shared by all staff and crew for (65-75) people. Kitchen area shared by all staff and crew.	Crew Areas, Exterior patio	12'	(2) full size refrigerators, (1) full size freezer, (6) microwaves, possible dishwasher, possible range, lower and upper cabinets, sink. Island or Serving Counter. Includes pantry with extra cabinets for emergency storage. Up to (2) vending machines, standalone ice machine.
Shared	A	2 Wellness Room	A22	16 x 20	320	1	320	Workout room for up to (5) people	Centrally located near locker rooms areas. Could be 2nd level	10'	Tread mill, excersize bike, stair stepper, free weights
Shared	A	1 Laundry Alcove	A23	10 x 16	160	1	160	Utility alcove for industrial washer & dryer (possibly use residential W/D)	Locker rooms	8'	Separate "pre-wash" units to be provided for Sewer. (2) Commercial-grade washers, (2) Commerical-grade dryers, counter space, hanging rods, wash sink.
Shared	A	Men's Mud Room/Wet Locker Room	A24	35 x 50	1,750	1	1,750	Space for storage and drying of wet gear / bulky gear.	Adjacent to men's locker rooms, exterior access, boot wash	10'	Potential for locker room space to be gender neutral w/ separate changing/Shower/Toilet Areas. Provide space for up to (100) lockers, 18"x18", full height cage style lockers. Boot dryers integrated into base of lockers, bench, floor drains.
Shared	A	1 Men's Locker / Toilet Room	A25	25 x 40	1,000	1	1,000	Private men's locker and toilet room. Toilets, sinks per plumbing code. Provide (2-3) private shower stalls.	Men's Mud room, wellness room	10'	Provide space for up to (100), 12"x12" wide full height lockers with concrete base. Bench, floor drains. (Allow expansion space for up to 15 more lockers).

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dept		or	Space Description	No	Proposed	20 Ye	ear Pro	gram	General Space Purpose and	Adiacencies	ear lut	± Other Criteria / Equin / Eurnishing Needs
Dept	Loc	FIG	space Description	NU.	Standard	Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies	Lei Hai	Johner Chteria / Lyuip. / Furnishing Neeus
Shared	A	1	Women's Mud Room/Wet Locker Room	A26	12 x 24	288	1	288	Space for storage and drying of wet gear / bulky gear.	Adjacent to women's locker rooms, exterior access, boot wash	10'	Potential for locker room space to be gender neutral w/ separate changing/Shower/Toilet Areas. Provide space for up to (12), 18"x18", full height cage style lockers. Boot dryers integrated into base of lockers, bench, floor drains.
Shared	A	1	Women's Locker / Toilet Room	A27	20 x 30	600	1	600	Private women's locker and toilet room. Toilets, sinks per plumbing code. Provide (1) private shower stall.	Women's Mud room, wellness room	10'	Provide space for up to (12), 12"x12" wide full height lockers with concrete base. Bench, floor drains. Allow expansion space for up to 6 additional lockers
Shared	A	1	Unisex Shower Room	A28	6 x 8	48	1	48	Unisex private shower stall, ADA accessible	Unisex restroom	8'	Tile, shower accessories, floor drain
Shared	Α	1	Custodial Room	A29	5 x 8	40	2	80	Mop sink/rack	Central to building	8'	Floor Drain
Shared	А	2	IT Room	A30	10 x 14	140	1	140	IT equipment	Centrally located, Admin	8'	Plywood walls.
Shared	Α	2	Electrical Room	A31	10 x 10	100	1	100	Electrical equipment	Central to building	8'	Plywood walls.
Shared	Α	2	Mechanical Room	A32	10 x 18	180	1	180	Mechanical equipment	Central to building	10'	
			SUBTOTAL AREA					15,932				
			Circulation / Walls / Misc			30%		4,780				
			TOTAL ADMIN / CREW					20,712				
			Approximate Split between F	loors		1st Floor		9,984				
						2nd Floor		10,728				
ENCLOSE	D AN	ND H	IEATED SHOPS / STORAGE	/ VEHIC	LES & EQU	IPMENT						
Shared	A	1	Wood Shop	M1	20 x 20	400	1	400	Multi-use Facilities workspace between all departments except Fleet.	Facilities Storage	16'	Mono-point or swinging jib arm at (1) overhead door to transfer material into show spaces (heaviest are hydrants, anvils, manhole covers). Wood/Carpentry : Table saw, chop saw portable hand tools, work bench, moveable table, air, vise, central vac dust.
Shared	A	1	Metal Shop + Staging Space	M2	20 x 30	600	1	600	includes staging area between metal and wood shops	Central		Metal Fabrication: ventilation for equipment, welder for catchbasins & field grate repair, dam components, and handrails (storm, max. 500lbs), central vac dust, drill press, band saw (horizontal & vertical), buffer grinder, pipe threader (for Water), plasma cutter(storm), Welder (both wire-feed & gas), work bench, moveable table. Paint: Paint Booth for items up to picnic table size (8' deep x 12' wide). Ability to prime/paint. Spray down gun/area adjacent to paint booth w/ waste disposal container for cleaning paint off equipment.
Shared	A	1	Future Stock Warehouse	M3	20 x 60	1,200	1	1,200	Inventory for all departments under audit control.	Central to site Operations.	23'	Pallet racking (4) high. Climate controlled
Shared	A	1	Unisex Restroom	M4	8 x 8	64	1	64	Unisex restroom in shop area if distance to crew areas is determined to be too far.	Shops	9'	Toilet, sink, urinal, floor drain, lockable with occupancy sensor. Should be directly accessible from the exterior.
Streets	A	1	Sign Shop	M5	20 x 20	400	1	400	Shop for sign fabrication/repair	Facilities Shop	16'	Computer workstation, air & electricity connections overhead, plotter, 8'x8' overhead door from exterior. Sign posts, blanks, inventoried signs, roling table. Still undecided if a full sign shop is desired by the City. Priority is to reface/reuse faded signs that would otherwise be thrown out.

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS

Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dont	Dent of	Space Description	No	Proposed	20 Year Program			General Space Purpose and	Adiacencies	aht a	ti Other Criteria / Equin / Eurnishing Needs	
Dept	Loc	Ę	Space Description	NO.	Standard	Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies	H C	
Shared	А	1	Hazmat Storage	M6	20 x 30	600	1	600	Shared Hazmat storage facility, no paint booth	Shops	12'	Herbicide/Pesticides: (3 pallets - Parks, 1 pallet - Streets). Paint storage: (50) 5-gal. buckets (Parks), (200) 5-gal. buckets (Streets). Chlorine: current capacity for Water use but will need to expand to cover future City Spray Park. Fertilizer: (3 pallets - Parks. Graffiti Remover: (12) 1/2-gal. jugs. Fluoride: unknown quantity - Water/Sewer use. Central Hazmat Disposal: sharps, batteries, chemicals, fluorescent lights, appliances, waste oil. Homeless Encampment Impound: store material for 60 days in secured bins prior to disposal.
Parks	A	1	Parks Storage/Shop	M7	20 x 40	800	1	800	General storage area	Facility Storage	16'	Includes Playgroud Equipment Storage/triage, general bulk storage of restroom supplies (TP, soap, cleaners, doggie bags, paper towels, misc. recreation (life jackets, nets), holiday décor. Pallet rack storage. Bulk storage may need to be interior, rest outside, covered? Urinal/Toilet repair should move more into Facilities' wheelhouse in future. Could share racked storage bay w/ Parks for this?
Facilities	A	1	Facilities Storage/Shop	M8	20 x 20	400	1	400	General storage Area	Parks Storage		Shared Bay w/ Parks (in addition to Park's dedicated bay). Restroom repair (urinals, toilets, etc.), future bulk storage of janitorial supplies (reabsorb scope in future - current service is private contract \$150k/yr).
Water	A	1	Water Meter Testing	M9	20 x 20	400	1	400	Miscellaneous shop working space and storage	Other shop spaces, STEP Pump Repair (potential shared space)	16'	Dedicated work bench & rolling rack storage for meters.
Water	A	1	Water Storage	M10	20 x 40	800	1	800	Miscellaneous shop working space and vehicle storage	Other shop spaces	16'	14'x14' overhead door. Vehicle in space. Meter pallet storage (meter maintenance program turnover every 5-7 years). General storage for meter boxes, hydrants, lids, chemical feed pumps, pump motors oil, oil pump motors, valves/clay valves. (Would prefer Central Storage Warehouse method for new stock w/ remaining in dedicated Water Storage Bay).
Sewer	A	1	Sewer Storage	M11	20 x 40	800	1	800	Miscellaneous shop working space and vehicle storage. STEP Pump Repair Work space for pump repair & storage	Water Meter Testing	16'	Wall storage for 5k pumps (existing & new) 3' tall ea., and storage for associated tools & replacement parts. Area for washing, scissor table, workbench.
Storm	А	1	Stormwater Storage	M12	20 x 20	400	1	400	Miscellaneous shop working space and vehicle storage	Other shop spaces	16'	Pallet rack storage. Rack storage for Catchbasin tops & stock barricades.
Shared	A	1	Wash Bay Equipment Room	M13	10 x 30	300	1	300	Houses water reclaim system & other wash bay equipment.	General Purpose and Chassis Wash Bays	16	Exterior man door access, 8'x8' overhead door. Floor drain. Oilk-water separation water reclaim equipment
Shared	A	1	Large Vehicle Parking	M14	12 x 40	480	2	960	See complete vehicle analysis document. This area i dedicated to vactor trucks. Planning for 2	s Other enclosed vehicle storage	16'	14'x'14' overhead door, trench drain.
Shared	А	1	Medium Vehicle Parking	M15	12 x 30	360	2	720	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other enclosed vehicle storage	16'	14'x'14' overhead door, trench drain.
Shared	Α	1	Small Vehicle Parking	M16	10 x 20	200	2	400	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other enclosed vehicle storage	16'	14'x'14' overhead door, trench drain.

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS

Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dept	ation	oor	Space Description	No.	Proposed	20 Ye	ear Prog	gram	General Space Purpose and	Adiacencies	ear	z Other Criteria / Equip. / Eurnishing Needs
Popt	Lo	FI	opuse 2 comption		Standard	Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	1	Ξ.	
Streets	А	1	X-Small Vehicle Parking	M17	8 x 8	64	0	-	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other enclosed vehicle storage	16	' 14'x'14' overhead door, trench drain.
			SUBTOTAL AREA					9,244				
			Circulation / Walls / Misc			15%		1,387				
			MAINTENANCE / SHOPS / VE	HICLES 8	& EQUIPMEN	т		10,631				
FLEET SI	HOP F	ACI	LITIES									
Fleet	A	1	Heavy Repair Bay	F1	20 x 55	1,100	3	3,300	Large Vehicle Maintenance Bay	Fleet Shop	24	Utilize wireless mobile column lifts. 14'x14' overhead doors. Lube reels, work tables, air & power. Drive through bay
Fleet	A	1	Light Repair Bay	F2	20 x 40	800	3	2,400	Automotive Vehicle Maintenance Bay	Fleet Shop	24	14'x14' overhead doors. Lube reels, work tables, air & power.
Fleet	Α	1	Hydraulic hose workstation	F3	8 x 12	96	1	96	cutting / crimping workbench	Fleet Shop	12	
Fleet	A	1	Secured Consumables Room	F4	10 x 15	150	1	150	Consumables Storage	Fleet Shop	12	
Fleet	A	1	Parts Storage	F5	20 x 20	400	1	400	Parts storage room, including central receiving area	Fleet Shop	12	
Fleet	A	2	Parts Storage Mezzanine	F6	20 x 20	400	1	400	Parts storage room, including central receiving area	Fleet Shop	12	 This mezzanine can be as large as the building allows. Use for other general storage.
Fleet	A	1	Fluids Storage	F7	10 x 20	200	1	200	Storage for bulk oil, lube, & fluids.	Fleet Shop	9'	Does not need to be enclosed room separate from shop. Double door to main shops, man door to exterior.
Fleet	Α	1	Tire Shop	F8	15 x 15	225	1	225	tire changing / balancing equip	Fleet Shop	12	1
Fleet	A	1	Welding/ Fabrication Bay	F9	20 x 55	1,100	1	1,100	aluminum & steel fabrication shop.	Fleet Shop	12	14'x14' overhead door. 3'x6' welding table, TIG & MIG Welders, Plasma cutter, drill press, horiz. band saw, grinder, break & shear, hyd. Press, acet/oxy, vise, misc. cabinets, brake lathe.
Fleet	A	1	Office	F10	10 x 12	120	1	120	Supervisor Office	Fleet Shop, Fleet Bays	9'	Prefer views to Fleet Bays. Workstation with (2) additional chairs at desk, bookshelves, white board
Fleet	А	1	Break Room	F11	10 x 14	140	1	140	Break area for (3-4) people	Office, Restroom	9'	Includes kitchenette with sink, fridge, microwave, table for (4) people, shelf
Fleet	A	1	Unisex Restroom	F12	10 x 12	120	1	120	Enlarged unisex restroom serving fleet shop, including fleet lockers.	Office, Break Room	9'	(3-4) 18" cage lockers and bench. Toilet, sink, urinal, floor drain, lockable with occupancy sensor. Should be directly accessible from exterior.
			SUBTOTAL AREA					8,651				
			Circulation / Walls / Misc			20%		1,730				
	FLEET							10,381				
			TOTAL ENCLOSED / HEATED	FACILITI	ES			41,724				

COVERED / UNHEATED FACILITIES

 Wash / Fuel / Misc

 Shared
 B 1 Wash Bay
 M18 20 x 65
 1,300 2
 2,600
 Drive through general purpose wash bays for shared use by all crews.
 Can be near other areas needing convenient truck access. Adjacent of Chassi 16
 If determined to be enclosed, provide 14'x14' overhead doors. access. Adjacent of Chassi 16
 Catwalk on one side. 1-1/2 inch hose connection plus manual wash bay and equipment room

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dont	Dent ation	or	Space Description	No	Proposed	20 Ye	ear Pro	gram	General Space Purpose and	Adjaconcios	ear oht	번 역 Other Criteria / Equip. / Furnishing Needs
Dept	Loci	Flo	space Description	NU.	Standard	Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies	Cle	ji Other Chtera / Lyuip. / Furnishing Neeus
Fleet	A	1	Chassis Wash Bay	M19	20 x 65	1,300	1	1,300	Drive through bay with steam cleaning & under carriage spray for use primarily by Fleet mechanics.	Adjacent to General Purpose Wash Bays and Equipment Room	16'	Steam cleaning & under carriage spray. Manual wash wand with high pressure water & soap. Consider minimal slab heat for anti-freezing if bay is not enclosd and heated.
Shared	A	1	Boot Wash	A33	8 x 10	80	1	80	Cleaning of boots before entering the building, exterior space with canopy	Crew Vestibule on yard side of main building	10	Hose bib, sump, grating, boot scrubber
Shared	A	1	Exterior patio	A34	15 x 40	600	1	600	Outside space for staff and crew	Kitchen and Break room	12'	BBQ, partially covered, enough covered area for (40-60) people
Shared	A	1	Facilities Storage	M20	4 x 30	120	1	120	Racking & material storage for various items. Includes Facilities dry goods inventory. Tall, linear, covered storage racking with adjustable rack arms	⁵ Facilities Shop, Facilities Dry Goods Inventory.	16'	Desired 20' length pipe rack storage (Water & Stormwater),bar & angle stock (stormwater), steetlight poles, 8' and 16' lumber lengths (concrete formwork), 4'x8' plywood sheets, filter storage (50 count) stacked and covered, general boneyard storage. Racking accessible by forklift. Stormwater would like catchbasin tops stored on-site & in-stock.
Shared	В	1	Decommissioned Vehicle Storage	C1	12 x 40	480	2	960	Large Vehicle	Other canopy spaces	16'	
Shared	В	1	Decommissioned Vehicle Storage	C2	12 x 30	360	3	1,080	Medium Vehicle	Other canopy spaces	16'	
Shared	А	1	Fueling	M21	10 x 15	150	1	150	Small vehicle fueling			(2) 55-gal. drums shared by all Ops. departments.
			SUBTOTAL AREA			450/		6,890				
	COVERED / UNHEATED PROGRAM AREA					1,034 7,924						
CANODY	-00	FDF				OBAGE						
Street	A		Brine Equipment	C3	35 x 35	1,225	1	1,225	Canopy covered area for brine equipment	Other materials storage	20'	White Rock Salt (produce brine on-site): +/- 300 ton. Liquid Salt (completed brine): 20k gallons (2x 10k gallons). Confirm brine equipment needs. If no brine system: 100-150 ton iceslicer.
Steet	А		De-icer		4 x 4	16	1	16				Pure Calcium Chloride: 200-250 gal. (Streets)
Shared	В		Decant	C4	40 x 100	4,000	2	8,000	Water or storm decant. Separate site if staying on current site.	Other site storage, Sewer Decant	24'	Decant Storm: 40 yards/day from catchbasin cleaning (20 yd water + 5-10 yd. solids). Produce 35-40 yds solids/week, need 1000 yd max pile of decant solids storage pile. Decant Streets: leaves/organics (solid waste), 40 yd capacity. Streets would prefer centralized hubs (North, Central, South) offsite for this.
Shared	В		Decant	C5	40 x 40	1,600	2	3,200	Sewer	Other site storage, Storm/Water decant	24'	Decant Sewer: (2) bays w/ 20 yard capacity. Same location as Storm/Street Decant but isolated.
Parks	В		Materials Storage	C6	16 x 16	256	1	256	Covered sand storage, (75 ton)	Other materials storage	10'	Material stored 10' high. Ecology blocks to 12' AFF.
Solid Waste	В		Bin Storage & Wash	M22	16 x 50	800	1	800	Stacked bin storage & bin "bidet"	Wash Bay? Could be offsite location?		Covered "box" enclosure on concrete pad. Confirm if location is on main site or off-site, centralized? Confirm bin quantities for ea. of (3) types. Wash capacity is 50-60 bins at a time. 35 gal: 350 @ 3 high = 467sf. 60 gal: 250 @ 3 high = 333sf. 300 gal: 6 @ 6 high = 64sf. 450 gal: 20 @ 6 high = 256sf.
Streets	В		Crematorium	M23	10 x 10	100	1	100	Contained storage & crematorium for road kill.		16'	Confirm capacity & crematorium equipment needs. Propose 30" diameter x 7'-0" unit on 10'x10' concrete pad.
Police	В		General Storage	M24	20 x 20	400	1	400	Work Crew equipment Storage	N/A	16'	
						-				-		

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Dept	ation	Enore Description	No	Proposed	20 Year Program			General Space Purpose and	Adiaconsias	ear ght	Other Criteria / Equin / Eurniching Needs
	Loc		NO.	Standard	Area (SF)	Qty.	Total Area	Design Criteria	Aujacencies	Hei	Other Criteria / Equip. / Furnishing Neeus
Shared	A/B	Large Vehicle Parking	C7	12 x 40	480	13	6,240	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'	
Shared	A/B	Medium Vehicle Parking	C8	12 x 30	360	101	36,360	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'	
Shared	Α	Small Vehicle Parking	C9	10 x 20	200	13	2,600	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'	
Shared	Α	X-Small Vehicle Parking	C10	8 x 8	64	15	960	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'	
		SUBTOTAL AREA					60,157				
		Circulation / Walls / Misc			10%		6,016				
		TOTAL COVERED / UNHEATE	D				66,173				
		Approx Spilt Parking between	n		Ops Site		23,800				
		Ops and Satellite Sites			Satellite		34,200				
CITY OF CAMAS

Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

									1
Dept	Location	Space Description	No.	Proposed Space Standard	20 Year Program Area (SF) Qty. Total Area	General Space Purpose and Design Criteria	Adjacencies	Clear Height	Other Criteria / Equip. / Furnishing Needs

SITE FACILITIES

PARKING	G - UNC	OVERED								
Shared		Large Vehicle Parking	S1	12 x 40	480	0	-	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'
Shared		Medium Vehicle Parking	S2	12 x 30	360	0	-	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'
Shared	Α	Small Vehicle Parking	S3	10 x 20	200	6	1,200	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'
Shared		X-Small Vehicle Parking	S4	8 x 8	64	0	-	See complete vehicle analysis document	Other canopy spaces	16'
Shared		Employee Parking	S5	10 x 20	200	112	22,400		Administration building	In secure fenced area, ADA stalls as required. (2) electric charging spots
Shared		Visitor Parking	S6	10 x 20	200	4	800		Main entry	In unfenced area. ADA stalls as required, (1) electric charging spot.
Shared		Bicycle Parking	S7	4 x 8	32	1	32		Main entry	
		SUBTOTAL AREA					24,432			
		Circulation			100%		24,432			
		Total Parking					48,864			
BULK M	ATERIAI	LS / MISCELLANEOUS SITE I	TEMS - U	INCOVERED						
Shared	А	Generator	S8	12 x 25	300	1	300	Concrete Pad	Centrally located	Power full site
Shared	В	Garbage Bins - 35 gal	S9	15 x 30	450	1	450	City stock of garbage bins for commercial/residential use	Other site storage	24"x24" = 4 sq.ft. x 350 on hand, stacked (3) high
Shared	В	Garbage Bins - 60 gal	S10	15 x 25	375	1	375	City stock of garbage bins for commercial/residential use	Other site storage	24"x24" = 4 sq.ft. x 250 on hand, stacked (3) high
Shared	В	Garbage Bins - 300 gal	S11	5 x 15	75	1	75	City stock of garbage bins for commercial/residential use	Other site storage	96"x96" = 64 sq.ft. x 6 on hand, stacked (6) high
Shared	В	Garbage Bins - 450 gal	S12	15 x 15	225	1	225	City stock of garbage bins for commercial/residential use	Other site storage	96"x96" = 64 sq.ft. x 20 on hand, stacked (6) high
Shared	A	Dumpsters	S13	10 x 20	200	7	1,400	Dumpsters & Recycling for all Dept. needs. Provide teardown/layout area for metal recycling.	Easily accessible by collection vehicle.	Garbage, metal recycling (multiple types), road kill, asphalt waste, concrete waste up to (10) yards container. Maintain clear area for drop off and pick up by vendor. Access for dump truck to dump directly from elevated platform.
Shared	В	Bulk Materials Storage	S14	25 x 50	1,250	1	1,250	Ecology block separators for material storage.	Other site storage Could be located at central facility on another site.	Ecology Block separators to 12' AFF. O rganics from excavations, grass clippings, trees, leaves (Stormwater/Streets/Parks).
Streets	В	Bulk Materials Storage	S15	25 x 50	1,250	1	1,250	Ecology block separators for material storage.	Other site storage	5/8m Gravel: 150 ton.
Streets	В	Bulk Materials Storage	S16	25 x 50	1,250	1	1,250	Ecology block separators for material storage.	Other site storage	1.25m Gravel: 150 ton.
Streets	В	Bulk Materials Storage	S17	25 x 25	625	1	625	Ecology block separators for material storage.	Other site storage	Gabion: 75 ton.
		Subtotal					7,200			
		Circulation			150%		10,800			
		Total Bulk Materials					18,000			

	-			04.0.00				Shelf L	ev. Qty.*	Palle	t Qty.	Palle	et Qty.	
				Storag	je iype			(Wk.	Stock)	(Wk.	Stock)	(Over	stock)	
line	Description		/er	6						_		_		Commonte
no.	Description		lev	jņ	e	ing	. Bu	ing	. Ę	ing	. ਦ	ing	. ਦ	Comments
		alle	ant	Jit Jit	n oe	ang	ooi agi	cist	y v	cist	Y V	cist	Y V	
		Å Å	ΰữ	to D	Š	Ϊ	E S	Ê	G G	ш	G G	ш	G G	
1	FACILITIES													
2	Lumber Storage		Х								2			part of Carpentry Shop
3	Plywood Storage		Х								2			part of Carpentry Shop
4	Sheet Metal Storage		Х								2			part of Metals Shop
5	Metals Extrusions/Bar		Х								2			part of Metals Shop
6	HVAC Storage	Х									1			future
7	Electrical Storage	Х									1			future
8														
9						Su	bTotals	0	0	0	10	0	0	
10														
11	FLEET MAINTENANCE													
12	Vehicle Seats	х										10	10	
13	Body Parts	Х								3	3			
14	Elec. Cables	Х								1	1			
15	Extension cords			Х				1	1					
16	Tubing			Х				1	1					
17	Air/Water hose	Х		Х				1	1	1	1			
18	Filters			Х				1	1					
19	Hydraulic Oil			Х				1	1					
20	Vac. Pump Oil Pallet	Х								1	1			
21	Antifreeze Pallet	Х								1	1			
22	Chains	Х								5	5			
23	Misc. Winter Pallets	Х								3	3			
24	DEF Fluid Tote	Х								1	1			
25	Tire Storage Pallets	Х										24	24	
26	Tire Storage Units	Х										5	5	
27	Misc. Pallets	Х								5	5			
28														
29		a	-		-	Su	bTotals	5	5	21	21	39	39	
30														
31	GROUNDS / PARKS &	REC.												
32	Grass Seed	Х								0	2]		
33	Playground Equipment						Х			20	20			
34	Restroom Supplies			Х				2	2					tp, soap, etc.
35	Restroom Repair			Х				2	2					urinals, toilets
36	Misc. Recreation			Х				2	2					life jackets, nets

				Storag				Shelf Le	ev. Qty.*	Palle	t Qty.	Palle	t Qty.	
				Storay	e Type	-		(Wk. \$	Stock)	(Wk. 9	Stock)	(Over	stock)	
line	Description		ver	ອ		5	_	-		-		-		Comments
no.	2000.1910.1	L L	ile	kin (Ire	gin	ing	tinç	۲ ۲ .	tinç	਼ ਦੂ	tinç	਼ ਦੂ	
		alle	ant	hel	ect	anç	loo tag	xis	0 yi	xis	lo y	xis	lo y	
37	Holiday Décor			ິ	S	T	шo	ш	0 0	<u>Ш</u> 1		ш	0 0	tractor
38	Traction Melt Pallet	X								1	1			
30	Street Asphalt Pallet	X								1	1			
40	Pelletized Gypsum	X								1	1			
41	Misc. Pallets	X								2	2	_		
42	Chain link Fencing	X								1	1			
43	Orange Fencing	X								1	1			
44	Garbage Bins	Х								2	2			
45	Irrigation Fittings			Х				1	2					
46	PVC Pipe		Х							2	2			
47	Tools													
48	Power Tools	Х		Х				2	2					Secured
49	Hand Tools					Х	Х			1	1			
50														
51						Sul	bTotals	9	10	33	35	0	0	
52														
53	SANITATION / SOLID W	ASTE												
														24"x24" = 4 sq.ft. x 350 on hand =
														1,400 / 3 high stacked = 467 sq.ft.
54	Garbage Bins 35 gallon						Х							required, stored at off-site location
														24"x24" = 4 sq.ft. x 250 on hand =
														1,000 / 3 high stacked = 333 sq.ft.
55	Garbage Bins 60 gallon						X							required, stored at off-site location
														96 X96 = 64 Sq.II. X 6 00 hand =
56	Carbaga Pina 200 gallan						v							sourced at aff aita logation
50	Garbage bins 500 gallon					^							96"x96" = 64 sq ft x 20 on hand =	
													1280/6 high stacked = 213 sq ft	
57	Garbage Bins 450 gallon						х							required, stored at off-site location
58														.,
59		<u>.</u>	•	-		Su	bTotals	0	0	0	0	0	0	
60														

		Storage Typ						Shelf Lo (Wk. \$	ev. Qty.* Stock)	Palle (Wk.	t Qty. Stock)	Palle (Over	et Qty. stock)	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Comments
61	STORMWATER													
62	Catch Basin Tops	Х								0	4			
63	Stormwater Piping		x											covered yard storage, 20' lengths
64	Lumber Stoage		x											formwork
65	Filter Storage	X	^							4	4			
66	Misc. Storage Pallets	X								2	2			
67	Barricade Storage						Х			4	8			
68	¥													
69	Tools													
70	Power Tools	Х		Х				2	2					Secured
71	Hand Tools					Х	Х			1	1			
72	Misc. Storage Pallets						Х			2	2			
73														
74					-	Su	bTotals	`	2	13	21	0	0	
75														
76	STREETS													
77	Non-Rolling Stock Equip													
78	de-icer units	Х								3	3			on pallet rack
79	paint striper						Х			1	1			
80	misc. equip.	Х					Х			2	2			
81	lighting	Х					Х			4	4	6	6	
82	generators						Х			2	2			
83	pressure washer						Х	-		1	1			
84	traffic cones	Х					Х			1	1			
	replacement de-icer													
85	pumps pallet	X				ļ				1	1			
86	Tools				ļ	ļ					ļ		ļ	
87	Power Tools	X		Х				3	3	L				Secured
88	Hand Lools					Х	Х				1			
89	Bulk Material Bunkers		1							1				

				Storag	е Туре			Shelf Lo (Wk. S	ev. Qty.* Stock)	Palle (Wk. S	t Qty. Stock)	Palle (Over	et Qty. stock)	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Comments
90	5/8 gravel	x					x							150 tons (x 0.714 = 107 cu.yds. x 9 = 963 / 2 = 482 sq.ft.) required, ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage
91	1-1/4 gravel	x					x							150 tons (x 0.714 = 107 cu.yds. x 9 = 963 / 2 = 482 sq.ft.) required, ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage
92	Sand						x							75 tons (x 0.714 = 54 cu.yds. x 9 = 486 / 2 = 241 sq.ft.) required (covered), ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage
93	Gabion						x							75 tons (x 0.714 = 54 cu.yds. x 9 = 486 / 2 = 241 sq.ft.) required , ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage
94	Indoor, dry cold mixes concrete						x							15 tons (x 0.714 = 11 cu.yds. x 9 = 99 / 2 = 50 sq.ft.) required , ecology block separators to 12' AFF, indoor heated
95	Brine													300 tons (x 0.714 = 214 cu.vds. x
96	White Rock Salt						x							9 = 1926 / 2 = 963 sq.ft.) required, ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage, covered
07	Liquid Salt Tanks						V							20k gallons required (2x 10k
97	(Completed Brine) Calcium Chloride Tote						X							galion tanks), off-site storage, 4'x4' tote 200-250 gallons off-site
98		x								1	1			storage

				Storag	е Туре			Shelf Le (Wk. S	ev. Qty.* Stock)	Palle (Wk. 3	et Qty. Stock)	Palle (Over	t Qty. stock)			
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Comments		
99	Waste / Recycle															
100	Concrete / Asphalt Debris						x							75 tons (x 0.714 = 54 cu.yds. x 9 = 486 / 4 = 122 sq.ft.) required, ecology block separators to 12' AFF, off-site storage		
101	Scrap Metal (ferrous)						х							storage		
102	Scrap Metal (non-ferrous)						х							aluminum, copper, brass, off-site storage, 4'x4' tote		
103	Organic Material						х							current capacity = 15 yard box, o site storage large dumpster required, off-site		
104	Waste Material						х							large dumpster required, off-site storage		
105	1 college fuel containers			v				1	1					stared in flammables ashingt		
100				^				I								
107	Eng Fiber Matrix	X						-		1	2					
100	Absorbant Material	X								1	2					
110	Spill Response Equip	X								4	4	8	8			
111	Lumber Storage	~	Х							· ·			Ű	covered vard storage		
112	Light Bulbs			Х				2	2							
113	Concrete mix	Х								1	2					
114	Filters	Х								1	1					
115	Blue Steel material			Х						1	1					
116	TackCoat Emulsion Drum						х			1	1					
117	Detack pallet	Х								1	1					
118	Asphalt Sealant	Х								1	1					
119	Light Poles		х											covered yard storage, 30' long poles		
120	Sign Storage															
121	Sign Storage Units, Inside			х				7	7					vertical storage units (3)		
122	Sign Storage, Covered	Х				Х				5	9					
123	Sign Storage, Uncovered	Х								4	0					
124	Sign Posts		Х											covered yard storage		
125	Stencils	Х]]		2	2					

				Storag	е Туре			Shelf Le	ev. Qty.* Stock)	Palle (Wk	t Qty. Stock)	Palle (Over	t Qty.	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Comments
126	Holiday Décor	Х								1	1			large tree
127														
128					1	Sul	oTotals	13	13	41	44	14	14	
129														
130	WATER													
131	Valves storage	Х		Х				8	8					
132	Fittings storage			Х				8	8					
133	Water Meters	Х								2	2		8	
134	Meter Boxes	Х								2	2		8	
135	Fire Hydrants	Х								4	4		8	
136	Lids	Х								2	2		8	
137	Chemical Feed Pumps	Х								4	4			
138	Pump Motors	Х								4	4			
139	Neptune Technology Pallets	х								3	3			
140	Haz. Mat.													
141	1 gallon fuel containers			Х				1	1					stored in flammables cabinet
142	Tools													
143	Power Tools	X		Х				3	3					Secured
144	Hand Tools					Х	Х			1	1			
145	Concrete saw						Х			2	2			
146	Pipe threader						X			1	1			
147	Oxy / Acetylene cart						Х	-		1	1			
148							T . (.) .		00		00		20	
149			r			Sui	o i otais	20	20	26	20	0	32	
150	0514/50													
151	SEWER					1	1				1	۱ 	1	
152	Sewer Piping		X							- 10	10			covered yard storage, 20' lengths
153	SIEP Pump Storage	<u> </u>								16	16			5,000 units, 3' tall,
154							- T - t - t	_		40	40			
100			1	1	1	Sul	o i otals	U	U	16	10		U	
156			1								1	11		

Storage Requirements Program

				Storag	је Туре			Shelf Le (Wk. \$	ev. Qty.* Stock)	Palle (Wk. S	t Qty. Stock)	Palle (Over	t Qty. stock)	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Existing	20 yr. Growth	Comments
157	Haz. Mat.													
158	Sharps	Х								1	1			from all departments
159	Batteries	Х								1	1			from all departments
160	Chemicals	Х								1	1			from all departments
161	Fluorescent light bulbs	Х								1	1			from all departments
162	Waste oil, misc.	Х	X X							1	1			from all departments
163	Herbicide / Pesticides	X X							4	4			Grounds	
164	Paint									2	2			Grounds
165	Fertilizer	Х								3	3			Grounds
166 167	1 gallon fuel containers graffiti remover			x x				1	1					Grounds, stored in flam. cabinet Grounds
168	Homeless Camp Impound						Х			10	10			from all departments
169	Herbicide / Pesticides	Х								1	1			Streets
170	Marking Paint						Х			2	10			Streets, 200 5-gallon buckets
171	Chlorine									1	1			Water dept.
172														
173							bTotals	2	2	28	36	0	0	
174														
175								Centra	Wareho	ouse Su	btotals	53	85	
1/6									+ 20% Uti	ilization	Factor	11	1/	
1//				r	T	r	C		WAREH	OUSE T	OTALS	64	102	
178												705	4 075	
179				WARE	HOUSE	SQ.FT	. REQUI	REMENT	(100 sq.	.tt. = 8	Pallets)	795	1,275	

* Note: Each shelving level quantity is equal to one(1) pallet position



				Storag	е Туре			Shelf Lev.	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	Comments
1	CEMETERY								
2	New Holland Tractor						Х	300	10'x 30' stall
3	Tractor Attachments		Х				Х	200	5 attachments at 8'X5'
4									
5						Su	bTotals	500	
6									
7	WATER PUMPING STA	TION (LEWI	S ANG	SELO)				
8	Irrigation Fittings			Х				20	36x18 storage unit
9	Irrigation Pipe						Х	60	vertical storage
10	Irrigation Vaults			Х				20	36x18 storage unit
11	Misc. Staging						Х	60	floor staging
12									
13						Su	bTotals	160	
14									
15	FIRE STATION (4010)	_							
16	Herbicide / Pesticides			Х				140	(2) 120x44 pallet rack
17	Backpack sprayers						Х	60	
18	Paint Storage			Х				60	1 gallons
16	Misc. Items						Х	60	
17	Hi-Pressure Washer Trailer						Х	200	10'x20' stall
10							Ň		
18	De-Icer Lank, 500 gal						X	200	protected by 10'x20' ecology blocks
19	Barbage Bins, 300 gal.						X	400	un acusara d
1/	Buik Sand Staging						X	200	uncoverea
10						<u></u>	h Totolo	1 2 2 0	
19		ì 				Su	o i otais	1,320	
20									

Cit	ty of Camas P	W						0	off-Site Storage Areas
				Storag	е Туре			Shelf Lev.	
line no.	Description	Pallet Rack	Cantilever Rack	Shelving Unit	Secure	Hanging	Floor Staging	Existing	Comments
			OFF-SI	TE STO	RAGE	AREAS	TOTAL	1,980	

PRELIMINARY PERSONNEL A

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Operations/Facilities	Public Dire	Works ector	Man	ager	Le	ad	Sei	nior	Crew Sup	/Tech port	Ad	min	Seas	onal	To	tals
	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041	2021	2041
Streets	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.16	1	1	1	2	5	8	0.16	0.16	0	0	7.43	11.43
Solid Waste	0.11	0.11	0.25	0.5	1	1	0	0	3	5	0.25	0.25	0	0	4.61	6.86
Operations Admin.	0.11	0.11	0.41	0.66	0	0	0	0	2	8	0.41	2.41	0	0	2.93	11.18
Stormwater	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.16	1	1	1	2	2	6	0.16	0.16	0	3	4.43	12.43
Water	0.11	0.11	0.25	0.5	1.5	2	1	3	5	12	0.25	0.25	0	1	8.11	18.86
Sewer	0.11	0.11	0.25	0.5	0.5	2	1	2	4	12	0.25	0.25	0	1	6.11	17.86
Parks	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.16	1	2	2	2	6	11	0.16	0.16	5	5	14.43	20.43
Facilities	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.16	1	1	0	0	1	3	0.16	0.16	0	2	2.43	6.43
Fleet	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.16	1	1	0	1	3	4	0.16	0.16	0	0	4.43	6.43
Totals	1	1	2	3	8	11	6	12	31	69	2	4	5	12	55	112

Streets	2021	2041	
Director	0.11	0.11	
Manager	0.16	0.16	*still covered under Ops/Facilities Supervisor
Lead	1	1	
Senior	1	2	
Crew	5	8	
Admin	0.16	0.16	
Seasonal	0	0	
TOTAL	7.43	11.43	

Solid Waste	2021	2041	
Director	0.11	0.11	
Manager	0.25	0.5	*still covered under Utility Manager
Lead	1	1	
Senior	0	0	
Crew	3	5	*2041 value = (1) replacement driver for Gary + (1) additional truck driver above '21 levels. Not accounting for annexation.

TCF Architecture, pllc

Item 2.

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Admin	0.25	0.25
Seasonal	0	0
TOTAL	4.61	6.86

Operations Admin.	2021	2041	
Director	0.11	0.11	
Manager	0.41	0.66	:
Stormwater Engineer	1	3	
Senior Admin	0.41	0.41	
Admin	0	2	
Tech Support/GIS	0	3	:
Custodial	1	2	:
TOTAL	2.93	11.18	

*2041 totals: (1) Ops. Manager, (1) Utilities Manager, (1) Utilities Supervisor *count includes (1) existing stormwater engineer + (2) new stormwater tech support staff in shared private office

* (2) GIS/Tech, (1) Asset Mgmt Coordinator

*(1) custodial staff is counted under "crew" in chart above

Stormwater	2021	2041
Director	0.11	0.11
Manager	0.16	0.16
Lead	1	1
Senior	1	2
Crew	2	6
Admin	0.16	0.16
Seasonal	0	3
TOTAL	4.43	12.43

Water	2021	2041
Director	0.11	0.11

CITY OF CAMAS

Item 2.

Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Crew	5	12	2041: (3) WQ, (1) Backflow, (8) Maintenance
Admin	0.25	0.25	
Seasonal	0	1	
TOTAL	8.11	18.86	

Sewer	2021	2041	
Director	0.11	0.11	
Manager	0.25	0.5	
Lead	0.5	2	*2021: counted STEP, WQ, Lead, & Senior positions in "Lead" category between Water & Sewer
Senior	1	2	2041: (1) Step, (1) Senior
Crew	4	12	2041: (2) STEP, (4) Pump, (6) Maintenance
Admin	0.25	0.25	
Seasonal	0	1	
TOTAL	6.11	17.86]

Parks	2021	2041
Director	0.11	0.11
Manager	0.16	0.16
Lead	1	2
Senior	2	2
Crew	6	11
Admin	0.16	0.16
Seasonal	5	5
TOTAL	14.43	20.43

Facilities	2021	2041
Director	0.11	0.11
Manager	0.16	0.16

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Needs Assessment Study

Item 2.

TOTAL	2.43	6.43
Seasonal	0	2
Admin	0.16	0.16
Crew	1	3
Senior	0	0
Lead	1	1

Fleet	2021	2041
Director	0.11	0.11
Manager	0.16	0.16
Lead	1	1
Senior	0	1
Crew	3	4
Admin	0.16	0.16
Seasonal	0	0
TOTAL	4.43	6.43

TCF Architecture, pllc

VEHICLES / ROLLING STOCK

PARKING REQUIREMENTS PROGRAM

PARKING STALL SIZE LEGEND: L = 12'x40' S = 10'x20' M = 12'x30' XS = 8'x8'

						EXIS	STIN	G QI	JAN	TITY :	2021				Т				FUT	URE	E QU	ANT	ITY 2	2041				
line		DESCRIPTION		HE4	TED		(COV	FRFI	ר	U	NCO	VFR	ED	┢	н	IFΔT	FD		(COV	FRE	D	U	NCC	VFR	FD	COMMENTS
no.		DESCRIPTION			6	Ve	-	M	6	ve				L Ve	١.		M 1	6	Ve		M	6	Ve		M		Ve	COMMENTS
<u> </u>			L	IVI	3	79	L	IVI	3	72	L	IVI	3	72			IVI	3	72	L	IVI	2	72	L	IVI	3	72	
1	FACILITIES																											
2	446	Ford Transit Van											1													1		
3		Ford 3/4 Ton Utility Body, F250																			4							new elec, mech, plumbing, hvac staff
4																												
5	GROUNDS / PA	RKS & REC.																										
6	296	Dodge 3/4 Ton Pickup, Ram 2500HD 4x2			-							1		1		-	-				5						-	
7	339	Chevy 3/4 Ton Utility Body Silverado 2500HD			-							1		1		-	-				1						-	
8	374	Ford 1 Ton Pickup F350 4x2										1		1		-	-				1						-	
g	423 424 453 455	Ford 3/4 Ton Utility Body, E250										4	-	1		-	-				4							
10	425	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup w/Canopy E250										1	-	1		-	-				1							
11	420	Toro Mower 3280-D										· ·		1		-	-										-	stored on 429T trailer
12	429 429T	Strongboy Elathed tilt trail						1								-	-				1							
12	4231	Toro Mower 3280-D														-	-											stored on 434T trailer
14	434 434T	Paros Elathed trailer						1								-	-				1							
15	135	Hustler Batwing Mower Super 10/												-		-	-				-						-	stored on 135T trailer
16	400 435T	Strongboy Elathed tilt trail						1						1		-	-				1							
17	489	Toro 4010-D Mower														-	-											stored on 489T trailer
18	400 489T	Olympic Tandem Ayle Trailer OM10-2F						1								-	-				1							
19	4001	New Holland Boomer 50 Tractor						•	1					1		-	-					1					-	currently stored at Cemetery
20	-01	Brush Cutter Attachment Woods BB720								1				1		-	-										-	currently stored at Cemetery
21		PAK Tank Spraver Attachment								1				1		-	-											currently stored at Cemetery
22		TerraNova Tiller Attachment								1						-	-										1	currently stored at Cemetery
23	498	Felling Equipment Trailer FT-16 IT-i			-							1		1		-	-				1						-	currently stored at centetery
24	524	Turfmaker 325 Hydroseeder							1					-		-	-					1						
25	G-GLV	Gravely - Leaf Vacuum 992001								1													1					
26	G-HWB	Hustler Walk behind mower 930388								1													1					
27	WTP-347	John Deere Mower X500 Garden Tractor								1													1					
28		Pressure Washer Trailer, Honda 4.0 gpm			1													1					-					currently stored at fire station
29	340	Dodge Grand Caravan											1													1		<u>,</u>
30																												
31	SANITATION / S	OLID WASTE		1	İ				1			İ 👘		1	1	T	T						İ 👘	1		1	1	
32	447-449	Peterbilt Garbage Truck 320									3			1		-	-			7							-	
33	476	Autocar Garbage Truck ACX64									1			-		-	-			1								
34	330	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup 4x4 Utility Body E250									•					-	-			· ·	1						1	
35	000													-		-	-				· ·							
36	SHARED													-		-	-											
27	220	Ford 2/4 Top Bickup, 4x4 Litility Rody, E250										1		-		-	-				1							
30	330	Olympic Equip. Trailer 20TDT 2										1	-	-		-	-				1							
30	3/8	International 7600 Hooklift									1	-		1	╢─		-+			1					-	+	1	
10	3/8P	Monroe 10' Plow Monroe Attachment		-	<u> </u>									1	╢─								1			+	<u> </u>	
<u>40</u> ⊿1	3485	Swenson Spreader Attachment		-	<u> </u>							<u> </u>	1	+-								1				+	<u> </u>	
12	349	Ford 1 Ton Crewcab Flatbed E450 4v2		-								1	-		╢─						1			-	-	+	1	
42	349P	Mevers 9' Plow Attachment	-	-									-	1	╢─						-		1		-	+	1	
44	3495	Airflo Spreader Attachment			-								1	<u> </u>		-	-+					1		1		+	1	
45	354	Ford 1 Ton Pickup F350 4x2			-				-			1	<u> </u>	1	╢─	-	-+				1	<u> </u>	-	1	-	+	1	

46	367	Chevrolet Impala										1			1							1	I	
47	370	Chevrolet 5500 Bucket Truck									1				1			1					1	
48	383	GMC 5500 Hooklift									1							1						
49	394	Ford Interceptor Sedan										1										1		
50	399	Ventrac Mower 4231TD										-										-		stored on 399T trailer
51	399T	Paros Elatbed tilt trailer					1											1						
52	405	Ford Interceptor Utility			 							1					 	· ·			 	1		
53	421	Ford 2 Ton 4x2 Stakebed, E550			 						1	· ·					 	1			 	· ·		
54	432	Ford 2 Ton Dump E550 4x2			 						1				1		 	1						
55	468	Freightliner 114SD Hooklift								1							1							H
56	468P	Henke 10' Plow /1R10IS Attachment	-										1				· ·			1				attachment for 168
57	4001	Monroe Spreader Pre wet Attachment			 							1	-	-		-	 		1				-	attachment for 468
50	4003	John Dooro Boodside Mower 6110M tractor			 		1					-		-		-	 	1					-	
50	409	Caterpiller 250D Track Loader					-	1										-	1					
09	403	Caterpillar 205E2 Exervator			 		1	-									 	1			 			
00	404	Calephial 505E2 Excavalor			 		-				2						 	1			 			
60	480, 480										2		4				 	2		4				
02	490	Doosan P185 Air Compressor			 								- 1			4	 			1	 			
63	493				 			1								1	 		4		 			
64	494	Bandit 250XP Chipper				<u> </u>		1		_			<u> </u>	I —	<u> </u>				1				I	┨─────
65	502	Freightliner 108SD Dumptruck								1				I —	I		 1			-			I	
66	502P	Henke 10" Plow 41R10JP, Attachment											1		I					1			<u> </u>	attachment for 502
67	502S	Henke Spreader, Attachment		L								1		I	I				1	L			I	attachment for 502
68	503	Ford F450 4x4 Flatbed CrewCa Pickup									1			I	I			1					I	<u>I</u>
69	511	Freightliner 108SD Dumptruck								1							1							
70	511P	Henke 10" Plow 41R10JP, Attachment											1							1				attachment for 511
71	511S	Henke Spreader, Attachment										1							1					attachment for 511
72																								
73	VERFIY DEPAR	TMENT																						
74	512	Ford F450 Flatbed									1				1			1					1	
75	520	Attenuator TTMA-200 trailer									1				1			1					1	
76	523	Smithco Sweepstar 60						1											1				1	
77	G152	Custom Utility Trailer									1				1			1					1	
78	G162	Halet Tilt Trailer									1							1						
79	G291	Darcy Utility Trailer									1							1						
80	P-RT1	RadarTrailer1 - AEP North Americ							1		-							-		1				
81	P-RT2	RadarTrailer2 - Decatur Onsite 300							1											1				
82	P-RB1	Reader Board - 2016 Addco DH250-EM			 				1								 			1	 			
83	S-RB1	Reader Board							1											1				
84	S-044	Welding Trailer						1	<u> </u>						1				1	-			1	
85	S-PS	Pesticide Spraver Bean R10						<u> </u>	1					1	1				•	1			1	1
86	<u>\$130</u>	Bock Litility Trailer	-						<u> </u>		1							1						H
87	S176	Snowco Barricade Trailer									1				1			1					1	11
88	S279	Mike Elathed Tac trailer Buz									1				1			1					1	11
80	S308	Litility Trailer, Elathed (roller) Eagle			 						1						 	1			 			
00	W304				 						1			-		-	 	1					-	
01	W260				 						1			-		-	 	1					-	
91	W//1	HM Trailer/Generator									1							1						┨────────────────────────
92			H -	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>					1		<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	1		<u> </u>			<u> </u>	H
93																	 							╢─────
94	SIUKIWWATER			L										I —	I					L		I	I	
95	386	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup, F350 4x2		L							1			I —	I			2		L		I	I	
96	496	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup, F250 4x2									1				I			1					I	╢─────
97	433	Freightliner Vactor 114SD								1				1	I								I	
98		Camera Van													I			1					I	
90	1													ľ	I I								I I	

Item 2.

100	STREET		1					1	- I			1			1						- 1						
100	214	Chove 2/4 Top Litility Rody 2500 2000 PU										1								1							
101	300	Cat 420 ET Backhoe										1								1							
102	302	Ford 1 Top 4x4 Pickup E350 4x4										1								1							
103	110 120	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup E250						-	-			2								2							
104	419, 420	Ford $3/4$ Ton 4×4 Dickup, F250 4×4	-									1								2							
105	431	Elain Crosswind Sweeper						-	-			1				2											
100	437	Crafco SS125D Crack Sealer							1			-				2					1						
107	402 500	Ford E450 4x2 Elothod Dump	-									1								1							
100	507	Caterpiller Poller CP22P							1			-								-	1						
110	507T	Felling Equipment Trailer ET 10 Pan Drop Deck							'			1								1	'						trailer for 507
111	510	CAT 420 Backboe						1												1							
112	510	CAT 420 Dackilde						-	-																		
112	WASTEWATED																										
110	WASIEWAIEK																			4							
114	371	Chevrolet C5500 Crane Truck										1								1							
115	397	Dodge T Ton Flatbed 3500								4		1								-		4					
116	436									1			-									1			-		
117	452	Ford Fusion											1	<u> </u>						4					1		
118	404	Ford 3/4 10n 4x4 Utility Body, F250 4X4										1	ļ	I			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		1						<u> </u>	
119																					_						
120	WATER																										
121	353	Ford 3/4 Ton Utility Body F250 4x2										1								4							
122	393	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup F250 4x2										1								4							
123	417	Ford 3/4 Ton SC 4x4 Utility, F250										1								4					_		
124	463, 473	Ford 1 Ton Utility Body, F350 4X2										2								4							
125																											
126	SEWER																										
127	277	Case Backhoe						1												1							
128	375, 422	Ford 3/4 Ton Utility Body F250 4x2										2								5							
129	462	Ford 3/4 Ton Pickup F250 4x2										1								5							
130	418	Ford 3/4 Ton SC 4x4 Utility, F250										1								5							
131	495, 499	Ford 1 Ton Utility Body, F350 4X2										2								5							
132	492	Freightliner 114SD Pump Truck									1								1								
133																											
135		SubTotals	0	0	1	0	0	9	9	12	10	57	11	6	1	2	2	0	13	101	13	15	0	0	6	0	
136		TOTAL		1	15		EXIS	TINC	G 202	21						1	53		FUT	URE	2041						
137			1	-			-		-						P						-						
138	BUILDING		1		1			I	I											I	T						
139	401, 444	Ford Interceptor Utility											2												2		
140	488	Ford Escape 2wd	1										1												1		
141													<u> </u>														
142	CEMETERY																										
1/3	308 /30	Hustler Mower 7 Diesel								2												2					
143	175 Jack 430	Hustler MDV Hitility Vehicle							1	2											1	2					
144	415	Ford 3/4 Top Dickup E250 4v2							1			1								1	1						
140	431	1 014 0/4 1011 FICKUP, F200 4X2																		1							
140			1							_							\vdash	<u> </u>				_				\vdash	
140	407 400												-				<u> </u>									<u> </u>	
148	421, 428	FOID FUSION											2				<u> </u>								2	<u> </u>	
149	440	FUIU ITAIISIL VAII				<u> </u>								\vdash				<u> </u>			_						
150																					-						
101													~												<u>^</u>		
152	350, 438, 461	Ford Escape 4x4	II .		I	1						1	3	1		I									3		

153	373, 474, 487	Ford Escape 2wd											3												3		
154	406	Ford Interceptor Utility											1												1		
155																											
156	FIRE																										
157	387, 388, 411	Ford 1/2 Ton Crew Cab 4x4, F150											3												3		
158	426, 456, 501	Ford Interceptor Utility											3												3		
159	466, 467	Ford 3/4 Ton 4x4 Crew Cab, F250										2												2			
160																											
161	POLICE																										
162	389	Chevrolet Impala											1												1		
163	396, 402, 441, 442	Ford Interceptor Sedan											4												4		
164	403	Ford Escape 4x4											1												1		
165	439	Chevrolet Workcrew Van 3500										1												1			
166	443, 445, 451, 459-	Ford Interceptor Utility			1								21												21		
	460, 470-472, 477-																										
	481, 504-506, 508-																										
	509, 514-516																										
167	457	GO-4 Parking Enforcement Veh											1												1		
168	458	Work Crew Trailer HD712-10K									1									1							
169																											
171		SubTotals	0	0) ()	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	3	47	0	
172		TOTAL	—	~	55	J	FXIS	TINC	3 202	- 1					Ť	5	5	3	FUT		2041	-	5	5			1
		IVIA	· .				-///0										•										

Equipment Schedule and Utility Requiremer

NOTE: MEP contractors are responsible to field verify all connections types and service sizes prior to installation and equipment connection activities.

						Dispos	tion			Respor	nsibility			E	Electrica	al		PI	umbing	/ Pipin	g	HV	AC	È		•
									Owner Fur	nrnished /	Contractor I	Funrnished						Ŀ,				t	ſ	atio		
	Equip ID	Description	Manufacturer/Model No	OTV					Owner Ir	nstalled	/ Contracto	or Installed					æ	ed⊅	as			aus	ction	bund	lors	Comments
	Equip. ID	Description		QTT.				s	ost (ded	ost (ded	٩				Dati	ress	al Ga	ater		Exh	Colle	al Fc Isola	Anch	Comments
≥					euse	ew	. Iture	urplu	lit C	dend ost \$	lit C	dend ost \$	oltaç	hase	(A)	۹.	oice /	dwo	atura	ty W	ain	ent /	ust (pecia oor	oor	
2					Ľ	z	шī (S	5	ŰŎ	5	ŰŎ	>	₽.	A F	Т	ž	O	z	ü	ā	>		SΕ	Ē	
1	FACILII	IES		1	1	1 1	-	m					1		<u> </u>			r –			n			r		
2	FAC-01	Storage Shelving		4		х			\$900	\$3,600																electrical components
3	FAC-02	Storage Racking		2		х					\$1,800	\$3,600													yes	HVAC material
4																										
5	SHARE	D - CARPENTRY SHOP																								
6	CAR-01	Table Saw	Delta	1	х								120	1	20			yes					yes			
7	CAR-02	Miter Saw	TBD	1	х								120	1	20			yes					yes			
8	CAR-03	Band Saw, Vertical	TBD	1		х			\$4,000	\$4,000			220	1	20			yes								
9	CAR-04	Panel Saw	TBD	1		х			\$9,000	\$9,000			220	1	20			yes								
10	CAR-04	Belt / Disc Sander	TBD	1		х			\$800	\$800			120	1	20			yes								
	CAR-05	Workbench	36"x96"	1		х			\$900	\$900			120	1	20			yes								
11	CAR-06	Cantilever Storage Rack, Lumber	36"x144"	1		х					\$1,800	\$1,800													yes	
12	CAR-07	Vertical Storage Rack, Plywood	48"x96"	1		х					\$1,800	\$1,800													yes	
13	CAR-08	Dust Collection System	TBD	1		х					\$2,800	\$2,800	120	1	20											per mechanical
14	CAR-09	Spray Booth	TBD, 96x96	1		х					\$8,000	\$8,000	120	1	20			yes				yes			yes	small item painting
15	CAR-10	Storage Shelving, Paint	24"x48"	2		х			\$900	\$1,800																
16	CAR-11	Storage Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
17																										
18	SHARE	D - METALS SHOP																								
19	MET-01	Horizontal Band Saw	TBD	1		х			\$6,000	\$6,000			220	1		3		yes							yes	
20	MET-02	Drill Press	Porter Cable	1	х								120	1	10			yes							yes	
21	MET-03	Pedestal Grinder		1	х								120	1	10										yes	
21	MET-04	Welder	140 MIG	1	х								220	1	70											
22	MET-05	Welder	TIG	1	х								220	1	60											
23	MET-06	Plasma Cutter	48"x96"	1		х			\$4,000	\$4,000			240	1	40											
	MET-07	Oxy / Acetylene Cart		1	х																					
23	MET-08	Welding Table	48"x48"	1		х			\$5,800	\$5,800												yes				
24	MET-09	Workbench	48"x96"	1		х			\$2,800	\$2,800			120	1	20			yes								
25	MET-10	Vertical Storage Rack, Sheet Metal	48"x96"	1		х					\$2,800	\$2,800													yes	
26	MET-11	Horiz. Storage Rack, Bar Stock	24"x120"	1		х					\$3,200	\$3,200													yes	
27	MET-12	Jib Crane - 1 ton	16' boom, 12' mast	1		х					\$12,000	\$12,000	120	1	20										yes	
28	MET-13	Fume Extractor, Portable	TBD	1		х			\$6,000	\$6,000			120	1	20											
29	MET-14	Piope Threader		1	х								120	1	20											water dept.
30	MET-15	Storage Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
31	MET-16	Dust Collection System	TBD	1		х					\$2,800	\$2,800	120	1	20											per mechanical
32																										
33	FLEET	MAINTENANCE																								

le

Equipment Schedule and Utility Requiremer

NOTE: MEP contractors are responsible to field verify all connections types and service sizes prior to installation and equipment connection activities.

						Disp	ositior	1		Respo	nsibility			E	lectrica	al		Plu	Imbing	/ Pipin	g	HV	AC	'n		
									Owner Fu	nrnished /	Contractor	Funrnished						Air				st	ç	datio		
	Equip. ID	Description	Manufacturer/Model No.	QTY.					ତ ଜ	IIstalleu	69	n installeu					ta	'pəs	as			haus	ectio	ound	chors	Comments
					e		e	sn	Cost	s \$	Cost	\$	ge	e	s —		/ Da	bres	al O	Vater		/ Ex	Coll	ial F	- Anc	
MO.					Seus	Vew	=utu	Surp	Jnit (Exter	Jnit (Exter	Volta	phas	Amp. FLA	₽	/oice	Com	Vatu	City V	Drain	/ent	Dust	Spec	1001-	
34	FM-01	Vehicle Lift, Mobile Column (4)	TBD, wireless	3		x			\$44,000	\$132,000			120	1	20		-			-	_					charging station required, Heavy Reapir Bavs
35	FM-02	Vehicle Lift, 2-post	rotary	1	х								230	1		5		yes							yes	light repair bays - exisitng
36	FM-02	Vehicle Lift, 2-post	mohawk 15k capacity	1	х								230	1		5		yes							yes	light repair bays - exisitng
37	FM-03	Vehicle Lift, 2-post	TBD	1		х					\$22,000	\$22,000	230	1		5		yes							yes	light repair bays
38	FM-04	Parts Storage Shelving	24"x48"	6		х			\$900	\$5,400																
39																										
40		Weld / Fab Bay																								
41	FM-05	Bridge Crane - 3 ton	20' span, 50' run	1		х					\$75,000	\$75,000	230	1	30										yes	18' raised hook height
42	FM-06	Horizontal Band Saw	Jet	1	Х								230	1	20										yes	
43	FM-07	Plasma Cutter	Hypertherm	1	х								240	1	40											
44	FM-08	Welder	Miller	1	х								240	1	40											
45	FM-09	Cut-Off Saw		1	х								120	1	20			yes								
46	FM-10	Drill Press	Powermatic	1	х								120	1	20			yes							yes	
47	FM-11	Pedestal Grinder	Milwaukee	1	х								120	1	10										yes	
48	FM-12	Solvent Cleaner		1	х								120	1	10											
49	FM-13	Shear		1	х								230	1	20										yes	
50	FM-14	Brake		1	х																				yes	
51	FM-15	Hydaulic Press		1	х																				yes	
52	FM-16	Oxy / Acetylene Cart		1	х																					
53	FM-17	Parts Washer		6	х								230	1	20										yes	
54	FM-18	Stor. Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
55	FM-19	Workbench	48"x96"	1		х			\$2,800	\$2,800			120	1	20			yes								
56	FM-20	Hydraulic Hose Workstation		1		х							120	1	20			yes								
57																										
58		Tire Shop																								
59	FM-21	Tire Changer		1	х								230	1	20			yes							yes	
60	FM-22	Tire Balancer		1	х								230	1	20										yes	
61	FM-23	Tire Storage Racks		5	х																				yes	
62																										
63		Fluids Storage																								
64	FM-24	Engine Oil 15W-40		1	х													yes								
65	FM-22	Engine Oil 5W-30		1	х													yes								
66	FM-23	Engine Oil 5W-20		1	Х		1											yes								
67	FM-24	Hydraulic Fluid		1	Х		1											yes								
68	FM-25	Transmission Fluid		2	х		1											yes								
69	FM-26	Chassis Grease		1	х		1											yes								
70							1																			

Equipment Schedule and Utility Requiremer

NOTE: MEP contractors are responsible to field verify all connections types and service sizes prior to installation and equipment connection activities.

					0	ispos	ition			Respo	nsibility			E	lectrica	al		Plu	umbing	J / Pipir	ng	HV	AC	/u		
									Owner Fu	nrnished /	Contractor I	-unrnished						Air				st	E	datic ۲	<i>(</i> 0	
	Equip. ID	Description	Manufacturer/Model No.	QTY.				l	es es	-	69	T					ita	sed	as	~		hau	ectic	oun	chors	Comments
					se		e	snlo	Cost	ndec t \$	Cost	indec t \$	age	se	s) (Y		e / Da	bres	ural C	Wate	c	t / E>	t Col	cial F r Iso	r An	
row					Reu	New	Futt	Surp	Unit	Exte Cost	Unit	Exte Cost	Volt	Pha	Amp (FL/	머	Voic	Con	Natu	City	Draii	Ven	Dus	Spe Floc	Floc	
71		Wash Bay																								
72	FM-27	Hot Water Hi-Pressure Washer	TBD	1		х					\$12,000	\$12,000	120	1	20				yes	yes	yes	yes			yes	Shared between Parks & Vehicle Maint.
73	FM-28	Detergent Tanks	TBD	1		х					\$2,000	\$2,000						yes								
74																										
75	GROUN	DS																								
76	GND-01	Pallet Racking	44"x108"	4		х					\$1,200	\$4,800													yes	
77	GND-02	Stor. Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
78	GND-03	Workbench	36"x96"	1		х			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes								
79	GND-04	Storage Cabinets	36"x24"	2		х			\$900	\$1,800																
80	GND-05	Hanging Tool Storage	24"x144"	1		х			\$600	\$600																
81																										
82	SANITA	TION / SOLID WASTE			111																					L
83	SAN-01	Barbage Bin Racking	TBD	1		х		П	\$5,000	\$5,000																
84																										
85	STORM	WATER		IL																						
86	SW-01	Pipe Storage Cantilever Rack	20' lenaths	1		х	Т	П			\$3,200	\$3.200													ves	stormwater pipe
87	SW-02	Pallet Racking	44"x108"	4		x					\$1,200	\$4,800													ves	
88	SW-03	Stor, Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		x			\$900	\$3 600	¢1,200	\$ 1,000													,	
89	SW-04	Workbench	36"x96"	1		x			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			ves								
90	SW-05	Storage Cabinets	36"x24"	2		x			\$900	\$1,800			.20		20			,								
91	SW-06	Hanging Tool Storage	24"x144"	-		x			\$600	\$600																
92	0.1.00					~			\$ 000	\$ 000																
92	STREET	rs																								
04	STD 01	Starage Captilever Back	20' longtha	4	n r	v		т			¢2 200	¢2 200												r		aign pagta / light palag
94	51R-01					^					\$3,200	\$3,200													yes	sign posts / light poles
95	STR-02		44 X108	4		~	_		¢000	¢0.000	\$1,200	\$4,800													yes	
96	STR-03	Stor. Sneiving, consumables	24"x48"	4		x			\$900	\$3,600																
97	STR-04	Workbench	36"x96"	1		x			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes								
98	STR-05	Storage Cabinets	36"x24"	2		X			\$900	\$1,800																
99	STR-06	Hanging Tool Storage	24"x144"	1		х	_		\$600	\$600																
	STR-07	Paint Shaker		1		х							120	1	20											
100	STR-08	De-Icer Tanks	10k gallons	2		х					\$12,000	\$24,000	120	1	20											
101																										
102		Sign Shop																								
103	STR-09	Plotter	TBD	1		х			\$3,000	\$3,000			120	1	20											
104	STR-10	Heat Lamp Applicator	TBD	1		х			\$5,000	\$5,000			230	1	20											
105	STR-11	Squeeze Roll Applicator	TBD	1		х			\$4,000	\$4,000			230	1	20											
106	STR-12	Workbench	48x96	1		х			\$2,200	\$2,200			120	1	20											

Equipment Schedule and Utility Requiremer

NOTE: MEP contractors are responsible to field verify all connections types and service sizes prior to installation and equipment connection activities.

						Dispo	sition			Respor	sibility			E	lectrica	al		Plu	umbing	g / Pipir	ng	HV	AC	,		
									Owner Fur	nmished /	Contractor F	-unrnished						Air				st.	Ę	datio		
	Equip. ID	Description	Manufacturer/Model No.	QTY.				ŀ	69	T	69	T					ta	sed	as	_		haus	ectic	oun	chors	Comments
					se		e	snlo	Cost	ndec \$	Cost	ndec \$	age	se	s (/		e / Da	bres	lial (Wate	Ē	t / E>	Col	cial F r Iso	r An	
row					Reu	New	Futu	Surp	Unit	Exte Cost	Unit	Exte Cost	Volt	Pha	Amp (FLA	Ε	Voice	Corr	Natu	City	Draiı	Ven	Dust	Spe	Floo	
107	STR-13	Sign Storage Units	36x96	4		х			\$1,400	\$5,600																
108	STR-14	Cremator - Incinerator	36"x84"	1		х			\$9,500	\$9,500			120	1	10				yes			yes				for roadkill
109																										
110	WATER																									
111	WAT-01	Pallet Racking	44"x108"	4		х					\$1,200	\$4,800													yes	
112	WAT-02	Stor. Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
113	WAT-03	Workbench	36"x96"	1		х			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes								
114	WAT-04	Storage Cabinets	36"x24"	2		х			\$900	\$1,800																
115	WAT-05	Hanging Tool Storage	24"x144"	1		х			\$600	\$600																
116	WAT-06	Water Meter Testing Bench	TBD	1		х			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes		yes	yes					
117	WAT-07	Water Meter Storage Racks		2		х			\$1,200	\$2,400																
118																										
119	SEWER																									
120	SEW-01	Pallet Racking	44"x108"	4		х					\$1,200	\$4,800													yes	
121	SEW-02	Stor. Shelving, consumables	24"x48"	4		х			\$900	\$3,600																
122	SEW-03	Workbench	36"x96"	1		х			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes								
123	SEW-04	Storage Cabinets	36"x24"	2		х			\$900	\$1,800																
124	SEW-05	Hanging Tool Storage	24"x144"	1		х			\$600	\$600																
125	SEW-06	Step Pump Repair Bench	TBD	1		х			\$1,800	\$1,800			120	1	20			yes		yes	yes					
126																										
127	CENTRA	L WAREHOUSE																								
128	CW-01	Pallet Racking	44"x108"	20		х					\$1,200	\$24,000														
129	CW-02	Forklift, reach truck		1		х			\$40,000	\$40,000																
130																										
131	HAZ. MA	NT.																								
132	HM-01	Containment Pallets	48"x48"	8		х			\$800	\$6,400																
133	HM-02	Flammables Cabinets		4		х			\$2,500	\$10,000																
134																										
135	FUELING	3																							-	
136	FUEL-01	Small Engine Fuel Tanks	48"x48"	8	х													yes								two(2) 55 gallon drums
137																										
138								1														L		L		
139										OF / OI		CF / CI														
140			COS	T EST	IMA	TE T	ΟΤΑ	LS		\$331,400		\$228,200														



WORKSHOP - AGENDA

CITY OF CAMAS

Public Works Operations Facility Site & Space Needs Study

Programming Workshop 1

October 26-27, 2021 Camas Operations Center, 616 4th Avenue, Camas, WA

WORKSHOP DAY 1 AGENDA

+ Tuesday October 26, 2021

	SESSION AGENDA OUTLINE	ATTENDANCE
9:00am -	Session 1.1 Kick-ose with Operations Leads	TCF Team:
10:30pm	This session offers an opportunity for the Design Team to meet the lead	TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell
Meet at the Operations	personnel for each work group/department, and to discuss responses to the questionnaire. Review Crew Facilities.	EPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fisher
campus	Take a brief tour around the building and site together.	Core Advisory Team Operations Leads
10:30am – 12:00noon	SESSION 1.2 - STREETS DIVISION Review daily workflow and deployment process Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions Review growth projections and potential future changes that could	TCF Team: TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fisher City Participants:
Lunch Break	impact Streets operations and facility & equipment needs.	Streets: Scott Purkeypyle Others as determined
12:00-1:00pm-		
1:00-2:30pm	 SESSION 2.5 - Solid WASTE DIVISION Review daily workflow and deployment process Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions Review growth projections and potential future changes that could impact Solid Waste operations and facility & equipment needs. 	TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fisher City Participants: Solid Waste: Gary Reed Others a determined
2:30pm – 4:00pm	SESSION 1.4 – OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION Review daily workflow Review program needs for office functions, public spaces, and other shared and general-purpose spaces.	City Participants: Admin Staff
NOTES		

TCF Architecture

WORKSHOP DAY 2 AGENDA

TCF Architecture

TIME & LOCATION	SESSION AGENDA OUTLINE	ATTENDANCE
8:00am - 9:30am	Session 2.1 – STORMWATER Division • Review daily workflow and deployment process. • Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions. • Review growth projections and potential future changes that could impact Stormwater operations and facility & equipment needs.	TCF Team: TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fish City Participants: Stormwater: Jackie Caldwe Others as determined
10:00am – 11:30pm	SESSION 2.2 - WATER - SEWER DIVISION(5) Review daily workflow and deployment process. Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions. Review growth projections and potential future changes that could impact Water & Sewer operations and facility & equipment needs.	TCF: Team; TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fish City Participants; Water/Sewer: Tobin Reed Others as determined
11:30pm- 12:30pm	LUNCH ON YOUR OWN	
12:30pm – 2:00pm	SESSION 2.3 - PARKS / CEMETERY Review daily workflow and deployment process. Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions. Review growth projections and potential future changes that could impact Parks/Cemetery operations and facility & equipment needs.	TCF Team: TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fish City Participants: Parks/Cemetery: Nick MacQuarrie Others and commissed
2:00pm – 3:30pm	SESSION 2.4 – FACILITIES Review daily workflow and deployment process. Review program needs for parking, storage, maintenance, and crew facility functions. Review growth projections and potential future changes that could impact Facilities operations and facility & equipment needs.	TCF Team: TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fish City Participants: Facilities: Ryan Hickey Others as determined
3:30pm – 4:30pm	DEBRIEF Review discussions from the sessions and discuss next steps	TCF Team: TCF: Randy Cook TCF: Coreen Van Ausdell FPS: Mike Frei & Steve Fish City Participants: Denis Ryan & Sam Adams
NOTES	JORES OPERATIONS FACILITY SPACE NEEDS STUDY	Page 2 of 2

WORKSHOP – MEETING MINUTES



TCF Architecture

CCPW – Programming Workshop #1 Meeting Notes TCF Architecture, PLLC 3 P a g a 10/27/2021	CCPW – Programming Workshop #1 Meeting Note TCF Architecture, PLLC 4 P a g a 10/27/202
- Workbench/kaore	 Need 5+ nested on-site
Fortable nand tools Workbench/table	 Can stack (6) high
Chop saw Portable hand tools	 450 gal rounds (2 yard) (currently have 20 on-site)
Chon saw	o 60 gal (currently have 250)
• Table caw	o 35 gal (currently have 350)
 weed table/bandycrop saw access Equip: 	Types:
Need table/band/chon saw access	Bins (See Workshop Flipchart B):
Some carpentry	o Storage:
o Shon (See Workshon Flinchart D)	 Difficulty coordinating between private & public providers
Workstock	 Garbage is #1 source of citizen complaint. s
New Inventory	SESSION 1.3 SOLID WASTE
 Dispose of appliances at nearby waste transfer 	 Acoustics, each group needs privacy to meet
Hazmat	Mutanticational weeking/course (see workshop Flipchart A)
Propose crematorium	 More conference/presentation & tech savey intrastructure throughout building Multifunctional Meeting (Cowarking Space (See Workshop Classical A)
o Denis to provide data on amounts	 May consider immose signing a nop Mars conference (increantation & tech savar infrastructure throughout building
people	 Sou gayeach (white Yenday) May consider in-bourse signate shop
 Takes 1hr roundtrip to take off site to dispose w/ 2 	Operation will grow Song selects (ubits + vellow)
Pick-up roadkill	o striping
Round dumpsters available don't fit these	South hub
Current need for large dumpster	Central hub (ideally main location)
 Current metal dumpster gets dumped 1x/month Traffic signals, street signs, appliances/roadside.comp 	North hub
Current capacity (15 yard box)	 Ideally would need remote locations for this
o Organic material	box every 2 weeks) (need covered, drained storage for 40 yards)
Carbon steel Orappic material	 1.5 hours to empty leaves/organics from maintenance yards (6 loads of 10yd
Copper/blass Carbon steel	 Street sweepings fall under solid waste (no special treatment)
Copper/brass	Leaves/Organics
Multiple metal types Alum	Storm
o Multiple metal types	 Decant (See Workshop Flipchart F)
Endugn volume to justiny?	(ask water/sewer)
 Can provide yard docks w/ diff bins for materials Ensuch volume to justifie? 	 Small paint booth on-site
 waste/Recycle(see workshop Flipchart E): 	 Will need to lift hydrants/anvils, etc.
If no prine system: icesilier 100-150 ton capacity Wester /Require/Con Workshop Elizaberts C)	 Jib-arm or mono crane to transfer material to one side/work area
 ait – 20k gallons(2x 10k gallons) (completed brine) ait no bring systems identical 100 150 top constitution 	 Ideal combined Wood & Metal fab shop for general use (all depts)
 Liquid S also 200 antilana (201 antilana) (antilana (11 antilana)) 	o Heavy duty benches & tables
 White Rock Salt (produce brine on-site) = (+/-300 ton) 	o Welder (both wire-feed & gas)
o Brine:	o Pipe threader (for water)
 Currently buy by bag – more expensive 	o Buffer grinder
 Indoor, dry cold mixes concrete (10-15 tons) 	o Band saw
o Gabion (75 ton)	o Drill press
o 1.25 (150 ton)	o Central vac dust
o Sand (75 ton - covered)	Equip:
o 5/8m gravel (150 ton)	isolated area for them)
Bulk materials	 Centralized metal fabrication for all depts. Except fleet (fleet would have
 Portable welder (ideally on trailer) 	Currently unvented
Tools	 Some metal fabrication

CCPW – Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC

Meeting Notes 10/27/2021

o 300 g	al (1 ½)
---------	----------

- Need 5+ nested on-site
- o Annexation cans (would take over existing private cans, many are 32 gal)
- · Most bins aren't stored on-site, they are spread around for operational reasons
- Currently buy 15-20 new bins every couple years (for 450 gal bins)
- Storage Methods:

o 65's:

- . (12) come in shipment
 - Stacked on-site w/o axels in 3's
- Currently (2) rows of 12 stacks ea.
- 35's have to be laid down
- o Could create a storage "box" enclosure, covered, on conc. pad to contain both types, then you could stack higher

Washing:

- "bidet" for bins (automatic) Steve to track down
- o Main wash session every 1.5 months, ~50-60 bins at a time
- · Desired: totally separate area of bins, cans, etc. away from other Ops
- Current location is functional for operations

Vehicles

- 4 Garbage Trucks currently, non-covered
 - o Don't drive in inclement weather
 - o Set out extra bins at commercial areas or extra pick-up prior to known
 - weather events
 - o Trucks need to be heated (block heaters)
 - Washing(See Workshop Flipchart C): Don't wash inside of hopper
- (1) truck coming for quick can delivery to customers
 - o Ford ¼ ton?
- · Steve to provide summary of list of vehicles most susceptible to deterioration o Effective cycle of garbage trucks for Camas is ~7 years
- Double of population:
 - (1) driver, (2) additional trucks minimum (not accounting for annexation)
 - o All commercial customers are on 450 gal max round bins (residential too)
 - · Annexed areas are currently serviced by private provider. If these areas are taken over, would need min:
 - o (2) trucks, (2) drivers
 - (1) replacement driver for Gary
 - o (1) finance person
 - 20 year growth:
 - o (4) new routes added (~1 route every 5 years)
 - o (1) route / day = 1,000 pickups
- No recycle or yard debris is facilitated contracted out for those 5 Page

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC

o Crew Facilities

- Meet at 6am, leave by 2pm
- Locker improvements, boot dryers needed
- Minimal wellness area in City Hall, nothing at this facility
- Individual showers would be utilized if available / restrooms
- (1) Lead Office
 - Semi-private shared
 - Fully private enclosed
- Desk space for each other crew members
 - Shared computer spaces
 - · Does each employee (all groups, not just solid waste) need individual personal desk space, or shared between certain amount of employees that come and
 - · Can utilize meeting space/tailgate early and share w/ other staff because they arrive first
- SESSION 1.4 OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION
 - o Daily Foot traffic:
 - 12-15 through front door (public & deliveries)
 - o Staff:
 - Currently (2) senior admins (Susan & Tara)
 - (1) customer service admin + support for senior admins (Future)
 - (1) tech support/GIS Private office (Future)
 - (1) Public Works Director private office
 - (1) Operations Supervisor private office
 - (1) Stormwater engineer private office
 - · (1) stormwater tech support, could share private office w/ engineer (Future) (See Workshop Flipchart G)
 - Potential for (1) flex office
 - (1) Utilities Manager private office
 - Future Supervisor (1)
 - (4) Utility Leads (water, sewer, sanitation, water quality) (See Workshop Flipchart G)
 - Operations Leads:
 - o (1) streets, (1) parks/grounds
 - Leads responsibilities will all be elevated in future greater responsibility
 - At least shared semi-private space
 - o Like Lead desk space at Rock Island
 - o Daily Routine
 - 7am-3/4pm
 - Current visual lines to front parking lot & trucks in/out

6 Page

- Site Security: w/ increased security (gates closed) will increase foot traffic through front desk area

 - · Option for 2-way voice activation of gates to allow yard deliveries
 - o Automatic gate
 - o Can be programmed according to routine needs

TCF Architecture, PLLC

Meeting Notes 10/27/2021

TCF Architecture

Meeting Notes

10/27/2021

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1

- Package delivery:
 - Small (take to recipient)
 - Large (hold at front desk)
- Resource Materials:
 - · Generalized IT questions are most common
 - · Move large layout table into crew room-type space (See Workshop Flipchart G)
 - Don't want too much individualized ownership of desk spaces for crew employees
- Communal Training/Assembly Space (See Workshop Flipchart A):
 - EOC space w/ 100 person capacity (future)
 - · All hands-meeting would include engineering division from City Hall & Wastewater Treatment staff
 - Could utilize space for outside functions for City
 - Remote videoconferencing and training
- Kitchenette
 - Not encouraging staff to return to home base for lunch
 - Large ice machine
 - Oven/range (possible)
 - Microwaves
 - Dishwasher (possible)
- Office supplies/PPE/layout/print kiosk
- o Small conference space for vendors/private phone calls, mother's room etc.
- o Wellness room
- o Put Employee parking outside of main gates/yard
 - Could be outside main vard but still secure
- o Conference Spaces:
 - Future:
 - (1) large for meeting of Team Leads or higher ups, etc. (15-20 people)
 - (2-3) smedium/small conference rooms for general use (6-8 people)

SESSION 2.1 STORMWATER DIVISION

- Dav in the Life:
 - Facilities:
 - Oversee all catch basins
 - (3) dams
 - Storm ponds
 - Future ditching
 - Mix of old infrastructure and new development
 - Major outfall, service some private areas, special projects
 - Intend to do more day labor, capital projects in the future but don't have current capacity
 - Ex: No dump site for ditching
 - Any stormwater issues related to facility or park is done by this crew
 - Busy season is summer (dry weather)

```
CCPW - Programming Workshop #1
TCF Architecture, PLLC
```

7 | Page

 Mitigated Wetlands (100s of acres in city). Possibly coming into Stormwater's wheelhouse in near future In future, will get into mainline cleaning (4) staff currently in group

TCF Architecture

- Current need (6-8) staff + seasonal workers in summer
- Future need (8-10) staff + seasonal workers
 - Private ponds exist that aren't currently serviced by City (8) staff doesn't account for servicing any of this area

· This coincides w/ Streets' busy season so it's difficult to share equipment

Decant:

o Staff:

- Material Volumes:
 - · 30 yards/day for cleaning catchbasins
 - o 20 yards water + 5-10 solids
 - Daily Loads:
 - All loads currently driven to Whatley/Decant. ~2hrs roundtrip, 2x Day
 - o 6-8 yards solids/day, remaining is water
 - o 35-40 yards/week
 - · Hauling of material out of decant location will be contracted out
 - o 1000 yard max pile (that would be pickup 1x per 6 months)
 - Water's Vactor Truck use can dump elsewhere
 - Streets V Truck use can dump elsewhere
- o Vegetation Materials/Ditching (See Workshop Flipchart F)
 - Currently no one will take vegetation associated w/ dump truck loads
 - Types:
 - Stormwater Organics from excavations
 - Streets/Parks
 - Grass Clippings
 - Trees
 - · Expand "Transfer Bays" needed to sort/hold vegetative material before it is
 - contractually emptied and taken away (See Workshop Flipchart E)
 - · Would need full time employee to manage this "transfer station" that services all depts.
 - · This facility doesn't have to be located on main Ops site, could be elsewhere centrally in city
 - o Could potentially partner w/ State & County & City of Vancouver or the Port to help fund
- Vehicles:
 - (1) Vactor currently, (1) coming soon
 - New vactor coming is grant funded, requires expansion of service areas. Staff will be utilizing this vehicle full time to cover this
 - (2) Crew trucks (3/4 ton) currently, will need (3)
 - Currently utilize shared equipment trucks (ex. Dump trucks)
 - · Will take over a truck for a whole season, not taken on a daily/weekly basis
 - Will need (1) camera inspection van to share w/ Water/Sewer SIPage
- CCPW Programming Workshop #1

TCF Architecture, PLLC

Meeting Notes

10/27/2021

Meeting Notes

- Staff often short a vehicle
- Storage:
 - · Option for central warehouse storage shared between all departments
 - More secure, easier to manage
 - Better for Audit
 - Most ordering for Stormwater is currently "just in time" & not held in stock
 - · Would like to keep some long-lead items (ex. Catchbasin tops) on-site and in stock regularly
 - · Currently have to order material on as-needed basis bc no room to store on site. Pay a premium to order (1) piece at a time vs. bulk
 - o Desired 20' length pipe rack storage
 - Piping used primarily for repairs
 - Water Dept. could use pipe storage also
 - Streetlight poles
 - Lumber rack
 - Concrete formwork
 - Desired filter storage (50) stacked & covered
 - o General Boneyard storage
 - · Many tools used by Storm were purchased w/ grant money & dictates use only by
 - storm
 - · Also insures that tools/equipment are in working order when they are needed by Storm
 - · Have to rent most barricades because not enough room to store own
 - Vactor Bays (See Workshop Flipchart H):
 - (2) bays w/ tools in middle and storage along each side
 - Enclosed, heated
 - Crack Tank truck could be heated
 - Hydroseeder could be heated
 - Denis to mark which vehicles in fleet need heating capability vs. covered vs. open air
- Fab Shop (See Workshop Flipchart D):
 - · (see additional notes from Streets session, doesn't include Fab Bay associated solely w/ Fleet)
 - Additional Equipment needs:
 - Plasma Cutter
 - Storage for bar stock/angle stock
 - Welding capabilities for catchbasin and field grates

9 Page

- o ~max 500lb loads
- Potential components associated w/ Dams
- o Handrails
- · Communicate w/ Keith about tools/equip that can move out of fleet shop
- In-house sign shop potential would allow for reface/reuse of existing faded signs that currently get thrown out
- Paint:
 - · Prime & paint w/ spray galvanized for all new items
 - o Currently there are exhaust issues when this occurs

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC



- Plotter
- · Computer station w/ software (bluebeam)
- Combo Quiet/Mother's Room/Private Room/Small Conference Room
 - · Potentially need storage elsewhere for a couple cots

SESSION 2.2 WATER/SEWER/MAINTENANCE

o Crew Rooms

- Crew Size (Now & Future)
 - Currently 14 staff, not dedicated (not including Sam)
 - Pump Supervisor (Sam)
 - o Currently Sam is Pump Supervisor & Utility Mgr. Future (3-5 years) this will be split into (2) positions
 - Step (1)
 - o Sewer (3-5 years): 2
 - Sewer (20 year): additional (1) total (4)
 - Water Quality: (1)
 - o Water (3-5 years): 2
 - Water (20 years): additional (1) total (4)
 - Lead (1)
 - o Sewer (3-5 years): 1
 - Senior (1)
 - o Sewer (3-5 years): 1
 - o Water (currently 1)
 - Backflow (none currently)
 - o Water (3-5 years): 1
 - General Maintenance (9)
 - o Water (3-5 years): 4
 - Additional (4) (8 total) in 20 years
 - o Sewer (3-5 years): 5
 - Additional (1) (6 total) in 20 years
 - Everyone works on pumping crew
- Service:
 - 5000 septic tanks
- o Vehicles:
 - (1) Vactor dedicated Water/Sewer
 - Future could use TV van but not regularly needed. Could share w/ Storm
- Decant/Dumping (See Workshop Flipchart I):
 - Sewer Pumping dumped at Wastewater treatment
 - Spoils to Rotchy's (Large Rock Pit):
 - Pay \$5/yard to dump (usually a 2-3 yards but charged full load)
 - 1hr/roundtrip per load, ~(1) load per week
- CCPW Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC

10 Page

Meeting Notes

10/27/2021

Meeting Notes

TCF Architecture

- · Plan for future dedicated Sewer Decant (2) bays, connected to Sewer
 - 20 yard capacity
 - · Could be on same site as Storm/Street Decant but isolated (they are connected to Stormwater)
- Storage(See Workshop Flipchart I):
 - Water:
 - Meter pallet storage for meter maintenance program recurs ~5-7 years
 - · Meter boxes, Hydrants, Lids, chemical feed pumps, pump motors, oil, oil pump motors, valves/clay valves
 - o Advocate for central storage warehouse for all new stock, then leftover items would be stored within Water Bay
 - Vehicles:
 - o Currently storing working stock alongside vehicles within indoor bays
 - Currently (12) Crew Trucks mainly % ton
 - · Future goal: all crew trucks outfitted and stored outside under canopy
 - Future capacity: (16 total Water crew trucks + 20-24 total Sewer Crew trucks)
 - Future Working Stock storage in bays w/ dedicated Vactor
 - Dedicated Cleaning/Shop Space for Step Pump Repair (~5k of those, 3' tall)
 - Wash and rebuild
 - · Storage: 20'x40' module for entire building w/ storage along wall of pumps (existing and repaired) + components + tools
 - Base area on STOP's pump room
 - o Scissor table, work bench, etc.
 - Fab Shop (see previous notes in other departments (See Workshop Flipchart D):
 - · Water/Sewer would use both horizontal & vertical band saws
 - Water Meter Testing (residential) (See Workshop Flipchart K)
 - Need dedicated work bench & storage
 - o Rolling racks for meters, small operation
- o Crew Rooms: see notes from previous sections

SESSION 2.3 PARKS MAINTENANCE

o Scope:

- Cemetery
- Parks:
 - (16) parks current
 - Possibly ~24 (total) in 20 years

 - Sports fields
 - Trails (50-60 mi currently)
 - o Will increase in 20 years
 - Open Spaces
 - Wooded Areas
 - Some Facilities (landscaping at Police/Fire stations)

```
CCPW - Programming Workshop #1
TCF Architecture, PLLC
```

11 | Page

 Some seasonal pots/hanging baskets/etc. o These items often split w/ Streets Dept Landscaping areas in Right of Ways & medians

o Personnel:

	2021	3.5 years	2041
Lead	1	1	2
Senior	2	2	3
Maintenance II	1	3 (2 promoted from Maint. I)	5
Maintenance I	5	5	5
*Seasonal	(5)	(5)	(5)
TOTAL:	9	11	15

Not included in totals

Vehicles:

(7-8) Work trucks (Current)

- · Try to keep the mowers going as much as possible, parks and sites spread out so people work alone to reach items
- (3.5 years): 9 trucks total
- (20 years): 10-12 trucks total
- (4) separate crew truck + trailer combos needed (See Workshop Flipchart J) o Efficiency to keep connected up
 - o Misc. trailers stored adjacent
- Tractor & trailer currently parked at cemetery, no room on-site
 - Would like relocated to Main Ops Location
- o Storage:
 - Hazmat (quantities are ideal amount stored on site) (See Workshop Flipchart K)
 - Herbicide/Pesticides currently stored at old Fire Station
 - o Special containment needed & relocate to main ops site
 - Need up to 3 pallets (parks)
 - (1) pallet (Streets)
 - · Paint also stored there currently, should be relocated
 - o Up to (50) 5 gal. buckets (Parks)
 - o (200) 5 gal. (Streets)
 - o Paint Booth (Sewer/Water & Storm will use this most)
 - Spray down gun/area directly adjacent to paint booth w/ waste disposal container for cleaning paint off equipment
 - · Chlorine (Water uses this currently but potential spray pad would need this in
 - future)
 - Fertilizer
 - o (3) pallets (Parks)
 - o Try to mix herbicides/fertilizers in ways that create zero waste
 - Small fuel guantities

12 Page

- o (8) 1 gal. containers/ each. Department at Ops
- (2) 55 gal drum gasoline
- o Shared by all Ops
- Graffiti Remover

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC

Meeting Notes 10/27/2021

Meeting Notes

- o (12) ½ gal. jugs
- Pure Calcium Chloride o 200-250 gallons (Streets)
- Fluoride
- o Sewer/Water use unknown quantity Centralized Hazmat disposal location needed
 - o Sharps
 - o Batteries
 - o Chemicals
 - o Fluorescent lights
- Waste Oil
 - o All depts deal with some level of this
- · Misc. bags of concrete mix shared by all departments
- Will need future storage for grass seed
- · Will need to impound homeless encampment materials, store for 60 days
- Pressure washer currently stored off-site at old Fire Station
 - Relocate to main ops site
- o Still have a need for all departments to share Small Tool Crib (See Workshop Flipchart K)
- Parks equipment:
 - Playground equipment storage/triage: 24' x 30' space needed
 - · Some assembly will happen prior to site delivery for new equipment
 - Restroom Supplies (tp, soap, cleaners, doggie bags, paper towels etc.)
 - Restroom repair (urinals, toilets, etc.)
 - Misc. recreation (life jackets, nets....)
- o Holiday Décor:
 - Large Tree (décor covered by Streets)
 - Tractor Décor (Parks)
 - Community Center area near tree décor (Community Center Staff?)
- Washing Equipment (See Workshop Flipchart C):
 - Mowers are moved off trailers to wash, washed after every use
 - · Use (4) mowers every day for 6 months out of year at peak times under current capacity
 - Grass will need to be contained/captured in run-off
 - · All departments: staggered shifts or alternate schedules could free up wash areas/equipment for everyone instead of combining peak times
 - Potential for (2) bay wash facility (See Workshop Flipchart K):
 - One for larger trucks/equipment
 - · One for equipment with large solids (mowers, tractor, etc...grass/dirt)

SESSION 2.4 FACILITIES

(NOTE: DENIS STOOD IN FOR FACILITIES SPECIALIST FOR THIS SESSION)

Many things are currently contracted out (Mech/Elec/Plumbing)

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1 TCF Architecture, PLLC

13 Page

TCF Architecture, PLLC

14 Page

TCF Architecture

- o Most items are reactionary
- Vehicles:
 - . (1) Transit van full of tools, high value, parked in high visibility site behind gate
 - (1) ½ ton crew truck
 - (1) F150/light duty truck per future HVAC/Electrician
- o Staff:
 - (1) Specialist (current)
 - Shared private office w/ Maintenance worker
 - (1) Maintenance (current)
 - · Shared private office w/ Specialist gave specialist a desk in "Lead Open office" and the (3) future maintenance workers don't have much desk space. (See Workshop Flipchart G)
 - (1) Electrician (shared between departments): coming 3-5 years
 - Water/Sewer had dedicated contracted electrical
 - Streetlight repair, low voltage, etc.
 - (1) HVAC: coming 3-5 years
 - City Building Facilities = 160k sf of space throughout city
 - (1) Community Center
 - Scope:
 - · Facilities should plan to take on more of restroom maintenance and repair (toilets, partitions, urinals, etc. and take scope off Parks)
 - · Potential for Facilities to reabsorb janitorial services in the future City currently pays ~\$150k to contract this out
 - Shop/Storage:
 - · Facilities could likely share 20'x40' racked bay with Parks (in addition to Park's dedicated bay). Facilities probably doesn't need full bay.
 - · Access to carpentry shop, paint booth, etc. Don't need additional dedicated shop

WORKSHOP DEBRIEF & NEXT STEPS:

- · TCF to compile workshop notes and proceed with populating draft preliminary program for CCPW review
- · TCF to begin shortlist of cost-benefit related items discussed in workshops for Denis/Sam to assemble related metrics.
- · FPS to update vehicle fleet and overall inventory list line items for Facility, including items stored at alternative sites within City
- FPS to begin storage sf and organization for central warehouse concept
- · Denis/Sam to further brainstorm cost-benefit items everything you know is being done now that has significant or potentially significant labor hours associated due to facility, location, or simply old practices that have never gone away

END OF MEETING NOTES

Prepared by Coreen Van Ausdell

CCPW - Programming Workshop #1

Meeting Notes

10/27/2021

Meeting Notes

WORKSHOP – FLIPCHART IMAGES



SOLID WASTE (New Route/5113 (Route = 1,000 Rougs) Vehicles 4 Tarks + 1 - How Covered Block Heaters. * Prefer separate yard area for bing - away from ops Crawing Storage - Bins for on site Courbaye Only 2021 204 355/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 135/65 145/64 1 2021 2041, 3500 2500 Areas (1) Would And Ctruck (New Sevelopments) At least (Druck # Driver · Could add I Fname Person. - Paved Stored in Multiple locations (confirm all sites) (653 12 Netted -> Stack in 3's , wash adjacent to storage (50.60) #3 CCPW PROGRAMMING WORKSHOPS -10/26-10/27/21 В

С



1



ANT STORM

· currently

1 Driver.

GTRIPS/MOXIDYd.

Street Sweepings (Solid presse) out - Dec.

40 yrd each

Covered # Modulined

>, Need remote

North

CCPW PROGRAMMING WORKSHOPS -10/26-10/27/21 #12

· Central

locations










EXISTING OPERATIONS FACILITY PHOTOS







































SECTION 2 - DRAWINGS

- Existing Operations Facility Site Plan
- Existing Operations Facility Main Building Plan
- Conceptual Redevelopment Plan for Existing Operations Site







BUILDING NAME	AREA	PROGRAM
BUILDING A.1	4,000 SF	ADMIN FACILITIES
BUILDING A.1a	8,000 SF	ADMIN & CREW SUPPORT SPACES
BUILDING A.2	6,000 SF	CREW FACILITIES
BUILDING A.3	10,000 SF	FLEET SHOP
BUILDING A.4	1,920 SF	CHASSIS WASH & EQUIPMENT ROOM
BUILDING A.5	3,000 SF	SHARED SHOP SPACE & CENTRAL WAREHOUSE
BUILDING B.1	4,320 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING B.1a	960 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING B.2	2,880 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING C	10,975 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING D	5,760 SF	COVERED VEHICLE PARKING & STORAGE
BUILDING E	3,840 SF	DEDICATED DEPARTMENT STORAGE & SHOPS
TOTAL BUILDING PROGRAM AREA:	61,655 SF	

PROVIDED UNCOVERED PARKING VISITOR CREW & STAFF CITY VEHICLE

LEGEND

- LEGEND
 BUILDING A.1 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR FOR CREW & ADMIN TO BE REMODELED (4000 SF)
 BUILDING A.2 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR TO BE REMODELED FOR CREW FACILITIES (5000 SF)
 BUILDING A.1 NEW XID FLOOR ATOP A.1 & A.2 (8,000 SF)
 BUILDING A.3 NEW FLETS ShOP (1000 SF)
 BUILDING A.4 NEW WASH CANOPY (AND WASH EQUIPMENT ROOM (1,920 SF)
 BUILDING A.5 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (4,320 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (2,360 SF)
 BUILDING B.1 EXISTING CANOPY (2,360 SF)
 BUILDING C NEW CANOPY (1,075 SF)
 BUILDING C NEW CANOPY (1,075 SF)
 BUILDING STUCTURE TO BE DEMOLISED
 EXISTING STRUCTURE TO BE DEMOLISED
 SUFACED & REPLACED W/ STORM VAULT STUCTURES
 STATE A REW TARKING
 (7) VISTOP FARKING
 (7) VISTOP FARKING
 (7) VISTOP FARKING
 (7) PARKING
 (7) PARKING
 (7) PEDESTRIAN GATE

CITY OF CAMAS - EXISTING OPERATIONS FACILITY CONCEPTUAL REDEVELOPMENT TCF ARCHITECTURE DECEMBER 23, 2021



12/17 P.M

Item 2.



SECTION 3 – BUDGETARY COST ESTIMATES

- Budgetary Summaries for Estimated Total Project Costs
- Detailed Budgetary Estimate for Scenario 1

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATING METHODOLOGY

Scenario Comparison: The Part 1 Work Scope developed by the TCF Team is intended to provide a preliminary comparison between two development Scenarios:

Scenario 1: A Split Operation whereby the City renovates and expands the existing City Operations Facility (1A), maximizing the site to accommodate as much of the proposed program areas as possible, and locating remaining program area to a yet-to-be determined Satellite site (1B), creating a Split Operation.

Scenario 2: A consolidated, single campus facility accommodating the full proposed program area.

Because actual sites for a satellite or consolidated scenario have not yet been identified or studied, the cost comparisons only provide the basis for initial comparison and discussions to determine next steps. The Part 2 Work Scope will allow for actual sites to be explored and evaluated for programmatic and operational suitability, and for more specific budget estimating.

Estimating Methodology: Estimates represent an "Opinion of Probable Costs" based on cost data as collected by RC Cost Group, or "Rough Order of Magnitude" in the case of establishing cost numbers for site acquisition and development for sites that are not yet known. The RC Cost Group has prepared estimates for each of the three possible sites (existing, satellite, and consolidated), providing general contractor mark-ups and provision for escalation over a minimum two year period. Additional escalation provision will be necessary for years beyond. For the Existing Operations site, a GC/CM delivery method is anticipated, with premium costs noted for this delivery method.

SCENARIO 1A - EXISTING OPERATIONS FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT

Project Scope Description	Unit	Estimate	Remarks
A1 - SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS			
On Site Improvements to accommodate full redevelopment		\$3,744,760	Estimate by RC Cost Group and KPFF
Off-Site Improvements (ROW on facing streets)		\$200,000	Allowance
Soil Remediation (Allowance)		\$500,000	Allowance
Total Estimated Site Costs		\$4,444,760	
A2 - BUILDING COSTS			
Existing Main Building - A- Expansion Area		\$4,770,739	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
Existing Main Buiding - A - Remodeled First Level		\$3,119,729	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
Existing Main Buiding - A - New Upper Floor		\$4,415,650	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
Existing Storage Canopy Structure - B - Misc Upgrades		\$179,820	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
New Storage Canopy Structure - C - Storage Canopy		\$1,945,465	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
New Storage Canopy Structure - D - Storage Canopy		\$672,199	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
New Storage Enclosed Structure - E - Dept Storage/Work Bays		\$1,254,209	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
Buildinbg Demolition		\$45,000	See RC Cost Group Cost Estimate
New Equipment: CF-CI		\$300,000	See FPS Preliminary Equipment List
Total Estimated Building Costs (61,655 SF)		\$16,702,811	Blended Cost/SF = \$266/SF
A3 - GC/CM CONTRACTUAL MARK-UP FACTOR			
GC/CM - Provision for GC/CM Delivery Method	5%	\$835,141	
Total Estimated Off-Site Costs		\$835,141	
Subtotal Construction Cost (A1+A2+A3)		\$21,982,712	
B - SOFT COSTS ON CONSTRUCTION COSTS			
Sales Tax	8.40%	\$1,846,548	City of Camas Sales Tax
Professional Design and Construction Support Services	14.00%	\$3,077,580	Allowance
Permitting & Development Fees	2.00%	\$439,654	Allowance - Confirm with City
Other Owner Internal Development and Management Costs	5.00%	\$1,099,136	Allowance - Confirm with District
Total Estimated Soft Costs on Construction Cost	29.40%	\$6,462,917	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs (A1+A2+A3+B)		\$28,445,629	
C - EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS (OWNER-FURNISHED)			
Owner-Provided Equipment (OF/OI)		\$340,000	See FPS Preliminary Equipment List
Owner-provided Technology		\$150,000	Allowance
Furnishings		\$400,000	Allowance
Total Equipment Furnished by Owner		\$890,000	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs, FF&E (A1+A2+A3+B+C)		\$29,335,629	
D - MANAGEMENT RESERVE			
Owner's Management Reserve Fund	5.00%	\$1,466,781	
Total Management Reserve Fund	·	\$1,466,781	
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGETARY ESTIMATE		\$30.802.410	

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Site Redevelopment

SCENARIO 1B - SATELLITE SITE

Satellite Site: Because the existing Operations Site is not sufficient in size to accommodate the full Operations Program Requirements, estimated budgetary costs for development of a satellite site to accomodate all remaining program elements is included after the Existing Operations Facility Redevelopment Budgetary Estimate. The estimate below provides an "Rough Order of Magnitude" (ROM) budgetary estimate for a hypothetical site developed to accommodate the program scope identified in the Preliminary Program document. Program estimates for minimum area of development indicate 3.2 acres are needed. For conservative planning purposes, 4 acres of development are shown for estimating, and 5 acres are shown for purchase.

Project Scope Description		Estimate	Remarks
A - SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS			
On-Site Costs (Assume a 4 acre site)		\$5,041,332	See budgetary ROM estimate by RCCG
Assumed Off-Site Costs		\$1,084,997	Allowance
Total Estimated Building Costs		\$6,126,329	
B- BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT			
Assume Canopy Structures totalling (50,000sf)		\$7,372,845	See budgtary ROM RCCG
(2) Wash Bays plus Equip Room &RR (3,840 Sf)		\$1,498,118	See budgtary ROM RCCG
Equipment: CF/CI		\$30,000	Wash Bay Equipment / Misc
Total Estimated Building and Equipment Costs		\$8,900,963	Blended: \$165/SF
Subtotal Construction Cost (A+B)		\$15,027,292	
C - SOFT COSTS ON CONSTRUCTION COSTS			
Sales Tax	8.40%	\$1,262,293	City of Camas Sales Tax
Professional Design and Construction Support Services	11.00%	\$1,653,002	Allowance
Permitting & Development Fees	2.00%	\$300,546	Allowance
Other Owner Development and Management Costs	5.00%	\$751,365	Allowance
Total Estimated Soft Costs on Construction Cost	26.40%	\$3,967,205	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs (A+B+C)		\$18,994,497	
D- EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS (OWNER-FURNISHED)			
Allowance for OF/OI Equipment		\$25,000	Allowance
Owner-privided Technology		\$50,000	Allowance
Furnishings		\$0	Allowance
Total Equipment Furnished by Owner		\$75,000	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs, FF&E (A+B+C+D)		\$19,069,497	
E - SITE ACQUISITION VALUE			
New 5 Acre Site = 217,800sf (Acreage to be confirmed)		\$3,000,000	Value Range: \$12-15/sf
Total Estimated Acqisition or Sales Value		\$3,000,000	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs, FF&E (A+B+C+D+E)		\$22,069,497	
F- MANAGEMENT RESERVE			
Owner's Management Reserve Fund	5.00%	\$1,103,475	
Total Management Reserve Fund		\$1,103,475	
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGETARY ESTIMATE		\$23,172,972	
TOTAL EXISTING OPS + SATELLITE SITE BUDGETARY ESTIMA	TE	\$53,975,382	

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Site Redevelopment

SCENARIO 2 - CONSOLIDATED CAMPUS SITE

Consolidated Campus: The cost figures below provide a "Rough Order of Magnitude" (ROM) budgetary estimate for a hypothetical site developed to accommodate the full City Operations Program for comparison purposes to the Split Campus Scenario. The Program indicates a developable site area of approximately 10 acres. Costs are based on developing 10 acres. However, the site acquisition budget indicates a site of bewteen 12-15 acres which will be recommended for planning purposes, allowing additional site area for expansion or sites that may require a purchase of such acreage to yield an actual developable area of 10+ acres. Building Areas are expressed as hypothetical separate buildings organized by building type for budgeting.

Project Scope Description		Estimate	Remarks
A - SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS			
On-Site Costs (Assume a 10 acre site development)		\$10,000,000	Assume \$23/sf
Assumed Off-Site Costs		\$1,400,000	Allowance
Total Estimated Building Costs		\$11,400,000	
B- BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT			
Building A: Admin & Crew (One story, 18,000sf)		\$9,486,000	Budget \$475/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$527/SF
Building B: Warehouse/Shops/Dept Bays (One Story 21,000sf)		\$7,455,000	Budget \$320/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$355/SF
Buildings C.1 and C.2: Covered Vehicle/Equip Storage 27,000 SF Each		\$4,482,000	Budget \$150/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$166/SF
Building D: Wash Bays/Chassis Wash/Equip Rm (4,850sf)		\$2,080,650	Budget \$390/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$429/SF
Building E: Canopy Covering for bulk materials/Decant (14,000sf)		\$1,918,000	Budget \$125/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$137/SF
Building F: 3-sided canopy storage: Salt/Brine (1,400sf)		\$210,000	Budget \$150/SF plus 11% Esc to March 2024 = \$166/SF
Equipment: CF/CI		\$331,000	See FPS Preliminary Equipment List
Total Estimated Building and Equipment Costs (113,250sf)		\$25,962,650	Blended: \$229/SF
Subtotal Construction Cost (A+B)		\$37,362,650	
C - SOFT COSTS ON CONSTRUCTION COSTS			
Sales Tax	8.40%	\$3,138,463	City of Camas Sales Tax
Professional Design and Construction Support Services	14.00%	\$5,230,771	Allowance
Permitting & Development Fees	2.00%	\$747,253	Allowance
Other Owner Development and Management Costs	5.00%	\$1,868,133	Allowance
Total Estimated Soft Costs on Construction Cost	29.40%	\$10,984,619	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs (A+B+C)		\$48,347,269	
D- EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS (OWNER-FURNISHED)			
Allowance for OF/OI Equipment		\$300,000	Allowance
Owner-privided Technology		\$200,000	Allowance
Furnishings		\$400,000	Allowance
Total Equipment Furnished by Owner		\$900,000	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs, FF&E (A+B+C+D)		\$49,247,269	
E - LAND ACQUISITION AND SALES			
New 12-15 Acre Site = (Acreage to be confirmed)		\$9,000,000	Value Range: \$12-15/sf
Potential to sell current Operations Site 3.7 acre		(\$2,200,000)	Value Range: \$12-15/sf
Total Estimated Acquisition or Sales Values		\$6,800,000	
Subtotal Const. Costs, Soft Costs, FF&E (A+B+C+D+E)		\$56,047,269	
F- MANAGEMENT RESERVE			
Owner's Management Reserve Fund	5.00%	\$2,802,363	
Total Management Reserve Fund	5.0070	\$2,802,363	
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGETARY ESTIMATE		\$58.849.633	



CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS M&O FACILITY CAMAS, WA PRE-DESIGN ESTIMATE

ESTIMATE ISSUE DATE: December 6, 2021 ESTIMATE REVISION: 0

Submitted To: RANDY COOK, MANAGING PRINCIPAL TCF ARCHITECTURE PLLC 902 NORTH 2ND STREET TACOMA, WA 98403

CLARIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS



RC Cost Group Estimating Team:

Lead Estimator: Andy Cluness

Exclusions from Construction Cost:

Design fees

Owners administration costs

Building and land acquisition fees

Legal and accounting fees

Removal of unforeseen underground obstructions

Owner's furniture, furnishings and equipment

Owners supplied materials

Moving owners equipment and furniture

Compression of schedule, premium or shift work

Assessments, finance, legal and development charges

Builder's risk, project wrap-up and other owner provided insurance program

Washington State Sales Tax

AV Equipment

Assumption used in establishing the estimate:

The project will be procured utilizing the Design, Bid, Build Delivery Method

Open and competitive bidding among all proportions of the work

Construction Start Date: March 2024

Escalation has been included at the following to Start of Construction: 11.27%

Year 1: 5.50%, Year 3: 4.50%, Year 3: 4.00%

Items that may affect the cost estimate:

Modifications to the scope of work included in this estimate.

Special phasing requirements other than mentioned above.

Restrictive technical specifications or excessive contract conditions.

Any non-competitive bid situations.

Bids delayed beyond the projected schedule.



Date: December 6, 2021

OVERALL SUMMARY CONSTRUCTION COST

Existing Operations Facility		GFA	\$/SF	\$			
Building A.1 and A.2 Remodel for Crew / Facilities	Building A1 / A2	10,000 SF	311.97	3,119,729			
Building A New Second Floor	Building A	8,000 SF	551.96	4,415,650			
Building A.3 New Fleet Shop	Building A3	10,000 SF	370.20	3,702,011			
Building A.4 New Wash Bay and Equipment Room	Building A4	1,920 SF	390.13	749,059			
Building A.5 Renovation for New Fleet Shop	Building A5	3,000 SF	106.56	319,669			
Upgrades to Existing Three Sided Canopy Structure	Building B	8,160 SF	22.04	179,820			
Enclosed Canopy	Building C1	3,631 SF	238.16	864,747			
New Three Sided Canopy Storage	Building C2	7,344 SF	147.16	1,080,718			
New Canopy Structure	Building D	5,760 SF	116.70	672,199			
New Heated Shop Space	Building E	3,840 SF	326.62	1,254,209			
Building Structure Demolition		3,000 SF	15.00	45,000			
Sitework	Site			3,744,760			
Equipment CFCI	Equipment			330,129			
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION CO	OST AT EXISTING FACILITY			20,477,700			
Satellite Facility Scope - 4 Acre							
Garbage Bin Storage		1,125 SF	45.00	50,625			
Wash Bays (2)		3,840 SF	390.13	1,498,118			
Covered Bulk Materials Storage (Balance of 115,253 S	49,758 SF	147.16	7,322,220				
Sitework (\$20/SF + Mark Ups)	174,240 SF	28.93	5,041,332				
Frontage Improvements (\$750K + Mark Ups) 1,0							
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST AT SATELLITE FACILITY 14,997,292							



BUILDING DATA

DATE:

December 6, 2021

Building A1 and A2 Remodel Area:		
Level 1	10,000 SF	
Total Gross Floor Area		10,000 SF

	Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area
Gross Area	10,000	SF	1.000
Footprint Area	-	SF	
Suspended Slab	10,000	SF	1.000

CITY OF C M&O FAC	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS								ltem 2.
CAMAS, W	A							IK	
PRE-DESI	GN ESTIMATE				GROSS FLOOR AREA:		10,000 SF		
BUILDING	A1 and A2 REMODEL				DATE:	De	ecember 6, 2021	COST	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTAL	-	GROUP TOTAL		COST P	ER SF	
A10	FOUNDATIONS			0	\$ 14,500			\$	1.45
A1010	Standard Foundation	9	; -			\$	-		
A1020	Special Foundation	9	\$ -			\$	-		
A1030	Slab on grade	:	\$ 14,5	00		\$	1.45		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION			Ś	-			\$	
A2010	Basement Excavation	S				\$	-		
A2020	Basement Wall Construction	9				\$	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		-	Ś	-	_		\$	-
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		β -			Ş	-	*	~~ ~~
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE			\$	\$ 205,000		10.00	Ş	20.50
B2010	Exterior Walls	5	\$ 120,0	00		Ş	12.00		
B2020	Exterior Windows		\$ 65,0	00		Ş	6.50		
B2030	Exterior Doors		\$ 20,0	00	`	Ş	2.00	6	
B30 B2010	ROOFING		5	,	-	ć		\$	-
B3010		i.	-		222 500	Ş	-	ć	20.25
C1010	Dartitions		\$ 200.0	00	5 323,500	ć	20.00	Ş	32.30
C1010	Interior Deore		5 200,0 \$ 46.0	00		ç	20.00		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		\$40,0 \$775	00		¢	4.00		
C20	STAIRS		ç 77,0	.00	-	Ŷ	7.75	Ś	-
C2010	Stair Construction				,	Ś	-	Ŷ	
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES			\$	\$ 283,500	Ŷ		Ś	28.35
C3010	Wall Finishes		\$ 85.0	00		Ś	8.50	Ť	20100
C3020	Floor Finishes		\$	00		Ś	8.90		
C3030	Ceiling Finishes	Ś	\$ 109,5	00		\$	10.95		
D10	CONVEYING		· · ·	Ś	-	·		\$	-
D1010	Elevators & Lifts	9	; -			\$	-		
D20	PLUMBING			Ś	\$ 165,000			\$	16.50
D2010	Plumbing	Ś	\$ 165,0	00		\$	16.50		
D30	HVAC			Ś	\$ 470,000			\$	47.00
D3010	HVAC	0	\$ 470,0	00		\$	47.00		
D40	FIRE PROTECTION			ç	\$ 56,000			\$	5.60
D4010	Sprinkler System		\$56,0	00		\$	5.60		
D50	ELECTRICAL			5	\$ 470,000			\$	47.00
D5000	Electrical		\$ 470,0	00		\$	47.00		
E10	EQUIPMENT				\$ 12,500			\$	1.25
E1010	Equipment		\$ 12,5	00		Ş	1.25		
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS				Ş 66,500			Ş	6.65
E2010	Fixed Furnishings		\$ 66,5	00		Ş	6.65	~	
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		`	,	j -	ć		Ş	-
F1010	Special Structure					Ş	-		
F1020		· · · · ·			\$ 00.000	-	_	ć	0.00
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		\$ 90.0	00	\$ 90,000			Ŷ	9.00
12010	Sub-Total Direct Cost		÷ :0}0		\$ 2.156.500			Ś	215.65
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%		5	\$ 215,650			\$	21.57
	Sub- <u>Total</u>				2,3 <u>72,150</u>			\$	237 <u>.22</u>
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		Ş	\$ 240,773			\$	24.08
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%			\$ 190,743			\$	19.07
	Sub-Total				\$ 2,803,667			\$	280.37
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		Ş	316,062			\$	31.61
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			\$	3,119,729			\$	311.97

E	-DESIGN ESTIMATE		DATE:	December 6, 2021	co
		BUILDING DATA			
	Building A Area: Add Second Floor				
	Level 1	8,000 SF			
	Total Gross Floor Area		8,000 SI		
		Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area	
	Gross Area	8,000	SF	1.000	
	Footprint Area	-	SF		
	Suspended Slab	8,144	SF	1.018	

CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS									ltem 2.
M&O FACI										
	IA CN ESTIMATE				0.00			0.000 CF		
RIIII DING	A' NEW SECOND ELOOR				GRU	DATE	De	8,000 SF	cost	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		FI FMFN1	ΤΟΤΑΙ	GR	OUP TOTAL	00	COST P	ER SF	
			EEEWEN							
A10	FOUNDATIONS		*		\$	49,600			\$	6.20
A1010	Standard Foundation		Ş	38,000			Ş	4.75		
A1020	Special Foundation	:	Ş	-			ş	-		
A1030	Slab on grade		Ş	11,600	<u>ه</u>		Ş	1.45	<u>ہ</u>	
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION		¢		\$	-	ć		\$	-
A2010	Basement Wall Construction		\$ ¢	-			ې د	-		
A2020			Ş		ć	490.000	Ş	-	ć	60.00
B1010	Eloor & Roof Construction		¢	480.000	Ş	460,000	¢	60.00	Ş	00.00
B20			Ş	400,000	Ś	406 900	Ŷ	00.00	Ś	50.86
B2010	Exterior Walls		Ś	296 400	Ŷ	+00,000	Ś	37.05	Ŷ	50.00
B2010	Exterior Windows		Ś	110 500			ŝ	13.81		
B2020	Exterior Doors		¢ ¢	-			Ś	-		
B30	ROOFING		Ŷ		Ś	240 000	Ŷ		Ś	30.00
B3010	Roofing		Ś	240.000	Ŷ	210,000	Ś	30.00	Ŷ	00.00
C10	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION		*	2 . 0 / 0 0 0	Ś	330.000	Ť	00100	Ś	41.25
C1010	Partitions		Ś	192.000	Ŷ	000,000	Ś	24.00	Ŷ	11.20
C1020	Interior Doors		Ś	53 200			Ś	6 65		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		\$	84 800			ŝ	10.60		
C20	STAIRS		Ŷ	0 1,000	Ś	60.000	Ŷ	10.00	Ś	7.50
C2010	Stair Construction	_	Ś	60.000	Ŷ	00,000	Ś	7.50	Ť	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES		÷	00,000	Ś	226.800	÷	1.00	Ś	28.35
C3010	Wall Finishes		Ś	68.000		,	Ś	8.50		
C3020	Floor Finishes		Ś	71,200			ŝ	8.90		
C3030	Ceilina Finishes		Ś	87.600			Ś	10.95		
D10	CONVEYING		Ŧ		Ś	175.000	•		Ś	21.88
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		Ś	175.000	Ť	., 0,000	Ś	21.88	Ť	2.1100
D20	PLUMBING		·	-,	Ś	112.000	÷		Ś	14.00
D2010	Plumbing		Ś	112.000		,,	Ś	14.00		
D30	HVAC		·	,	Ś	376,000	÷		Ś	47.00
D3010	HVAC		Ś	376,000			Ś	47.00		
D40	FIRE PROTECTION			,	\$	44,800	,		\$	5.60
D4010	Sprinkler System	_	\$	44,800			\$	5.60		
D50	ELECTRICAL				\$	376,000			\$	47.00
D5000	Electrical		\$	376,000			\$	47.00		
E10	EQUIPMENT				\$	10,000			\$	1.25
E1010	Equipment		\$	10,000			\$	1.25		
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS				\$	53,200			\$	6.65
E2010	Fixed Furnishings		\$	53,200			\$	6.65		
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION				\$	-			\$	-
F1010	Special Structure	:	\$	-			\$	-		
F1020	Special Construction		\$	-						
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION				\$	112,000			\$	14.00
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		\$	112,000						
	Sub-Total Direct Cost	10.000			\$	3,052,300			\$	381.54
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%			Ş	305,230			Ş	38.15
	Sub-Total	10 1 50			Ş	3,357,530			Ş	419.69
	Constal Contractor's Eas Panda and Insurance	10.15%			ې د	340,/89			¢ ¢	42.00
	Sub Total	7.30%			ې د	209,977			Ş Ç	33.75
	Escalation March 2024	11 27%			Ś	<u> </u>			Ś	55 02
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	11.27/0			Ś	4 415 650			ŝ	551.96
					Ŷ	1,110,000			Ŷ	

Footprint Area



1.000

DATE: December 6, 2021 **BUILDING DATA Building a3 Area: New Fleet Shop** Level 1 10,000 SF **Total Gross Floor Area** 10,000 SF Storage Mezzanine 1,440 SF Total Unoccupied Space (Excluded from GFA) 1,440 SF Quantity Unit **Ratio to Gross Area** Gross Area 10,000 SF 1.000

10,000

SF



CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS							ltem 2.
M&O FACI								
	IA CN ESTIMATE					10 000 65		
	A3: NEW ELEET SHOD					IU,UUU SF	COST	GROUP
No	FI EMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTAL	GROUP TOTAL		COST P	FR SF	
N0.				GROOF FOTAL				
A10	FOUNDATIONS			\$ 180,000			\$	18.00
A1010	Standard Foundation		§ 70,000		Ş	7.00		
A1020	Special Foundation	Ş	-		Ş	-		
A1030	Slab on grade	ç	S 110,000	*	Ş	11.00	<u> </u>	_
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION			\$ -	<u> </u>		Ş	-
A2010	Basement Excavation	\$ 6	j -		Ş	-		
A2020		Ş) -	۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵	\$	-	Ċ	26.65
B10 B1010	SUPERSTRUCTURE	ć	266 500	\$ 300,500	ć	26.65	Ş	30.00
BIUIU		ç	5 300,300	\$ 250,000	Ş	30.05	ć	25.00
B20	Exterior Walls	6	244,000	\$ 330,000	ć	24.40	Ŷ	33.00
B2010	Exterior Windows	ç	244,000 21,000		ç ¢	24.40		
DZUZU P2020	Exterior Mildows		5 31,000		ې د	3.10 7.50		
B2030		ŝ	5 73,000	¢ 200.000	Ş	7.30	ć	20.00
B2010	Roofing	ć	300.000	\$ 300,000	¢	30.00	Ŷ	30.00
C10		ч -	5 300,000	¢ 216.000	Ş	30.00	ć	21.60
C1010	Dartitions	ć	157 500	ş 210,000	ć	15 75	Ş	21.00
C1010		ç (22 500		ې د	13.73		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		23,300		ې د	2.33		
C1030	STAIPS	ŝ	5 33,000	\$ 18 500	Ş	3.30	¢	1 85
C2010	Stair Construction		18 500	Ş 10,000	ć	1 95	Ŷ	1.05
02010		, ,	5 10,500	¢ 05.000	Ş	1.85	ć	0.50
C2010	Wall Einishes		20,000	Ş 90,000	ć	7.00	Ŷ	9.00
C3010	Floor Finishes	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	20,000		ې د	2.00		
C3020	Ceiling Einishes		\$ 20,000 \$ 5,000		ç	2.00		
03030		, 	5 5,000	¢ _	Ŷ	0.50	ć	
D1010	Elevators & Lifts	ć	· _	Ş -	ć		Ŷ	
20				¢ 102.000	Ŷ		ć	10.20
D20 D2010	Plumbing	ć	108.000	\$ 190,000	¢	10.80	Ŷ	19.00
02010	HVAC	ч -	190,000	\$ 325,000	Ŷ	19.00	Ś	32 50
D3010	НУАС	ć	325,000	\$ 525,000	¢	32.50	Ŷ	52.50
D3010	FIRE PROTECTION	· ·	5 525,000	\$ 52 500	Ŷ	32.30	Ś	5 2 5
D4010	Sprinkler System		52 500	Q 02,000	¢	5 2 5	Ŷ	0.20
D-010	FLECTRICAL	, ,	5 52,000	\$ 330,000	Ŷ	0.20	Ś	33.00
D5000	Electrical	ç	330,000	ф 000,000	Ś	33.00	Ŷ	00.00
F10	FOLIPMENT	, ,	, 000,000	\$ -	Ŷ	00.00	Ś	-
F1010	Fauipment	ć	-	Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	_
F20	FIXED FURNISHINGS	Ÿ		\$ 42,500	Ŷ		Ś	4 25
F2010	Fixed Furnishings	Ś	42,500	¢ 12,000	Ś	4.25	Ŷ	1.20
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		,	Ś -	÷		Ś	-
F1010	Special Structure			Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	_
F1020	Special Construction	Ś	-		·			
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION			\$ 85,000			\$	8.50
F2010	Building Elements Demolition	Ş	\$ 85,000					
	Sub-Total Direct Cost			\$2,559,000			\$	255.90
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%		\$ 255,900			\$	25.59
	Sub-Total			\$ 2,814,900			\$	281.49
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		\$ 285,712			\$	28.57
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%		\$ 226,345			\$	22.63
	Sub-Total			\$ 3,326,957			\$	332.70
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		\$ 375,054			Ş	37.51
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			\$ 3,702,011			Ş	370.20

E-DESIGN ESTIMATE		DATE:	December 6, 2021
	BUILDING DATA		
Building A4 Area: New Wash Bay a	nd Equipment Room		
	1 020 SE		

Total Gross Floor Area1,920 SFQuantityUnitRatio to Gross AreaGross Area1,920SFFootprint Area1,920SF1,920SF1.000	Level I	1,920 SF		
QuantityUnitRatio to Gross AreaGross Area1,920SF1.000Footprint Area1,920SF1.000	Total Gross Floor Area		1,920	SF
Gross Area 1,920 SF 1.000 Footprint Area 1,920 SF 1.000		Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area
Footprint Area1,920SF1.000	Gross Area	1,920	SF	1.000
	Footprint Area	1,920	SF	1.000

CITY OF C M&O FACI	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS LITY								C	ltem 2.
CAMAS, W PRE-DESI	/A GN ESTIMATE				GR	OSS FLOOR AREA:		1.920 SF		
BUILDING	A: NEW WASH BAY AND EQUIPMENT ROOM					DATE:	De	cember 6, 2021	COST	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMEN	T TOTAL	GR	OUP TOTAL		COST P	ER SF	
A10					ć	E2 760			ć	20.00
ATU 41010	FOUNDATIONS Standard Foundation		ć	24.060	Ş	53,760	ć	12.00	Ş	28.00
A1010 A1020	Statual Foundation		¢	24,900			ې د	13.00		
A1020	Slab on grade		¢ ¢	28 800			¢	15.00		
A1030			Ŷ	20,000	Ś	-	Ŷ	10.00	Ś	-
Δ2010	Basement Excavation		Ś		Ŷ		Ś		Ŷ	
A2010	Basement Wall Construction		ŝ	-			š	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		Ŷ		Ś	59.000	Ŷ		Ś	30.73
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		Ś	59.000	Ť	07,000	Ś	30.73	Ť	
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE			,	\$	32,640	·		\$	17.00
B2010	Exterior Walls		\$	28,800		· ·	\$	15.00		
B2020	Exterior Windows		\$	-			\$	-		
B2030	Exterior Doors		\$	3,840			\$	2.00		
B30	ROOFING				\$	1,440			\$	0.75
B3010	Roofing		\$	1,440			\$	0.75		
C10	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION				\$	14,592			\$	7.60
C1010	Partitions		\$	3,552			\$	1.85		
C1020	Interior Doors		\$	1,920			\$	1.00		
C1030	Fittings and Specialties		\$	9,120			\$	4.75		
C20	STAIRS				\$				\$	
C2010	Stair Construction		\$	-			\$	-		
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES				\$	9,600			\$	5.00
C3010	Wall Finishes		\$	5,760			\$	3.00		
C3020	Floor Finishes		\$	3,840			Ş	2.00		
C3030	Ceiling Finishes		Ş	-			Ş	-		
D10	CONVEYING		*		Ş	-			Ş	-
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		Ş	-			Ş	-		==
D20	PLUMBING		<u> </u>	00.040	Ş	99,840	~	50.00	Ş	52.00
D2010	Plumbing	_	Ş	99,840		0.000	Ş	52.00	<u>^</u>	1 50
D30	HVAC		^	0.000	Ş	2,880	6	1 50	Ş	1.50
D3010		_	\$	2,880	ć	10 750	\$	1.50	6	E CO
D40	FIRE PROTECTION		<u> </u>	10 750	Ş	10,752	ć	E 60	Ş	5.60
D4010		_	Ş	10,752	ć	55 600	Ş	5.60	ć	20.00
D50 D5000	Electrical		ć	55 680	Ş	55,080	ć	20.00	Ş	29.00
E10	Electrical	_	Ş	55,080	ć	86.400	Ş	29.00	ć	45.00
E1010	Equipment		ć	86.400	Ŷ	80,400	¢	45.00	Ŷ	43.00
E1010			Ŷ	00,400	Ś	-	Ŷ	45.00	Ś	-
E20	Fixed Furnishings		Ś	-	Ŷ		Ś		Ŷ	
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		Ŷ		Ś	91 200	Ŷ		Ś	47 50
F1010	Special Structure		Ś	91.200	Ŷ	51,200	Ś	47.50	Ŷ	-17.00
F1020	Special Construction		\$	-			·			
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION				\$	-			\$	-
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		\$	-			_			
	Sub-Total Direct Cost				\$	517,784			\$	269.68
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%			\$	51,778			\$	26.97
	Sub-Total				\$	569,562			\$	296.65
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%			\$	57,811			\$	30.11
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%			\$	45,798			\$	23.85
	Sub-Total	11.070			Ş	673,171			Ş	350.61
		11.2/%			Ş	/5,888			ې د	39.52
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST				Ş	749,059			3	390.13

Footprint Area



BUILDING DATA

DATE:	December 6, 2021

1.000

SF

Building A5 Area: Renovation to Warehouse Area 3,000 SF Level 1 **Total Gross Floor Area** 3,000 SF Quantity Unit **Ratio to Gross Area** SF Gross Area 3,000 1.000

3,000

CITY OF C M&O FACI CAMAS, W PRE-DESIG	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS ILITY VA GN ESTIMATE D: FLEFT MAINTENANCE, WASH BAY, FLIFL CANOF	ογ.		C	GROSS FLOOR AREA:	Π	3,000 SF	COS	Item 2.
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	•	FI FMENT TOTAL	6	ROUP TOTAL		COST P	ER S	F
A10	FOUNDATIONS			Ş	6,000			Ş	2.00
A1010	Standard Foundation		- -			Ş	-		
A1020	Special Foundation		- -			Ş	-		
A1030	Slab on grade		\$ 6,000	6		Ş	2.00	^	
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION	ć	`	Ş	-	ć		\$	-
A2010	Basement Wall Construction		-			с ¢	-		
R10	SUPERSTRUCTURE	, ,		¢	19 500	Ŷ		Ś	6 50
B1010	Floor & Boof Construction	9	\$ 19,500	Ŷ	19,000	Ś	6 50	Ŷ	0.00
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE		, 19,000	Ś	30.000	Ŷ	0.00	Ś	10.00
B2010	Exterior Walls	S	-			Ś	-		
B2020	Exterior Windows	Ś	-			\$	-		
B2030	Exterior Doors	Ś	\$ 30,000			\$	10.00		
B30	ROOFING		· ·	\$	-			\$	-
B3010	Roofing	Ş	- 3			\$	-		
C10	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION			\$	28,000			\$	9.33
C1010	Partitions	0	\$ 18,000			\$	6.00		
C1020	Interior Doors	:	\$ 5,000			\$	1.67		
C1030	Fittings and Specialties		\$ 5,000			\$	1.67		
C20	STAIRS			\$	-			\$	-
C2010	Stair Construction	Ę	-			\$	-		
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES			Ş	11,600			Ş	3.87
C3010	Wall Finishes		\$ 6,600			Ş	2.20		
03020	Floor Finishes		\$ 5,000			Ş	1.67		
C3030		3	-	ć		Ş	-	ó	
D10 D1010	Elevators & Lifts			Ş	-	ć		Ş	-
20		, ,	, -	ć	10 000	Ş	-	¢	3 33
D20	Plumbing	9	\$ 10,000	Ŷ	10,000	Ś	3 33	Ŷ	0.00
D30	HVAC	,	, 10,000	Ś	45.000	Ŷ	0.00	Ś	15 00
D3010	HVAC		\$ 45.000	Ť		Ś	15.00	Ť	
D40	FIRE PROTECTION		,	Ś	10,500	Ť		Ś	3.50
D4010	Sprinkler System		\$ 10,500			\$	3.50		
D50	ELECTRICAL		· ·	\$	48,000			\$	16.00
D5000	Electrical	Ś	\$ 48,000			\$	16.00		
E10	EQUIPMENT			\$				\$	
E1010	Equipment	ę	-			\$	-		
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS			\$	-			\$	-
E2010	Fixed Furnishings	<u> </u>				\$	-		
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION			\$	-			\$	-
F1010	Special Structure		- -			Ş	-		
F1020		3	-	ć	24.000	-		ć	0 00
F20 F2010	Building Elements Demolition	9	\$ 24,000	Ş	24,000			Ş	0.00
1-2010	Sub-Total Direct Cost	,	✓ 2-7,000	\$	232.600			\$	77.53
	Estimating / Design Contingency	4.50%		Ś	10.467			Ś	3.49
	Sub- <u>Total</u>			\$	243,067			\$	81.02
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		\$	24,671			\$	8.22
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%		\$	19,545			\$	6.51
	Sub-Total			\$	287,283			\$	95.76
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		\$	32,386	_		\$	10.80
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			Ş	319,669			Ş	106.56

CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS M&O FACILITY CAMAS, WA PRE-DESIGN ESTIMATE

RE-DESIGN ESTIMATE		DATI	E: December 6, 2021	COST GRC
	BUILDING DATA			
Building B Area: Existing Canopy				
Canopy: B1	4,320 SF			
Canopy: B2	960 SF			
Canopy: B3	2,880 SF			
Total Gross Floor Area		8,160 S	SF	
	Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area	
Gross Area	8,160	SF	1.000	
Footprint Area	8,160	SF	1.000	

CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS					Ite	m 2.
M&O FAC	ILITY						
CAMAS, V	VA						
PRE-DESI	GN ESTIMATE			GROSS FLOOR AREA:	8,160 SF	0007.01	
BUILDING	B: EXISTING CANOPY			DATE:	December 6, 2021	COSTGR	OUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTAL	GROUP TOTAL	COST	PER SF	
A10	FOUNDATIONS			\$-		\$	-
A1010	Standard Foundation		\$-		\$-		
A1020	Special Foundation	:	\$-		\$-		
A1030	Slab on grade	:	\$-		\$-		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION			\$-		\$	-
A2010	Basement Excavation	:	\$-		\$-		
A2020	Basement Wall Construction	:	\$-		\$-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE			\$ 40,800		\$	5.00
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		\$ 40,800		\$ 5.00		
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE			\$-		\$	-
B2010	Exterior Walls	:	\$-		\$ -		
B2020	Exterior Windows	:	\$-		\$-		
B2030	Exterior Doors		\$-		\$ -		
B30	ROOFING			\$ 15,000		\$	1.84
B3010	Roofing		\$ 15,000		\$ 1.84		
C10	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION			\$ 8,500		\$	1.04
C1010	Partitions	:	β -		Ş -		
C1020	Interior Doors	:	ş -		\$ -		
C1030	Fittings and Specialties		\$ 8,500		\$ 1.04		
C20	STAIRS			Ş -		Ş	-
C2010	Stair Construction		Ş -	*	Ş -		
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES		*	Ş -	^	Ş	-
C3010	Wall Finishes				\$- \$		
C3020	Floor Finishes				\$- \$		
03030			Ş -	<u> </u>	\$ -	Å	
DIU			<u>م</u>	Ş -	<u> </u>	Ş	-
			> -	6	Ş -	A	
D20 D2010	PLUMBING		<u>^</u>	Ş -	ć	Ş	-
D2010			- -	¢	\$ <u>-</u>	ć	
D30 D2010			5	Ş -	ć	Ş	-
D3010			- ¢	ć _	Ş -	ć	
D40	FIRE PROTECTION		\$	Ş -	ć	Ş	-
D4010			· ·	\$ 60,000		ć	7 3 5
D5000	Electrical		\$ 60,000	\$ 00,000	\$ 735	Ŷ	7.55
F10	FOLIPMENT		Ç 00,000	Ś -	Ç 7.00	Ś	-
F1010	Equipment	-	\$ <u>-</u>	Ŷ	\$ -	Ŷ	
F20	EIXED EURNISHINGS		~	Ś -	Ŷ	Ś	-
F2010	Fixed Furnishings		\$ -	Ŷ	\$ -	Ŷ	
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		*	Ś -	+	Ś	_
F1010	Special Structure	;	\$-	- *			
F1020	Special Construction	:	\$-				
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION			\$-		\$	-
F2010	Building Elements Demolition	:	\$-				
	Sub-Total Direct Cost			\$ 124,300		\$	15.23
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%		\$ 12,430		\$	1.52
	Sub-Total			\$ 136,730		\$ 1	6.76
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		\$ 13,878		\$	1.70
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%		\$ 10,994		\$	1.35
	Sub-Total	44.075		\$ 161,602		\$ 1	9.80
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		ş 18,218		Ş	2.23
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			\$ 179,820		Ş 2	22.04

CITY OF T M&O FACI TUMWATI PRE-DESI	UMWATER PUBLIC WORKS ILITY ER, WA GN ESTIMATE				GROSS FLOOR AREA	λ:	3,631 SF	ƙ	Item 2.
BUILDING	C1: ENCLOSED STORAGE				DATE	: I	December 6, 2021	COSI	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTA	L	GROUP TOTAL		COST P	ER SF	
Δ10	FOUNDATIONS				\$ 72.80	7		Ś	20.05
A1010	Standard Foundation		\$ 33.	883	Ŷ 72,00	Ś	9.33	Ŷ	20.00
A1020	Special Foundation		\$ \$	-		Ś	-		
A1030	Slab on grade		\$ 38.'	924		Ś	10.72		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION				\$-	·		\$	-
A2010	Basement Excavation		\$	-		\$	-		
A2020	Basement Wall Construction		\$	-		\$	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE				\$-			\$	-
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		\$	-		\$	-		
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE				\$ 75,294	4		\$	20.74
B2010	Exterior Walls		\$ 16,	081		\$	4.43		
B2020	Exterior Windows		\$	-		Ş	-		
B2030	Exterior Doors		\$	213	.	Ş	16.31	*	
B30	ROOFING		^	205	\$ 2,90) A	0.00	Ş	0.80
B3010			\$ Z,	905	<u>م</u>	Ş	0.80	6	0.00
01010			¢		Ş 10,64 [,]	4 6		\$	2.93
C1010	Parilions		<u> </u>	-		ې د	-		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		ວ \$ 10	- 611		ç ¢	- 2.02		
C20	STAIRS		Ş 10,	044	\$ -	Ŷ	2.95	Ś	-
C2010	Stair Construction		\$		Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	
C30	INTERIOR FINISHES		Ŷ		\$ 17.429))		Ś	4.80
C3010	Wall Finishes		Ś 10.	893	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Ś	3.00	Ť	
C3020	Floor Finishes		\$ 6.	536		Ś	1.80		
C3030	Ceiling Finishes		\$	-		\$	-		
D10	CONVEYING				\$-			\$	-
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		\$	-		\$	-		
D20	PLUMBING				\$ 21,060)		\$	5.80
D2010	Plumbing		\$ 21,	060		\$	5.80		
D30	HVAC				\$	4		\$	14.00
D3010	HVAC		\$ 50,	834		\$	14.00		
D40	FIRE PROTECTION				\$ 14,52 [,]	4		\$	4.00
D4010	Sprinkler System		\$ 14,	524		\$	4.00		
D50	ELECTRICAL		Å		\$	5		Ş	26.00
D5000	Electrical		\$	406	*	Ş	26.00		
E10	EQUIPMENT		<u>^</u>		Ş -	<u> </u>		Ş	-
E1010	Equipment	_	Ş	-	~	Ş	-	6	
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS		¢		Ş -	ć		Ş	-
EZUIU			\$	-	۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵ ۵	\$	-	ć	65 51
F10 F1010	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		\$ 237	850	\$ 237,851	ر م	65 51	Ş	00.01
F1010 F1020	Special Structure		\$ 237, \$	-		Ş	05.51		
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION		\$		Ś -			Ś	-
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		Ś		Ŷ			Ŷ	
. 2010	Sub-Total Direct Cost				\$597,753	3		\$	16 <u>4.62</u>
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%			\$ 59,77	5		\$	16.46
	Sub-Total				\$ 657,528	3		\$	181.09
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%			\$ 66,739	9		\$	18.38
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%			\$ 52,87	1		\$	14.56
	Sub-Total	44.672			\$ 777,138	3		\$	214.03
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%			\$ 87,608	5		Ş	24.13
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST				\$ 864,74			Ş	238.16

December 6, 2021

DATE:



	BUILDING DATA			
Building C2 Area: New Three Sided Canopy				
Canopy	7,344 SF			
Total Gross Floor Area		7,344	SF	
	Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area	
Gross Area	7,344	SF	1.000	
Footprint Area	7,344	SF	1.000	

CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS									ltem 2.
M&O FACI	LITY									
CAMAS, W	A									
PRE-DESI	GN ESTIMATE					GROSS FLOOR AREA:		7,344 SF		
BUILDING	C2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY					DATE:	De	ecember 6, 2021	COST	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEM	IENT TOTAL	(GROUP TOTAL		COST F	ER SF	
A10	FOUNDATIONS				Ś	230,100	-		Ś	31.33
A1010	Standard Foundation		Ś	143.521	Ŷ	200,100	Ś	19.54	Ŷ	01.00
A1020	Special Foundation		Ś	-			ŝ	-		
A1030	Slab on grade	,	ŝ	86 579			ś	11.79		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION		Ŷ	00,075	Ś	-	Ť		Ś	-
Δ2010	Basement Excavation		Ś	-	Ť		Ś	-	Ŷ	
A2020	Basement Wall Construction		Ś	-			ŝ	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		÷		Ś	1.514	Ť		Ś	0.21
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		Ś	1.514	Ŷ	1,011	Ś	0.21	Ŷ	0.21
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE		Ŷ	1,011	Ś	101.660	Ŷ	0.21	Ś	13 84
B2010	Exterior Walls		Ś	97.060	Ť	,	Ś	13 22	Ť	
B2010	Exterior Windows		Ś	-			ŝ	-		
B2020	Exterior Doors		Ś	4 600			Ś	0.63		
B2000	ROOFING		Ŷ	4,000	Ś	4 840	Ŷ	0.00	Ś	0.66
B3010	Boofing		Ś	4 840	Ŷ	-1,010	Ś	0.66	Ŷ	0.00
C10			Ŷ	1,010	Ś	7 740	Ŷ	0.00	Ś	1 05
C1010	Partitions		Ś		Ŷ	7,7-10	Ś		Ŷ	1.00
C1020	Interior Doors		¢	-			¢	_		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		¢	7 740			¢	1.05		
C20	STAIRS	_	Ŷ	7,740	Ś	-	Ŷ	1.00	Ś	-
C2010	Stair Construction		¢	-	Ŷ		¢	-	Ŷ	
C2010		_	Ŷ		¢	755	Ŷ		¢	0 10
C2010	Wall Einishes		¢		Ŷ	700	¢		Ŷ	0.10
C3010	Floor Finishes		¢	_			¢	_		
C3020	Coiling Einishes		ç ç	755			ç ç	0.10		
03030	CONVEVING		Ŷ	733	ć		Ŷ	0.10	ć	
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		ć		Ŷ		ć		Ŷ	
			Ş	-	¢		Ş		ć	
D20 D2010	Plumbing		¢		Ş		¢		Ŷ	
D2010	HVAC		Ŷ		Ś	1 680	Ŷ	-	Ś	0.23
D3010	нулс		¢	1 680	Ŷ	1,000	¢	0.23	Ŷ	0.20
D3010			Ŷ	1,000	¢	21 208	Ŷ	0.23	ć	2 00
D40	Sprinkler System		ć	21 208	Ŷ	21,290	ć	2.00	Ŷ	2.90
D4010	ELECTRICAL		Ŷ	21,290	¢	78 021	Ŷ	2.90	ć	10 75
D5000	Electrical		¢	78 021	Ŷ	70,921	¢	10 75	Ŷ	10.75
E10	ENURA		Ŷ	70,921	ć		Ŷ	10.75	ć	
E1010	Equipment		¢		Ŷ		Ś		Ŷ	
E1010	EIVED ELIBNISHINGS		Ŷ		¢		Ŷ		¢	
E2010	Fixed Eurnishings		¢	-	Ŷ		¢	-	Ŷ	
E2010		_	Ŷ		ć	208 521	Ŷ		ć	10.65
E1010	Special Structure		Ś	298 534	Ŷ	290,004		_	Ŷ	40.05
F1070	Special Construction		ŝ	-						
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION		÷		Ś	-			Ś	-
F2010	Building Elements Demolition	_	Ś	-	Ŷ				Ŷ	
1 2010	Sub-Total Direct Cost				\$	747.042			\$	101.72
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%			\$	74,704			\$	10.17
	Sub-Total				\$	821,746			\$	111.89
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%			\$	83,407			\$	11.36
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%			\$	66,076			\$	9.00
	Sub-Total				\$	97 <u>1,230</u>			\$	1 <u>32.25</u>
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%			\$	109,489			\$	14.91
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST				\$	1,080,718			\$	147.16

Г

DESIGN	A I ESTIMATE	Gross Flo	or Area:	7,344 SF		
DING C	2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY		Date:	December 6, 2021	COST G	
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS	
A10	FOUNDATIONS					
A1010	Standard Foundation					
	A1011 Foundations					
	Reinforced concrete continuous footings					
	Excavate for continuous footings	123	CY	55.00	6,763	
	Backfill, assume imported fill	73	CY	50.00	3,639	
	Disposal of excavated material off-site within 8 miles,					
	assumed a 33% swell factor	164	CY	26.25	4,293	
	Fine grade bottom of footing	1,232	SF	0.74	912	
	Formwork to foundations - sides	526	SF	10.60	5,576	
	Reinforcing steel in foundations	6,525	LB	1.46	9,527	
	Concrete, 4,000 psi	50	CY	235.43	11,817	
	Finish to top of footing	1,232	SF	0.75	924	
	Reinforced concrete grade beams					
	Excavate for continuous footings	84	CY	55.00	4 611	
	Backfill, assume imported fill	50	CY	50.00	2 481	
	Disposal of excavated material off-site within 8 miles.		01		2,10	
	assumed a 33% swell factor	112	CY	26.25	2 92	
	Fine grade bottom of footing	840	SE	0.74	623	
	Formwork to foundations - sides	566	SE	10.60	6 000	
	Reinforcing steel in foundations	4 4 4 9	L R	1 46	6 4 9	
	Concrete 4 000 psi	-,,- 34	CY	235.43	8.05	
	Finish to top of footing	840	SF	0.75	630	
	A1012 Column foundations					
	Reinforced concrete spread footings					
	Excavate for spread footings	67	CY	55.00	3 67(
	Backfill assume imported fill	48	CY	50.00	2,383	
	Disposal of excavated material off-site within 8 miles	-0	01	00.00	2,000	
	assumed a 33% swell factor	80	CV	26.25	2 3 3	
	Fine grade bottom of footing	400	SE	20.20	1 0 9	
	Formwork to foundations - sides	274	SE	10.60	3 060	
	Reinforcing steel in foundations	2282	IR	1 46	2 /Q(
	Concrete 4 000 psi	2,505	CV	258.00	ر ار م 10	
	Finish to top of footing	400	SF	2.72	1,088	
	A1013 Perimeter drainage and insulation					
	Perimeter drain pipe and rock	357	I F	27.06	9.661	
	Perimeter insulation	536	SF	4.33	2,319	
	Miscellaneous					
	Reinforced concrete stem walls	13	CY	1 425 00	18 034	
	Waterproofing at stem walls	257	SE	10 40	2 713	
	Masonry pilaster	11	EA	972.00	10,69	
	Total For Standard	l Foundations			143,52	
A1020	Special Foundation					

A1030 Slab on Grade

105 Page 17 01 38

Y OF SUN D FACILI INER, W -DESIGN -DING C	<i>I</i> INER TY A I ESTIMATE 2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	7,344 SF December 6, 2021	
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	A1031 Standard slab on grade Reinforced concrete slab on grade, 6" thick Thickened slab edge Striping / Markings	7,344 289 1	SF LF LS	10.72 22.00 1,500.00	78,728 6,351 1,500
	Total For	Slab on Grade			86,579
A20 A2010	BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION Basement Excavation	-			_
	No work anticipated				N/A
A2010	Total For Basem Basement Walls	ent Excavation	-	_	
	No work anticipated				N/A
B1010	Total For B Floor & Roof Construction	asement Walls			
	B 1020 Roof Construction Masonry lintel at riser room Joists, 6", 18 ga FRT Plywood sheathing Remaining structure included in pre-engineered building estimate in estimate section	6 74 74	LF SF SF	55.00 10.50 5.50	330 777 407
	Total For Floor & Roo	f Construction		_	1,514
B20 B2010	EXTERIOR CLOSURE Exterior Walls				
	B2011 Exterior wall construction CMU walls, 12" fully grouted and reinforced CMU walls, 8" fully grouted and reinforced Grafitti coating	2,867 196 1	SF SF LS	30.80 24.30 4,000.00	88,310 4,751 4,000
B2020	Total For Exterior Windows	Exterior Walls			97,060
	No work anticipated				N/A
B2030	Total For Ext Exterior Doors	erior Windows			_
	B 2030 Exterior Doors Exterior door, HM, flush, double	1	EA	4,600.00	4,600
	Total For	Exterior Doors			4,600
B30 B3010	ROOFING Roof Covering			_	
	B3011 Roof finishes Membrane roofing system over rigid insulation	82	SF	20.00	1,640

106 Page 20 01 38

CITY OF SUM M&O FACILI SUMNER, W PRE-DESIGN BUILDING C	MNER TY A I ESTIMATE 2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY	Gross Floo	or Area: Date:	7,344 SF December 6, 2021	R Cost GROUP
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	B3014 Flashings and trim Included in pre-engineered building estimate section F1012				N/A
	B3016 Gutters and downspouts Included in pre-engineered building estimate section F1012				N/A
	Miscellaneous Rough carpentry	1	LS	3,200.00	3,200
	То	tal For Roofing			4,840
C10 C1010	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION Partitions				
	No work anticipated				N/A
C1020	Total For Interior Doors	erior Partitions			
	No work anticipated				N/A
C1030	Total For <u>Specialties</u>	r Interior Doors			
	C1035 Identifying devices Exterior building signage	1	LS	4,500.00	4,500
	C1037 General fittings and misc. metals Bollards Fire extinguishers, wall mounted on brackets Key lock box at riser room	2 5 1	EA EA EA	940.00 188.00 420.00	1,880 940 420
	Total For Fittings and S	Specialty Items			7,740
C20 C2010	STAIRS Stair Construction		-		
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Sta	ir Construction			
C30 C3010	INTERIOR FINISHES Wall Finishes		-	_	
	No work anticipated				N/A
C3020	Total Fo	r Wall Finishes			
03020	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For	Floor Finishes	-		

CITY OF SUM M&O FACILI SUMNER, W PRE-DESIGN BUILDING C	MNER TY A I ESTIMATE 2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	7,344 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROUP
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
C3030	<u>Ceiling Finishes</u>				
	C 3030 Ceiling Finishes Allowance for GWB ceiling at riser room, painted	59	SF	12.80	755
	Total For Ce	eiling Finishes			755
D10 D1010	VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION Elevator & Lift				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For E	levator & Lifts	_		
D20 PL	JMBING	_			
D2010					
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total	For Plumbing			
D30 D3010	HVAC HVAC			_	
	Unit heater at riser room	1	EA	1,680.00	1,680
	T	otal For HVAC			1,680
D40 D4010	FIRE PROTECTION <u>Fire Protection</u>				
	D 4010 Sprinklers Fire protection system	7,344	SF	2.90	21,298
	Total For Fire Spr	inkler System			21,298
D50 D5000	ELECTRICAL Electrical				
	D5010 Electrical Service and Distribution Switchboard, panel boards, feeder conduit and wire, etc.	7,344	GFA	2.08	15,276
	D5020 Lighting and Branch Wiring User convenience power Receptedes including conduit and wire	11	EA	360.00	2 060
	Lighting fixtures	17	EA	1,545.00	26,265
	Lighting controls Lighting control devices including conduit & wire	7,344	GFA	0.90	6,610
	D5033 Telephone/data systems Telephone/data/WAP outlets	7,344	GFA	0.24	1,763
	D5037 Fire alarm system Fire alarm system complete	7,344	GFA	2.85	20,930


CITY OF SUI M&O FACILI SUMNER, W PRE-DESIGI BUILDING C	MNER ITY A N ESTIMATE 2: NEW THREE SIDED CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	7,344 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROU
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	D5038 Security and detection systems CCTV systems, assumed not required				N/A
	D5091 Grounding systems Grounding	7,344	GFA	0.35	2,570
	D5095 General construction items Testing	1	LS	1,547.47	1,547
	Tota	al For Electrical			78,921
E10 E1010	EQUIPMENT Equipment	-	-	_	
	No work anticipated in GC contract, assumed by owner				N/A
	Total	For Equipment			
E20 E2010	FIXED FURNISHINGS Fixed Furnishing				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Fix	ed Furnishings			
F10 F1010	SPECIAL STRUCTURES Special Structure		-	_	
	F1012 Pre-engineered structures Pre-engineered building canopy, excludes metal roofing components	7,344	SF	40.65	298,534
F1020	Total For Sp Special Construction	ecial Structure			298,534
11020	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Speci	al Construction		_	
F20 F2010	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION Building Elements Demolition		-		
	No work anticipated				N/A

Total For Selective Building Demolition



RE-DESIGN ESTIMATE		DATE:	December 6, 2021	COSTG
	BUILDING DATA			
Building D Area: New Canopy				
Canopy	5,760 SF			
Total Gross Floor Area		5,760 SF		
	Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area	
Gross Area	5,760	SF	1.000	
Footprint Area	5,760	SF	1.000	

CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS						-	ltem 2.
M&O FACI	LITY						1 04	
CAMAS, W	A							
PRE-DESI	GN ESTIMATE			GROSS FLOOR AREA:	5,	760 SF		
BUILDING	D: NEW CANOPY			DATE:	December 6	5, 2021	COST	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTAL	GROUP TOTAL	C	OST P	ER SF	
A10	FOUNDATIONS			\$ 120.326			Ś	20.89
A1010	Standard Foundation		\$ 50.515	+,	Ś	8.77	· ·	
A1020	Special Eoundation	9	\$ -		Ś	_		
A1030	Slab on grade		\$ 69.811		Ś 1	2.12		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION		¢ 05,011	Ś -	÷ .		Ś	-
A2010	Basement Excavation	9	\$ -	•	Ś	-	· ·	
A2020	Basement Wall Construction		- -		ŝ	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		•	Ś -	•		Ś	-
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		\$ -	Ť	Ś	-	Y	
B20	FXTERIOR ENCLOSURE		*	Ś -	•		Ś	-
B2010	Exterior Walls	9	\$ -	•	Ś	-	· ·	
B2020	Exterior Windows		- -		ŝ	-		
B2030	Exterior Doors		• \$ -		ŝ	-		
B30	ROOFING		Ŷ	\$ 3,200	÷		Ś	0.56
B3010	Boofing		\$ 3,200	¢ 0,200	Ś	0.56	Ŷ	0.00
C10			¢ 0,200	\$ 23.676	Ŷ	0.00	Ś	4 1 1
C1010	Partitions	9	÷ - 2	ç 20,070	Ś		Ŷ	
C1020	Interior Doors		\$		ŝ	-		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		\$ 23.676		Ś	4 1 1		
C20	STAIRS		Ç 20,070	Ś -	Ŷ	4.11	Ś	-
C2010	Stair Construction	9	÷ - 2	Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	
C30		,	Ý	Ś -	Ŷ		Ś	_
C3010	Wall Finishes	(÷ -	Ŷ	Ś		Ŷ	
C3070	Floor Finishes		¢ ¢		Ś	_		
C3030	Ceiling Finishes		¢ ¢		Ś	_		
D10	CONVEYING	Ň	Ý	<u>ہ</u>	Ŷ		Ś	-
D1010	Elevators & Lifts	(Ś.	Ŷ	Ś		Ŷ	
20	PLUMBING	, ,	Ý	¢ _	Ŷ		¢	
D20	Plumbing		÷ -	Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	
D2010	HVAC	, 	Ŷ	¢ _	Ş	_	¢	
D3010	НУАС		÷ -	Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	
D3010	FIRE PROTECTION	,	Ŷ	\$ 16704	Ŷ		¢	2 90
D4010	Sprinkler System		\$ 16.704	Ş 10,70 4	Ś	2 00	Ŷ	2.70
D4010	FLECTRICAL		Ş 10,704	\$ 66.605	Ş	2.90	ć	11 56
D5000	Electrical		\$ 66.605	Q 00,000	\$ 1	1 56	Ŷ	11.50
F10	FOLIPMENT		ç 00,000	<u>ہ</u>	Ŷ	1.50	Ś	-
E1010	Fauinment	(Ś.	Ŷ	Ś		Ŷ	
E1010		, ,	Ý	¢ _	Ŷ		¢	
E2010	Fixed Eurnishings	(Ś.	Ŷ	Ś	-	Ŷ	
E2010		Ň	,	¢ 23/11//	Ş		ć	10.65
E1010	Special Structure		\$ 234 144	Ş 204,144			Ŷ	40.05
F1070	Special Construction		\$ -					
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION		Ŷ	Ś -			Ś	-
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		\$ -	Ť			Y	
. 2010	Sub-Total Direct Cost			\$ 464.655			\$	80.67
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10.00%		\$ 46,466			\$	8.07
	Sub-Total			\$511,121			\$	88.74
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		\$ 51,879			\$	9.01
	General Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	7.30%		\$ 41,099			\$	7.14
	Sub-Total			\$ 604,098			\$	104.88
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		\$ 68,101			\$	11.82
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			\$ 672,199			\$	116.70

Г

TY OF SUN O FACILI MNER, W E-DESIGN ILDING D	MNER TY A NESTIMATE : NEW CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	5,760 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROU
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
A10 A1010	FOUNDATIONS Standard Foundation				
	A1012 Column foundations				
	Reinforced concrete spread footings				
	Excavate for spread footings	123	CY	55.00	6,744
	Backfill, assume imported fill	88	CY	50.00	4,379
	Disposal of excavated material off-site within 8 miles,				
	assumed a 33% swell factor	163	CY	26.25	4,281
	Fine grade bottom of footing	735	SF	2.72	1,999
	Formwork to foundations - sides	491	SF	10.60	5,209
	Reinforcing steel in foundations	4,379	LB	1.46	6,394
	Concrete, 4,000 psi	35	CY	258.00	9,039
	Finish to top of footing	735	SF	2.72	1,999
	A1013 Perimeter drainage and insulation				
	Perimeter drain pipe and rock	312	LF	27.06	8,444
	Perimeter insulation	468	SF	4.33	2,026
	Total For Standa	rd Foundations			50,515
A1020	Special Foundation				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Speci	al Foundations			
A1030	Slab on Grade				
	A1031 Standard slab on grade				
	Reinforced concrete slab on grade, 6" thick	5,760	SF	10.72	61,747
	Thickened slab edge	312	LF	22.00	6,864
	Striping / Markings	1	LS	1,200.00	1,200
	Total For	r Slab on Grade			69,811
A20	BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION	_	_		
A2010	Basement Excavation				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total Far Decom	ont Execution	_		
A2010	Basement Walls	IEIIL EXCAVALION			
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For B	asoment Walls	_		_
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Floor & Roc	of Construction			
B20	EXTERIOR CLOSURE				
B2010	Exterior Walls				

Y OF SUN O FACILI MNER, W/ E-DESIGN ILDING D:	INER TY A ESTIMATE NEW CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	5,760 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROU
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	No work anticipated				N/A
B2020	Tota Exterior Windows	al For Exterior Walls			
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total Fo	or Exterior Windows	_	_	
B2030	Exterior Doors				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Tota	l For Exterior Doors			
B30 B3010	ROOFING Roof Covering				
	B3014 Flashings and trim Included in pre-engineered building estimate section F1012	1			N/A
	B3016 Gutters and downspouts Included in pre-engineered building estimate section F1012	1			N/A
	Miscellaneous Rough carpentry	1	LS	3,200.00	3,200
		Total For Roofing			3,200
C10 C1010	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION Partitions				
	No work anticipated				N/A
C1020	Total Fo	or Interior Partitions	-		
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Tota	al For Interior Doors			
C1030	<u>Specialties</u>				
	C1035 Identifying devices Exterior building signage	1	LS	4,500.00	4,500
	C1037 General fittings and misc. metals Bollards	20	EA	940.00	18,800
	Fire extinguishers, wall mounted on brackets	2	EA	188.00	376
	Total For Fittings	and Specialty Items			23,676
C20	STAIRS Stair Construction				



CITY OF SUM M&O FACILI SUMNER, WA PRE-DESIGN BUILDING D	INER FY A ESTIMATE NEW CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	5,760 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROUP
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total Fo	r Stair Construction		_	
C30 C3010	INTERIOR FINISHES Wall Finishes				
	No work anticipated				N/A
C3020	Tot Floor Finishes	al For Wall Finishes		_	
	No work anticipated				N/A
C3030	Tota Ceiling Finishes	l For Floor Finishes			
00000	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total	For Ceiling Finishes	_		
D10	VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION				
D1010	Elevator & Lift				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total	For Elevator & Lifts			
D20 PLU D2010	IMBING <u>Plumbing</u>				
	No work anticipated				N/A
		Total For Plumbing			
D30 D3010	HVAC HVAC				
	No work anticipated				N/A
		Total For HVAC			
D40 D4010	FIRE PROTECTION Fire Protection				
	D 4010 Sprinklers Fire protection system	5,760	SF	2.90	16,704
	Total For Fi	re Sprinkler System			16,704
D50 D5000	ELECTRICAL Electrical				
	D5010 Electrical Service and Distribution Switchboard, panel boards, feeder conduit and wire,	etc. 5,760	GFA	2.08	11,981

	NEW CANOPY	Gross Flo	or Area: Date:	5,760 SF December 6, 2021	COST GROU
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	D5020 Lighting and Branch Wiring				
	User convenience power Receptacles including conduit and wire	10	EA	360.00	3,600
	Lighting fixtures	16	EA	1,545.00	24,720
	Lighting control devices including conduit & wire	5,760	GFA	0.90	5,184
	D5033 Telephone/data systems Telephone/data/WAP outlets	5,760	GFA	0.24	1,382
	D5037 Fire alarm system Fire alarm system complete	5,760	GFA	2.85	16,416
	D5038 Security and detection systems CCTV systems, assumed not required				N/A
	D5091 Grounding systems Grounding	5,760	GFA	0.35	2,016
	D5095 General construction items Testing	1	LS	1,305.98	1,306
I	Tota	al For Electrical			66,605
E10 E1010	EQUIPMENT Equipment				
	No work anticipated in GC contract, assumed by owner				N/A
I	Total	For Equipment		_	
E20 E2010	FIXED FURNISHINGS <u>Fixed Furnishing</u>				
	No work anticipated				N/A
I	Total For Fix	ed Furnishings			
F10 F1010	SPECIAL STRUCTURES Special Structure				
	F1012 Pre-engineered structures Pre-engineered building canopy, excludes metal roofing components	5,760	SF	40.65	234,144
F1020	Total For Sp Special Construction	oecial Structure			234,144
	No work anticipated				N/A
1	Total For Speci	al Construction			

115 Page 27 or 38

CITY OF SUMNER M&O FACILITY SUMNER, WA PRE-DESIGN ESTIMATE BUILDING D: NEW CANOPY	Gross Floo	or Area: Date:	5,760 SF December 6, 2021	R C COST GROUP
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
F2010 Building Elements Demolition				

No work anticipated

Total For Selective Building Demolition

N/A



RE-DESIGN ESTIMATE		DATE:	December 6, 2021	COST G
	BUILDING DATA			
Building E Area: Heated Shop Space				
Shop Space, Heated	3,840 SF			
Total Gross Floor Area		3,840 SI		
	Quantity	Unit	Ratio to Gross Area	
Gross Area	3,840	SF	1.000	
Footprint Area	3,840	SF	1.000	

CITY OF C	AMAS PUBLIC WORKS								Item 2.
M&O FAC	ILITY							105	
CAMAS, W	VA								
PRE-DESI	GN ESTIMATE			GROSS FI	LOOR AREA:		3,840 SF		
BUILDING	E: NEW CANOPY				DATE:	Dece	mber 6, 2021	COST	GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		ELEMENT TOTAL	GROUP	TOTAL		COST P	PER SF	
A10	FOUNDATIONS			Ś	69.798			Ś	18.18
A1010	Standard Foundation		\$ 28.633			Ś	7.46		
A1020	Special Foundation		\$ -			Ś	-		
A1030	Slab on grade		\$ 41.165			Ś	10.72		
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION		•	Ś	-	Ŧ		Ś	-
A2010	Basement Excavation		ś -			Ś	-		
A2020	Basement Wall Construction		, Ś -			Ś	-		
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		•	Ś	-	•		Ś	-
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction		\$ -			Ś	-		
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE		Ŧ	Ś	76.996	•		Ś	20.05
B2010	Exterior Walls		\$ 20.795	Ť	,	Ś	5.42	· ·	
B2020	Exterior Windows		\$ 14,976			Ś	3.90		
B2030	Exterior Doors		\$ 41,225			Ś	10 74		
B30	ROOFING		¢ 11,220	Ś	1 728	Ŷ	10.7 1	Ś	0 45
B3010	Roofing		\$ 1728	Ŷ	1,720	Ś	0.45	Ŷ	0.10
C10			¢ 1,, 20	Ś	56 422	Ŷ	0.10	Ś	14 69
C1010	Partitions		\$ 37.285	Ŷ	00,122	Ś	9 71	Ŷ	14.09
C1020	Interior Doors		\$ 6,200			¢	1 78		
C1020	Fittings and Specialties		\$ 0,020 \$ 12,316			¢	3 21		
C20	STAIRS		ç 12,310	Ś	-	Ŷ	5.21	Ś	-
C2010	Stair Construction		ć -	Ŷ		¢		Ŷ	
C2010			Ç -	¢	51 1 36	Ŷ		¢	13 32
C2010	Wall Einisbos		¢ 29.15/	Ŷ	51,150	ć	0.04	Ŷ	10.02
C3010	Floor Finishes		\$ 30,134 \$ 7.080			¢	2.09		
C3020	Ceiling Einishes		\$ 7,909 \$ 7,909			¢	2.00		
D10			Ş 4,992	Ċ		Ş	1.30	¢	
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		ć -	Ş		ć		Ş	
01010			Ç -	¢	17 101	Ş	-	ć	10.05
D20 D2010	PLUMBING		¢ 47.424	Ş	47,424	ć	12.25	Ş	12.35
D2010			\$ 47,424	Ċ	126 720	Ş	12.55	ć	22.00
D30 D2010			¢ 126 720	Ş	120,720	6	22.00	Ş	33.00
D3010			\$ 120,720	¢	20 1 6 0	Ş	33.00	ć	5.25
D40	FIRE FROTECTION		¢ 20.160	Ş	20,100	ć	E 2E	Ş	5.25
D4010			\$ 20,100	¢	100 000	Ş	5.25	Ċ	22.00
D50			¢ 100.000	Ş	122,000	6	22.00	Ş	32.00
D5000			\$ 122,000	<u> </u>		Ş	32.00	Ċ	
E1010			¢	Ş	-	ć		\$	-
			ç -	<u> </u>		Ş	-	Ċ	
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS		<u>٨</u>	Ş	-	ć		\$	-
EZUIU			Ş -	6	000 700	Ş	-	6	76.40
FIU	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		¢ 202.702	\$	293,703			\$	/6.49
F1010	Special Structure		\$ 293,703 \$						
F1020			Ş -	ć				ć	
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		¢	Ş				Ş	
F2010	Sub-Total Direct Cost		Y	Ś	866.967			\$	225 77
	Estimating / Design Contingency	10 00%		Ś	86 697			Ś	22 58
	Sub-Total	10.00%		\$	953.663			\$	248.35
	General Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%		Ś	96,797			Ś	25 21
	General Contractor's Fee. Bonds and Insurance	7.30%		Ś	76.684			Ś	19 97
	Sub-Total			Ś	1.127.144			\$	293.53
	Escalation, March 2024	11.27%		\$	127,065			\$	33.09
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST			\$	1,25 <u>4,209</u>			\$	326.62

CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS M&O FACILITY CAMAS, WA PRE-DESIGN ESTIMATE SITEWORK



DATE:

No. E	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION		EL	EMENT TOTAL		GROUP TOTAL	
G10 S	SITE PREPARATION				Ś	520.300	
G1010	Site Clearing	Ś	\$	-			
G1020	Site Demolition and Relocations	Ś	\$	210,000			
G1030	Site Earthwork	Ś	\$	310,300			
G1040	Hazardous Waste Remediation	\$	\$	-			
G20 S	SITE IMPROVEMENTS				\$	669,150	
G2010	Roadways	\$	\$	-			
G2020	Parking Lots	\$	\$	-			
G2030	Pedestrian Paving	\$	\$	495,400			
G2040	Site Development	\$	\$	136,250			
G2050	Landscaping	Ş	\$	37,500			
G30 S	SITE MECHANICAL UTILITIES				\$	1,134,100	
G3010	Water Supply	Ş	\$	218,000			
G3020	Sanitary Sewer	Ş	\$	91,250			
G3030	Storm Sewer	Ş	\$	824,850			
G3040	Heating Distribution	\$	\$	-			
G3050	Cooling Distribution	\$	\$	-			
G3060	Fuel Distribution	\$	\$	-			
G3090	Other Site Mechanical Utilities	\$	\$	-			
G40 S	SITE ELECTRICAL UTILITIES				\$	265,000	
G4010	Electrical Distribution	Ş	\$	140,000			
G4020	Site Lighting	ç	\$	90,000			
G4030	Site Communications and Security	Ş	\$	35,000			
G4090	Other Site Electrical Utilities	\$	\$	-			
	Sub-Total Direct Cost	10.000			\$	2,588,550	
E	stimating / Design Contingency	10.00%	_		Ş	258,855	
	Sub-Total	4.0.4.5%			Ş	2,847,405	
(Seneral Conditions/General Requirements	10.15%			Ş	289,012	
(Seneral Contractor's Fee, Bonds and Insurance	/.30%			Ş	228,958	
	Sub-Total	11 27%			Ś	3,300,375	
		11.27/0			ې د	2 7// 760	



CITY OF CAI M&O FACILI CAMAS, WA PRE-DESIGN SITEWORK	MAS PUBLIC WORKS TY I ESTIMATE		Date:	December 6, 2021	R Cost GROUP
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
G10 G1010	SITE PREPARATION Site Clearing			_	
	Included in G1020 Site Demolition and Relocations				
	Total For	r Site Clearing			
G1020	Site Demolition and Relocations				
	G1020 Site Demolition Allowance Site Contractor Mobilization General Crushed Rock Work Pad Brush Clearing Misc. Fencing Removal	1 1 0.3 1	LS LS ACRE LS	50,000.00 20,000.00 5,000.00 2,000.00	50,000 20,000 1,250 2,000
	Asphalt Paving Demolition & Removal Concrete Curb Removal Utility Removal & Structural Backfill - Variable Size	80,000 500	LF	7.50	3,750
	Storm/Sanitary Lines Utility Removal & Structural Backfill - Precast Manholes Utility Removal & Structural Backfill - Utility Vaults &	1,500 3	LF EA	25.00 500.00	37,500 1,500
	Drainage Structures Utility removal & structural backfill - water line Allowance Miscellaneous Landscape Demolition &	3 300	EA LF	500.00 25.00	1,500 7,500
	Removal	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000
	Total For Site Demolition an	d Relocations			210,000
G1030	Site Earthwork				
	G1030 Site Earthwork General Site Topsoil Striping (6" stripping) Onsite Cut Material Import Structural Fill Placement of Topsoil Haul Off Stripping/Cut Material Structural Building Excavation & Backfill (Footings) Building Floorslab 8" Compacted Layer Crushed Rock	100 1,000 2,000 50 1,050 30,000 3,500	CY CY CY CY SF SY	4.00 5.00 28.00 8.00 10.00 4.00 5.00	400 5,000 56,000 400 10,500 120,000 17,500
	G1031 Erosion Control Rock Construction Entrance Wheel Wash Facility Silt Fencing Inlet Protection Concrete Washout Area Straw Mulch Covering Allowance Stockpile Plastic Covering Allowance Temporary Infiltration or Settling Pond Facilities Maintenance & Monitoring	1 1,000 10 50,000 1 1 12	EA EA EA EA SF LS LS MONTHS	7,500.00 15,000.00 3.50 350.00 3,500.00 0.05 10,000.00 25,000.00 2,500.00	7,500 15,000 3,500 3,500 2,500 10,000 25,000 30,000
	Total For S	Site Earthwork			310,300

G1040 Hazardous Waste Remediation

No work anticipated

0 FACILI ⁻ MAS, WA E-DESIGN EWORK	ESTIMATE		Date:	December 6, 2021	
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	Total For Hazardous Waste	Remediation		_	
G20 G2010	SITE IMPROVEMENTS Roadways				
	Included in G2030 Pedestrian Paving				N/A
	Total F	or Roadways	-		
G2020	Parking Lots				
	Included in G2030 Pedestrian Paving				N/A
	Total For	Parking Lots			
G2030	Pedestrian Paving				
	G2031 Paving and surfacing ADA Stall Post Signage	2	EA	450.00	900
	Directional Traffic Signage	4	EA EA	450.00	2,400
	Other Directional Signage Heavy AC Pavement Sections (Access Drives & Drop Off Loops)	4	EA	600.00	2,400
	Base Course (12") AC Paving (4")	80,000 80,000	SF SF	2.50 2.50	200,000 200,000
	Geotechnical Subgrade Fabric	80,000 1	SF	0.25	20,000
	Cross Walks & Unload Lane Marking	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000
	Truncated Domes and Raised Surface Panels	2	EA	750.00	1,500
	ADA Parking Stencils	4	EA	500.00	2,000
	Painted Curbs Concrete Curbing (includes base rock)	200		2.00	400 26 000
	ADA Curb Ramps (including base rock)	2	EA	1,750.00	3,500
	Concrete Entrance Driveway Aprons (including base rock)	1	EA	7,500.00	7,500
	Standard Concrete Sidewalks & Plazas	2,000	SF	6.00	12,000
	Total For Pede	strian Paving			495,400
G2040	Site Development				
	G2040 Site Development				
	Galvanized 6' high Chain Link	1,400	LF	35.00	49,000
	IVIISC. UNAIN LINK PERSONNEI GATES	3	EA	/50.00	2,250
	Trash Enclosures	2 1	EA FA	25,000.00 25,000.00	25 000
	Site furniture, Bike racks, allow	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000

G2050 Landscaping





RE-DESIGN FEWORK	IESTIMATE		Date:	December 6, 2021	COST GRO
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	C2050 Landcoaning				
	Landscaping, allow	5,000	SF	7.50	37,500
	Total For	Landscaping	-	_	37,500
G30	SITE MECHANICAL UTILITIES				_
G3010	Water Supply				
	G3010 Water Supply				
	6" Ductile Iron Fire Water Lines (including trenching &	1 500		100.00	150,000
	111poneu backiiii) 4" DVC Schedule 40 Potable Water Lines	1,500		100.00	130,000
	Precast Fire Backflow Preventor Vaults	400	Γ FΔ	3 500 00	3 500
	6" Fire Backflow Assemblies	1	FA	6,500,00	6,500
	FDC Assemblies (at vaults)	1	EA	2,500.00	2,500
	Fire Hydrant Assemblies	2	EA	5,000.00	10,000
	4" Gate Valves	1	EA	500.00	500
	Joint Restraint Assemblies	15	EA	500.00	7,500
	4" RPBP Potable Backflow Assemblies with Enclosure	1	EA	9,500.00	9,500
	Potable Meter Vaults	1	EA	2,500.00	2,500
	Public Connections / Taps to Existing Systems	2	EA	5,000.00	10,000
	Sump Pump Assemblies for Backflow Vaults	1	EA	1,500.00	1,500
	Total For V	Water Supply			218,000
G3020	Sanitary Sewer				
	C2020 Sepitary Sower				
	6" PVC Gravity Sanitary (including trenching & import				
	backfill)	400	IF	80.00	32 000
	4"-6" Sanitary Building Laterals	400 50	LI	35.00	1 750
	Precast Concrete Sanitary Manholes	2	FA	5.000.00	10.000
	Sanitary Gravity Cleanouts	8	FA	750.00	6,000
	Oil/Water Separator Precast Concrete Vault (1,000 - 1,500	0	273		-,
	gal)	2	EA	20,000.00	40,000
	Trapped Sanitary Drain Inlet (Trash Enclosure)	1	EA	1,500.00	1,500
	Total For Sa	nitary Sewer			91,250
G3030	Storm Sewer				
	G3030 Storm Drainage				
	8" PVC Storm Lines (included trenching & import backfill)	1 000	IF	60.00	60.000
	12" PVC Storm Mains (included trenching & import	1,000	LI	00.00	00,000
	backfill)	500	LF	85.00	42,500
	48" Detention N-12 Pipe	4,000	LF	125.00	500,000
	Storm Outfall Allowance	2	EA	2,500.00	5,000
	Storm Pump Allowance	2	EA	15,000.00	30,000
	Riprap @ Discharges	2	CY	50.00	100
	12" Metal Lynch style Catch Basins (Landscape, Plazas)	2	EA	750.00	1,500
	24" Metal Lynch style Catch Basins	10	EA	1,500.00	15,000
	48" Precast Concrete Manholes	3	EA	4,000.00	12,000
	Trench Drains	100	LF	100.00	10,000





TEWORK			Date:	December 6, 2021	COST GROU
	ITEM DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTALS
	Contech Filterra Treatment Vault	850	SF	175.00	148,750
	Total F	or Storm Sewer			824,850
G3040	Heating Distribution				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Heat	ing Distribution			
G3050	Cooling Distribution				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Cool	ing Distribution			
G3060	Fuel Distribution				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For F	uel Distribution			
G3090	Other Site Mechanical Utilities				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Other Site Mec	hanical Utilities			
G40	SITE ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	_			
G4010	Electrical Distribution				
	Site Electrical distribution, allow by RC Cost Group	1	LS	140,000.00	140,000
	Total For Electri	cal Distribution			140,000
G4020	Site Lighting				
	G4020 Site Lighting Illumination - Site Lighting	1	LS	90,000.00	90,000
	Total F	or Site Lighting			90,000
G4030	Site Communications and Security				
	Site Communications and security, allow by RC Cost Group	D 1	LS	35,000.00	35,000
	Total For Site Communicatio	ns and Security			35,000
G4090	Other Site Electrical Utilities				
	No work anticipated				N/A
	Total For Other Site Fle	ectrical Utilities			

CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS						Item 2.
CAMAS, WA						
EOUIPMEN	NT CFCI			DATE	December 6. 2021	COST GROUP
No.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	ELEMENT TOTAL	GROUP TO	TAL	2000.11001 0, 2021	
A10	FOUNDATIONS		Ś	-	_	_
A1010	Standard Foundation			_		
A1020	Special Foundation					
A1030	Slab on grade					
A20	BASEMENT WALL CONSTRUCTION		\$	-		
A2010	Basement Excavation					
A2020	Basement Wall Construction					
B10	SUPERSTRUCTURE		\$			
B1010	Floor & Roof Construction					
B20	EXTERIOR ENCLOSURE		\$	-		
B2010	Exterior Walls					
B2020	Exterior Windows					
B2030	Exterior Doors					
B30	ROOFING		Ş	-		
B3010	Rooting		<u> </u>			
C10	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION		Ş	-		
C1010	Partitions					
01020	Interior Doors					
01030	Fittings and Specialties		<u> </u>			
020	STAIRS Stair Construction		Ş	-		
62010			¢	_		
C30	Wall Einishes		Ş	-		
C3010	Floor Finishes					
C3020	Ceiling Finishes					
D10	CONVEVING		Ś	-		
D1010	Elevators & Lifts		Ŷ			
D20	PIUMBING		Ś	-		
D2010	Plumbing		•			
D30	HVAC		Ś	-		
D3010	HVAC					
D40	FIRE PROTECTION		\$	-		
D4010	Sprinkler System					
D50	ELECTRICAL		\$	-		
D5000	Electrical					
E10	EQUIPMENT		\$ 2	28,200		
E1010	Equipment	\$ 228,200				
E20	FIXED FURNISHINGS		\$	-		
E2010	Fixed Furnishings					
F10	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION		\$			
F1010	Special Structure					
F1020	Special Construction					
F20	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION		Ş	-		
F2010	Building Elements Demolition		ė	20.200		
	Sub-Total Direct Cost	0/	\$ 2. ¢	28,200		
	Estimating / Design Contingency 10.00	/0	় ৫	∠∠,0∠U 51.020		
	General Conditions/General Requirements 10.15	%	<u> </u>	25 470		
	General Contractor's Fee Bonds and Insurance 7 30	%	Ś	20,184		
	Sub-Total		\$2	96.683		
	Escalation, March 2024 11.27	%	\$	33,446		
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST		\$3	30,129		



February 14, 2022

EXHIBIT A

Mr. Steve Wall Public Works Director City of Camas 616 NE 4th Avenue Camas, WA 98607

RE: CITY OF CAMAS PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS FACILITY SITE & SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS TCF Project No. 2021-013 SCOPE & FEE PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES – PART 2 - SITE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT

Dear Steve:

On behalf of TCF Architecture (hereafter "TCF") and our design team, we want to thank you and the City of Camas (hereafter "City") for the opportunity and privilege to provide you with professional planning and design services to complete the next step in Operations Facility Site & Space Needs Analysis Study, Part 2 Site Alternatives Assessment, (hereafter "the Work"). This letter provides descriptions of our proposed work tasks and deliverables.

Exhibit A.1, attached to this letter, provides the Master Fee Schedule for the Scope of Services, itemizing all fee budgets associated with each task for each team member. TCF will contract with various specialty consultants in the development of this planning work. All work will be performed on an hourly basis for this Study.

CONSULTING TEAM MEMBERS

The firms listed below will be under direct contract to TCF and will each have specific roles and responsibilities for the delivery of work scope under this proposal package. The term "Design Team" may be used occasionally in this document, referring to the full team.

|--|

•	Equipment / Operations:	Facility Planning Services
---	-------------------------	----------------------------

- Cost Estimating: RC Cost Group
- Others
 Not included under this Scope of Services

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The following Scope of Services defines TCF's tasks, deliverables, and the basis for the hours and fee compensation amounts provided in Exhibit A.1.

Task 1 – Project Administration

1.01 TCF will provide contract management, consultant management & coordination, schedule development and management, and manage day to day communication (phone and e-mail), and other general correspondence. The City will identify a "Core Advisory Team" (AKA "Steering Committee") that will periodically meet with TCF to review progress and provide on-going guidance and feedback.

Deliverables:

- Executed contract amendment with scope of services and associated fee budgets. (TCF will execute separate consultant agreements with each sub-consultant contracted under TCF.)
- Project Schedule (In Smartsheet)
- Correspondence and management of documents through Smartsheet.



Task 2 – Site Alternatives Evaluation

TCF will explore and evaluate alternative sites throughout the City of Camas for the potential to accommodate the Operations facilities program needs as a consolidated facility, including consideration of different scenarios for phased development or potentially split facilities development on more than one site. The goal of the work is to provide the City with a comparative analysis offering optional approaches for the City's decision-making process regarding the future of Operation facilities. The City will provide TCF with the site candidates to be studied and evaluated, as noted below.

2.01	Activities
Site	The TCF Team will perform the following activities:
Alternatives Evaluation: <u>Step 1:</u>	 Confirm with the City, evaluation categories and criteria to be used in the process of evaluating and comparing each site alternative. Anticipated categories include site location, site size and shape, access, grading/topography, zoning, environmental
Site Identification and Criteria	sensitivity, easements and encumbrances, major site development costs, site acquisition or assembly costs and considerations, tax-base considerations, neighborhood compatibility, and public relations/perception. Other potential categories and sub- categories will be discussed and confirmed.
	Prepare an evaluation and scoring matrix template (Excel-based) incorporating the

 Prepare an evaluation and scoring matrix template (Excel-based) incorporating the identified categories, and confirm with the City, the specific criteria and the scoring and weighting factors to be used in evaluating the site candidates.

Information Needed from City

 Potential Site Candidates: The City will provide TCF with a list of sites to be evaluated. The list will include address and a graphic identification using satellite aerial views (such as GIS or Google Maps), noting the extent of property boundaries to be included for each site.

Deliverables:

- TCF will facilitate a video conference with the Core Advisory Team to review the site candidates, discuss a draft version of the evaluation matrix, and confirm the categories, evaluation criteria, and scoring and weighting factors to be used. This meeting will also offer an initial opportunity to discuss each site candidate for general criteria such as location, neighborhood compatibility, and access.
- 2.02 Site

Alternatives Evaluation -

<u>Step 2:</u>

Research and Documentation

TCF will prepare a draft version of the Evaluation Matrix to facilitate the process of reviewing the various Scenarios with the Core Advisory Team in Workshop 2. Depending on the number of site candidates and Scenarios at this stage, this step in the process may either: A) further refine multiple options to two or three primary Scenarios or B) already be refined from task 4.01 to two of three Scenarios and be ready for comparative cost analysis. (See Task 5 for cost estimating and comparative NPV cost analysis).

Deliverables:

- Based on the programmatic information developed under the Part 1 work, explore the site candidates for development potential including general layout for accommodation of the program, major site infrastructure considerations (grading, utilities, stormwater), site access considerations, and potential off-site development considerations.
- Preliminary site plan concepts showing possible alternative site usage layouts responding to the program criteria and City's goals & objectives.
- Preliminary building layout concepts showing approaches for addressing program needs, integrated with the site layouts.
- Summary of Facility Scenario scope elements.
- Preliminary Evaluation Matrix Criteria for review with the Core Advisory Team in Workshop 2.



2.03 Site Alternatives Evaluation:	Conduct a video-conference workshop with the Core Advisory Team to review the preliminary site development Scenarios and facilitate an evaluation review using the Scenario Evaluation Matrix. Workshop 2 should be attended by the Core Advisory Team and potentially others from the City as determined.
<u>Step 3:</u>	Deliverables:
Alternatives Review	 Preparation for and conducting of the site candidates evaluation video-conference meeting
Meeting	 Completed Scenario Evaluation Matrix with scoring and preliminary identification of Preferred Scenario.
2.04	Based on the outcome of Workshop 2 noted under Task 2.03, TCF will further research and refine
Site Alternatives Evaluation: <u>Step 4:</u>	the preferred Scenario such as additional conceptual site and building layouts. If it is determined that environmental or geotechnical data is required to better understand potential development challenges and costs, TCF will inform the City and a determination will be made as to how such additional services may be procured. (Note: TCF prefers that the City procure such services separately but can bring them on under TCF as necessary).
Follow-up Research	Deliverables:
	 Updated conceptual site and building plan drawings further illustrating the preferred Scenario development for use in more detailed cost estimating. (See Task 5.02).
	Determination of additional services for environmental and geotechnical engineering

 Determination of additional services for environmental and geotechnical engineering services and the method of procurement.

Task 3 – Economics

As part of the work described under Task 2.02, the TCF Team will develop budgetary cost estimates for the various site Alternatives under each Scenario as part of the larger effort to analyze and compare long-term financial models using a 50-year Net-Present-Value modeling process.

3.01	TCF's civil consultant (KPFF) and Cost Estimator (RCCG) will prepare budgetary cost estimates
Preliminary Site Cost Estimating	for the short-listed sites identified under Task 4.02 for the purpose of comparative analysis between site alternatives. This cost information will be part of the Scenario Evaluation scoring in Workshop 2.

Work under this task will also include preliminary estimating for expansion and renovation of the existing Operations Facility and unique costs that may be associated with building development of any of the short-listed sites for use in comparative analysis between Scenarios under Task 4.03.

Deliverables:

- Order of Magnitude cost estimating for major site development at each of the shortlisted sites and unique building costs not common to each site for comparative purposes.
- Preliminary budget estimating for redevelopment and expansion of the existing Operations Facility.

3.02 Preferred Alternative/Draft Master Plan Cost Estimating Once a preferred Conceptual Alternative and overall development Scenario is identified through the comparative analysis process, it will become the preferred Draft Master Plan approach. TCF will prepare a more detailed Predesign Level cost estimate for the Draft Master Plan organized to reflect site costs (demolition, grading, storm water management, utilities, surfacing, landscaping, etc), buildings, furnishings-fixtures & equipment, (FF&E), soft costs,



contingencies, and escalation and multiple year phasing.

Deliverables

- For each Conceptual Alternative, provide budgetary cost estimates in sufficient detail to identify anticipated "hard" construction costs, soft costs (sales tax, professional services, permitting, general administration, construction administration, etc.), FF&E, contingencies, and escalation factors tied to multiple year phasing models.
- Conceptual phasing analysis exploring the potential for full build-out conducted over multiple years.

Task 4 – Report of Findings

TCF will prepare a Report of Findings, organizing and summarizing the comparative information, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the work tasks. A draft report will be produced for City review and comment, followed by a final report incorporating City review comments.

4.01 Draft Report	TCF will prepare a draft report summarizing all information noted under Tasks 1-3 above into a complete package. The deliverable will be organized in a tabbed .PDF electronic format. TCF will present the draft document to the Core Advisory Team and solicit feedback and comment.
	_Deliverables:
	 Draft Report
4.02	TCF will incorporate the City's review comments regarding the Draft Report and prepare a final
Final Report	version of the document for publishing and distribution.
Document	Deliverables:
	 Final Report
4.03	TCF will develop a Power Point presentation summarizing and illustrating all planning and
Power Point	analysis information for use in presenting to the City Council.
Presentation(s)	Deliverables:
	Power Point and presentation assistance to the City Council

Contract Amendment

If the above scope of services and associated fee budgets identified in Exhibit A.1 are acceptable, please execute an amendment to the Professional Services Agreement.

Sincerely,

Sanda Cale

Randy Cook, AIA, LEED AP Principal-in-Charge

Attachments:

Exhibit A.1:	Master Fee Schedule
Exhibit B:	TCF 2022 Schedule of Rates and Charges
Exhibit C:	KPFF Scope of Services and Fee Proposal

CITY OF CAMAS Public Works Operations Facility Site and Space Needs Analysis

EXHIBIT "A	ltem 2.		
MASTER FEE SCHED			
PART 2 WORKSCO	PE		

TASK NO.	PROJECT TASKS			T(Archi Proj	CF Architectur itecture / Plar ect Managem	r e Ining Ient			Other Team Members (Contracted under TCF) (See Separate Proposals)		TOTALS					
		Mg. Principal (Randy)	Principal	Designer/ Arch 5 (Amy G)	Designer/ Arch 3 (Coreen)	Designer/ Arch 2 (TBD)	Project Coord. (Teta)	Admin Support (TBD)	KPFF (Civil)	FPS (Equip/Ops)		RCCG (Cost Est)		BCE (MEP)	AHBL (Structural)	
TASK 1 -	PROJECT ADMINISTRATION															
1.01	Project Administration:	20					6									
	ESTIMATED HOURS OR FEES	20	0	0	0	0	6	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	HOURLY RATE	\$295.00	\$245.00	\$145.00	\$125.00	\$115.00	\$115.00	\$95.00			See C	onsultant Let	tters			
	ESTIMATED FEES	\$5,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$690	\$0			500 0	onsultant Ec				
	SUBTOTAL				\$6,590				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,590
TASK 2 -	SITE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION															
2.01	Site Identification Criteria	8			12											
2.02	Research & Documentation	20			60				\$26,000	\$2,000						
2.03	Alternatives Review - Meeting	8			12				\$20,000	\$2,000						
2.04	Research & Follow-up	16			40											
	ESTIMATED HOURS OR FEES	52	0	0	124	0	0	0	\$26,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	HOURLY RATE	\$295.00	\$245.00	\$145.00	\$125.00	\$115.00	\$115.00	\$95.00			See C	onsultant Let	tters			
	ESTIMATED FEES	\$15,340	\$0	\$0	\$15,500	\$0	\$0	\$0			566.6	onsultant Lei	tter 3			
	SUBTOTAL				\$30,840				\$26,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$58,840
TASK 3 -	ECONOMICS															
3.01	Preliminary Alternatives Estimating	4			8				\$16,000	\$2,000		\$6,000				
3.02	Preferred Alternative Estimating - Follow-up	4			12				<i>\$10,000</i>	\$2,000		<i>\$0,000</i>				
	ESTIMATED HOURS OR FEES	8	0	0	20	0	0	0	\$16,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	HOURLY RATE	\$295.00	\$245.00	\$145.00	\$125.00	\$115.00	\$115.00	\$95.00			See C	onsultant Let	tters			
	ESTIMATED FEES	\$2,360	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0			566.0		tters		-	
	SUBTOTAL				\$4,860				\$16,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$28,860
TASK 4 -	REPORT OF FINDINGS															
4.01	Draft Report Preparation	8			20											
4.02	Final Report	4			8				\$1,000							
4.03	Power Point Prep and Presentation Assistance	8			8											
	ESTIMATED HOURS OR FEES	20	0	0	36	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	HOURLY RATE	\$295.00	\$245.00	\$145.00	\$125.00	\$115.00	\$115.00	\$95.00			500.0	oncultant l of	tors			
	ESTIMATED FEES	\$5,900	\$0	\$0	\$4,500	\$0	\$0	\$0			See C	onsultant Lei	tters			
	SUBTOTAL				\$10,400				\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,400
SUBTOTAL PER TEAM MEMBER - ALL TASKS		\$52,690					\$43,000	\$4,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$105,690		
REIMBURSABLE EXPENSE BUDGETS		\$1,000						\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,250	
SUB CONSULTANT SUBTOTALS								\$43,250	\$4,000	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$53,250	
TCFA MA	ARKUP ON CONSULTANT SERVICES (10%)	N/A						\$4,325	\$400	\$0	\$600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,325	
TOTAL P	TOTAL PER TEAM MEMBER - ALL TASKS (Incl. Mark-ups) \$53,690				\$47,575	\$4,400	\$0	\$6,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$112,265				
TOTAL E	OTAL ESTIMATED HOURLY FEE BUDGETS and REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES \$112,265															

129



Exhibit **B**

2022 Hourly Rate and Reimbursable Expense Schedule

Effective: January 1, 2022

Description	Rates
TCF Personnel:	
Principal-In-Charge / Managing Principal	\$295.00 / hour
Principal	\$245.00 / hour
Interior Design Director	\$205.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 9	\$185.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 8	\$175.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 7	\$165.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 6	\$155.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 5	\$145.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 4	\$135.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 3	\$125.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 2	\$115.00 / hour
Designer / Architect 1	\$110.00 / hour
Project Coordinator	\$115.00 / hour
Administrative Support	\$95.00 / hour

Subconsultant Services:

Subconsultant Services Contracted Through TCF	Direct Cost plus 10%

Reimbursable Expenses:

Mileage	Current Federal Rate
Other Expenses:	Direct Cost plus 10%
(Meals, air travel, per diem, reproductions, shipping, postage, etc.)	

Notes:

- 1. TCF Personnel Categories: Categories are based on experience and job responsibilities. Not all personnel are licensed architects.
- 2. Rate may be adjusted at the beginning of each calendar year. Rates will not be increased by more than 10% for any one category for a year for any project under contract.
- 3. Billing rates may, on occasion, be blended to approximately reflect specific personnel as well as specific tasks and services rendered.



SCOPE OF SERVICES AND FEE

City of Camas – Public Works Operation Facility Site and Space Needs Analysis

A. TASK BREAKDOWN

Task 2: Site Alternatives Evaluation

TCF will work with a real estate professional to generate a list of sites for evaluation. A simple matrix scoring tool will be developed to review the list of sites and narrow them down to 3-5 sites that warrant further investigation. Once the "short list" of sites is generated, KPFF's role for this task will be to assist TCF in the evaluation of alternative sites where the Operations Facility can be centrally located on one site or a combination of two or more sites. This site evaluation will feed into the Evaluation Matrix which will be used to score the various site options as part of Workshop 2. As part of Workshop 2, a preferred scenario will be selected and we will do a deeper dive into the preferred scenario with respect to civil-related development needs. KPFF will:

- Evaluate up to five sites, 10- to 15-acres in size for potential development. *Includes site access considerations, utility availability, terrain, potential environmental considerations, required public improvements, and other feasibility factors.*
- Assist in preliminary test fits for each of the sites studied.
- Provide civil-related input into the Evaluation Matrix for consideration in Workshop 2.
- Attend Workshop 2, assume one (1) day.
- Further develop preferred scenarios to fine-tune site elements and costs.
- Attend design and coordination meetings.
- Coordinate our work with TCF and the other design team members.
- Assist in determining the need for additional studies at each site such as fire flow test, sewer system modeling, stormwater downstream analysis, geotechnical investigation, environmental investigation, traffic analysis, boundary, and topographic survey, etc.

Task 3: Economics

Our role for this work will be similar in nature to what was completed in Phase I of the project. We will support TCF in providing rough order of magnitude on civil-related development costs for the short list of sites identified in Task 4. Once a preferred site is selected, this will become the Draft Master Plan and we will further develop the cost estimate for this site with the detail provided in the analysis of the preferred alternative. KPFF will:

- Provide order of magnitude cost estimating for up to five (5) sites as described above.
- Work with TCF and RC Cost Group to refine cost estimates for the preferred site configuration.

Task 4: Report of Findings

Our involvement in this task is anticipated to include review and comment on the civil-related items of the draft report.

B. ASSUMPTIONS & CLARIFICATIONS

- KPFF's role in these tasks is in support of TCF and the RC Cost Group. KPFF will provide recommendations and cost estimating related to the civil portion of the work.
- Floodplain, wetland, or environmental work is not included in this proposal.

C. OPTIONAL SERVICES

Should any of these services be required for this project, a mutually agreed upon scope and fee will be negotiated at such time.

- Preparation of special studies (i.e., water system modeling, storm drain system modeling outside our scope of work, detailed downstream analysis, traffic impact analysis, etc.).
- Intensive research and testing to determine conditions of existing site utilities (i.e., potholing, smoke testing, dye testing, pressure testing, fire flow testing, videotaping, etc.).
- Assistance in determining System Development Charges (SDCs) and utility connection fees.

D. PROPOSED FEES

Our lump sum fee for this project is outlined below based on the attached Scope of Services and Project Limits. We will bill for our work monthly based on the percentage of our effort completed. Expenses will be billed as a part of our lump sum fee.

Site Improvements	
Task 2: Site Alternatives Evaluation	\$26,000
Task 3: Economics	16,000
Task 4: Report of Findings	1,000
Total Lump Sum Fee Including Reimbursables	\$43,000

Should additional services, including site visits, beyond those noted in the above Scope of Services become necessary, the scope and fee will be negotiated as part of an Additional Service Request (ASR).

2100471-pm



Staff Report

March 7, 2022 Council Workshop

City of Camas 2023-2024 Budget Preparation – Data Program Relaunch Presenter: Cathy Huber Nickerson, Finance Director and Debra Brooks, Financial Analyst Time Estimate: 15 minutes

Phone	Email
360.817.1537	chuber@cityofcamas.us
360.817.7025	dbrooks@cityofcamas.us

BACKGROUND: This presentation is to revisit the use of performance measurements as part of Government Finance Officers' Association (GFOA) budgeting best practices. Budgeting is just as much about values and priorities as it is about dollars. It is important for the City to improve budget transparency, demonstrate fairness, and help justify difficult decisions. Performance measurements provide data to help the City show what is being done well and want isn't.

SUMMARY: Staff will provide information on why the gathering of data is important, how the data can help the public understand the service level the City provides and provide how this program relaunch and the ERP can provide tools to provide better information to staff, Council and the public.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS:

What are the desired results and outcomes for this agenda item? The intent of the presentation is to provide City Council information on what a data program is.

What's the data? What does the data tell us? See the attached National League of Cities study.

How have communities been engaged? Are there opportunities to expand engagement? What Works Cities is a program started by Bloomberg Philanthropies in 2015. It is a program that uses data and evidence to drive change. Cities which incorporate engagement achieve higher results. <u>https://whatworkscities.bloomberg.org/about/</u>

Who will benefit from, or be burdened by this agenda item? This agenda item provides context for decision making for City Council and discloses the state of the City's performance to the residents of Camas.

What are the strategies to mitigate any unintended consequences? N/A

Does this agenda item have a differential impact on underserved populations, people living with disabilities, and/or communities of color? Please provide available data to illustrate this impact. Potentially depending on the data collected.

Will this agenda item improve ADA accessibilities for people with disabilities? Yes, data can be communicated in accessible forms.

What potential hurdles exists in implementing this proposal (include both operational and political)? The hurdles are staff time and access to data. This is a project which will take time and commitment. This is a long-term project.

How will you ensure accountabilities, communicate, and evaluate results? There will be communications plan built into the project and all data will be incorporated into the 2023-2024 budget document.

How does this item support a comprehensive plan goal, policy or other adopted resolution? This item provides open and transparent financial reporting which is a goal of the City's strategic plan and meets best financial practices.

BUDGET IMPACT: This agenda item provides financial context for City Council considerations.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only.



Camas Data Program Relaunch

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MARCH 7, 2022



135

From a practice point of view, performance measures are simply numerical reflections of how well a program, service, line of business, strategy, action or activity is working.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE CONSORTIUM MUNICIPAL DASHBOARD PRACTITIONERS' HANDBOOK 1ST EDITION, 2019

Why is gathering data important?

As a public sector agency, the City lacks some of the same methods the private sector uses to convey outcomes to stakeholders.

Navigating the City's financial publications can be difficult, and the documents do not convey the status of City programs providing services to the community.



Department data could help fill this reporting gap by providing an at-a-glance status of City programs.

Data dashboards can help identify:

- if a program is meeting desired or required outcomes for service
- where resources may be needed to bring a program back on track
- programs with potential capacity to be grown or developed further

Finance			
Excellence in Financial Reporting	Fund Balance	Electronic Transactions	Utility Billing Collection Rate
1	32.83%	56%	89.90%
award for reporting	% fund balance in reserves	Electronic Transactions	% customers paying on time
1/1/16 - 12/31/16	1/1/20 - 12/31/20	12/1/17 - 12/31/17	8/1/21 - 8/31/21
🤗 On Track	🧭 On Track	🛞 Off Track	😣 Off Track
Target 1	Target 17.00%	Target 90%	Target 90.00%
Metric Information 🔿	Metric Information 🔿	Metric Information 🗢	Metric Information 🗢
Fire & EMS			
Call Volumes	Staffing Levels	Fire Permit Review Time	Fire and Life Safety Inspections
226	6.00	11	50
520	0.00	Dave for Decemit Deview	D 9
call responses	days per month without of		so inspections completed
2/1/18 - 2/28/18	2/////-12/3////	0 On Track	0ff Track
Measuring	Target 30.00	Target 14	Target 100
Metric Information 🛹	Metric Information A	Metric Information ~	Metric Information A
Information	Technology		
through Innovation	Mobilized Workforce		
19.00	77%		
Upgrades or Enhancements	% with mobile access		
1/1/20 - 12/31/20	1/1/20 - 12/31/20		
🔗 On Track	🛞 Off Track		
Target 8.00	Target 80%		
Metric Information 🛹	Metric Information 🔿		

Why relaunch the data program?

- Ensure compliance with the Government Finance Officers Association's requirements for receiving the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award.
- Budget with greater transparency by clearly identifying how funds are used to deliver services and the status of those services.
 - Help departments begin building a central data hub for transparency and data-driven decision making.
- \checkmark
- Ensure the citywide ERP migration is designed and launched with data that will facilitate monitoring program metrics.



Educate stakeholders about the services provided by local government in order to develop a greater understanding of complex financial and operational decisions.

Measuring what we're trying to accomplish is far more valuable than measuring the data we happen to have.

STEVE GORCESTER, FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT BOARD (TIB) *MUNICIPAL DASHBOARD PRACTITIONERS' HANDBOOK*

Next steps...

Staff will work with departments to draft metrics.

Staff will return to council in the second quarter to provide an update on the program relaunch.

Staff will continue to update council on the progress of the data program through the year, including during a summer budget retreat.



141







PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

A Guide for City Leaders

NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES

ABOUT THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

The National League of Cities (NLC) is the nation's leading advocacy organization devoted to strengthening and promoting cities as centers of opportunity, leadership and governance. Through its membership and partnerships with state municipal leagues, NLC serves as a resource and advocate for more than 19,000 cities and towns and more than 218 million Americans. NLC's Center for City Solutions and Applied Research provides research and analysis on key topics and trends important to cities, creative solutions to improve the quality of life in communities, inspiration and ideas for local officials to use in tackling tough issues and opportunities for city leaders to connect with peers, share experiences and learn about innovative approaches in cities.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Emily Robbins is the Senior Associate of Finance and Economic Development and **Christiana McFarland** is Research Director at the National League of Cities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research team at NLC is grateful for the research and writing contributions to this report from Stephanie Landry, graduate student at the McCourt School of Public Policy at Georgetown University.

We also thank the following individuals for their participation in this research project: Emily Love and Matt Malament from Atlanta; Christopher Dwelley from Boston; La Toya Jackson, Kim Martin and Cecilia Scheu from Dallas; David Edinger and Scotty Martin from Denver; Amy Knowles from Fort Lauderdale; Kate Bender from Kansas City, Missouri; Maggie Plaster and Debbie Phillips from Las Vegas; Dan Caroselli from Los Angeles; Scott Cordes from St. Paul; and Lucian Coleman from Washington, DC.

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

Generous funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts supported the research and development of this publication.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Profiles: Performance Management Programs in 10 U.S. Cities

6 Building a Performance Management Program

Office Structure: Centralized, Decentralized and Hybrid Cultivating Buy-In Across Departments Staff Skills

9 Performance Management: The Basics

Data Sources and Data Quality Setting Performance Targets Identifying Performance Metrics Types of Data Analysis

Data-Driven Decisions on Priority-Setting, Process Improvements and Budgeting Decisions

14 The Future of Performance Management: Predictive Analytics

- 15 Conclusion and Recommendations
- 16 Methodology

17 Appendices

Appendix A - Survey Questions

Appendix B - Interview Questions

FOREWORD

We are pleased to present, Performance Management: A Guide for City Leaders, a report written and published as a service to NLC members and all cities. This guide presents an overview of existing performance management best practices with an eye toward the future of service delivery in cities. We also aim to empower more city leaders to launch performance management programs in their own cities.

Performance management and data analytics in general are key aspects of the continued shift toward data-driven decision-making in cities nationwide. Data-driven decisions help local governments provide city services that are efficient, effective and driven by community priorities. The value of making data-driven decisions is imperative as many cities continue to face the post-recession realities of decreased city revenues, limited intergovernmental aid and reduced municipal workforces. At the same time, there is a growing trend towards openness and making the inner workings of municipal governments more accountable and transparent.

Looking to the future, as advanced data analytics and open data become more prevalent in cities, there will be more opportunities to prepare and predict service needs of constituents. We plan to continue highlighting the importance of this epochal shift in city governance through our City of the Future initiative that seeks to advise cities on coming trends and opportunities. Within the Center for City Solutions and Applied Research we strive to strengthen communities, transform and improve cities and assist city leaders.

Performance Management: A Guide for City Leaders was developed through staff interviews and surveys with a cross-section of large cities across the United States. This work was supported financially by a grant to the National League of Cities Institute by The Pew Charitable Trusts. We join the authors in thanking the city officials who helped make this work possible, and welcome comments and thoughts from readers, as we continue to work to help city leaders lead.

Clarence Anthony CEO and Executive Director National League of Cities

Brooks Rainwater

Director, Center for City Solutions and Applied Research National League of Cities

INTRODUCTION

Performance management – the process of consistently reviewing performance data to inform decision-making – is a strategy emerging in cities across the country. Performance management provides cities with the tools to make informed program and process improvements, to spend scarce budget resources more wisely and to ensure that the community's needs are being prioritized. Although anecdotally we know that performance management holds promise and produces results, little is known about how performance management programs are operating at the local level.

To this end, NLC studied existing performance management systems in 10 U.S. cities through staff interviews and surveys. The study revealed that performance management has been adapted to the unique circumstances within each city but that there are key components common to all systems. This report identifies those components, discusses the various adaptations within the cities and the experiences of staff involved in their implementation and provides strategies for those cities interested in pursuing a more data-driven approach.

Specifically, we shed light on how cities launched their programs, and we provide insights into office structures, staff skills and ways in which leaders cultivated buy-in across city departments. We also explore the basics of performance management: data collection, analysis and informed decision-making. The cities we studied provided guidance on how to track metrics that accurately measure the performance of city services and how to use performance management to make critical decisions about the management and financing of city services.

This report also provides an example of predictive analytics to indicate how the future of performance management is evolving. This emerging practice holds the potential to make city services even more effective by empowering performance management teams to proactively pinpoint potential problem areas and intervene before problems become costly and time-consuming to fix. We conclude with recommendations for city leaders to champion these efforts in their communities. An executive-level champion is a primary factor, and often the impetus, for effective performance management and is critical to infusing and sustaining a culture of performance in the city government.

We know that cities nationwide are still reeling from post-recession realities of decreased city revenues, limited intergovernmental aid and smaller municipal workforces. At the same time, with the advancement of new technologies, there is greater public pressure to make the inner workings of municipal government more accountable and transparent. Within this governing environment, the value of making data-driven decisions is greater than ever, and with the help of this guide, also more attainable.

Profiles: Performance Management Programs in 10 U.S. Cities



Atlanta, GA – Focus on Results (FOR) Atlanta

Mission Statement: The Focus on Results program enables tangible and lasting improvements in city operations through departmental collaboration and capacity building, analysis, and project and performance management support.

Launched: 2012

Annual Program Budget: \$545,000

Staffing: 6 full-time equivalent (FTE)

Results: The city reduced a backlog of uninspected housing code violation complaints by 70 percent and increased the percentage of cases inspected within target time frames from 17 percent to 77 percent.

Boston, MA - Boston About Results (BAR)

Mission Statement: The Boston About Results program uses data analytics and performance measurement to track, evaluate and enhance the city services provided to all of Boston.

Launched: 2008

Annual Program Budget: \$135,000

Staffing: 2 FTE, 1 dedicated information technology FTE and 10 budget office partners

Results: The city implemented performance meetings in the permitting department, and as a result, decreased the number of days permitting applications spend in review by nearly 30 percent, or by 6 days. These performance meetings helped identify workflow bottlenecks and provided an opportunity for increased interdepartmental communication and collaboration. The Boston About Results team is also currently in the process of using data to improve operations and increase hours in the city's registry department without adding additional resources.

Dallas, TX – Strategic Customer Services

Mission Statement: The city's performance measurement system, Dallas Measures, is housed within the city's Strategic Customer Services department. Strategic Customer Services was created to help improve city services by focusing on customer needs, benchmarking and the performance of city services in relation to accountability, responsiveness and the quality of the service experience for the Dallas community.

Launched: 2005

Annual Program Budget: \$421,000

Staffing: 2 FTEs, 10 budget office partners

Results: In 2005, the city began an aggressive campaign designed to promote continued excellence in customer service. This campaign included conducting community surveys, employee award programs, customer service training classes for all employees, a Customer Service Initiative Team to continuously develop new initiatives and incentives and the development of a 311 Customer Service Call Center. The results of these efforts are reflected in a 20 percent increase in the number of citizens reporting that they receive excellent/good customer service from city employees.

Denver, CO – Peak Performance

Mission Statement: The mission of Peak Performance is to achieve greater performance and efficiency within Denver's city government. Peak Performance empowers staff to embrace a culture of innovation and continuous improvement by providing them with tools to identify and solve city problems and support innovation in the mayor's priority areas.

Launched: 2011

Annual Program Budget: \$1 million

Staffing: 11 FTE

Results: The city saves \$10 million annually through employee-driven process improvements. For example, the city's emergency response team achieved a total annual savings of \$145,000 in 2013 by reducing the number of times police officers responded to false burglary alarms.

Fort Lauderdale, FL – Division of Structural Innovation

Mission Statement: The goal of Fort Lauderdale's Division of Structural Innovation is to support organizational transformation through strategic planning, performance management and process improvement.

Launched: 2011

Annual Program Budget: \$618,000

Staffing: 4 FTE, 1 senior management fellow from ICMA

Results: The city developed a multiyear storm water management plan after residents flagged it as a capital spending priority in a 2013 survey, in which 54 percent of respondents reported seeing an increase in flooding and only 27 percent reported being satisfied with the city's prevention of storm water–related flooding.

Kansas City, MO – Office of Performance Management

Mission Statement: The Office of Performance Management in Kansas City, and its KCStat program, encourage the provision of effective and efficient city services that are oriented toward citizens' needs and priorities and aligned with resource realities, in the present and the future.

Launched: 2009

Annual Program Budget: \$400,000

Staffing: 3 FTE, 1 management fellow

Results: By identifying and tracking the time frame for completing initial inspections for code enforcement, the city significantly reduced outliers without adding additional resources, increasing completed inspections from 90 percent in 120 days to 90 percent in 10 days.

Las Vegas, NV – Performance Plus

Mission Statement: The Office of Administration Services' Performance Plus program ensures alignment of performance measures to council priorities. The office reports on performance measures to elected officials and city departments so they can readily evaluate performance and make decisions on existing and future city programs.

Launched: 2007

Annual Program Budget: Approximately \$100,000 for one paid position; other paid staff on loan from city departments

Staffing: 2 FTE

Results: The city reduced the number of automobile accidents at targeted intersections by 23 percent by reengineering the 50 intersections with the most crashes in a specific year.

Los Angeles, CA – Innovation and Performance Management Unit

Mission Statement: The Innovation and Performance Management Unit (iPMU) oversees performance management, strategic planning and other data-driven processes both citywide and within individual city departments. The core functions of the iPMU are to act as expert consultants to city departments, working with department leadership to create and oversee performance systems and processes. The unit also provides support to the mayor's budget team regarding metrics, and helps instill a culture of innovation, collaboration and excellence within Los Angeles City Hall.

Launched: Re-launched in 2013

Annual Program Budget: Approximately \$100,000 for one paid position; other paid staff on loan from city departments

Staffing: 5 FTE

Results: By tracking and analyzing data from the city's 311 call center (including staff schedules, sick time, call volumes, call wait times and call abandonment rates), the city maximized staff resources and dramatically improved service. The average 311 call wait time dropped from 5.9 minutes in February 2013 to 0.6 minutes in February 2014.

4

St. Paul, MN – Innovation Team

Mission Statement: The Innovation Team in St. Paul's Office of Financial Services creates a culture of innovation by facilitating opportunities to improve service delivery through business practice reviews and process reengineering. The unit also develops transparent and collaborative governance processes for implementation of large projects.

Launched: 2014

Annual Program Budget: \$350,000

Staffing: 3.5 FTE, support from budget staff

Results: The city's pilot project resulted in \$500,000 in annual savings as a result of centralizing payroll staff and re-engineering business processes by automating and streamlining payroll workflows. The city is currently evaluating business processes in the police department records division, with the goal of minimizing redundant work, eliminating low priority services and streamlining document management. Also, the city is tracking weekly building trade inspections to evaluate the impact of a new business process related to how inspectors use technology in the field. Both projects are expected to yield significant and measurable productivity gains.

Washington, DC – Citywide Performance Management Program

Mission Statement: The Citywide Performance Management program consists of four main components: the Citywide Performance Management team within the Office of the City Administrator; the DCStat program within the Office of the City Administrator; the Citywide Data Warehouse team within the Office of the Chief Technology Officer; and the Performance Management specialists within each government agency. The mission of the Office of the City Administrator is to facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the mayor's polices by providing leadership, support and oversight of government agencies.

Launched: 2008

Annual Program Budget: \$1 million

Staffing: 7 FTE, 1 performance management specialist within each of the city's 73 agencies/offices

Results: The city's health department increased access to health care services for individuals diagnosed with HIV/ AIDS by tracking patient data (including lab tests, number of clients not receiving care and prescription fill dates) to identify, re-engage and treat outpatients.

BUILDING A PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Putting performance management into action at the local government level is an iterative, ongoing process that takes many forms. But there are several consistent factors that can help promote the growth of a program. First, is structure, or the presence of a performance management office within city hall. Next, is buy-in from city department staff, those on the front lines of service delivery. Lastly, is understanding the appropriate skill set for performance management staff and hiring or transitioning a performance management team. This section of the report describes how the 10 cities in this study tackled these issues during the development of their programs.

Office Structure: Centralized, Decentralized and Hybrid

We evaluated the structure of performance management offices in terms of staffing, data collection and analysis

and the data-driven decision-making process. Through this evaluation we developed a typology of performance management structures with three distinct models: centralized, decentralized and hybrid.

The centralized model for performance management consists of an independent department staffed with city employees who are responsible for collecting, analyzing and reporting out on the city's service delivery performance. We observed that centralized systems operate in Atlanta, Boston, Dallas, Kansas City, Las Vegas and St. Paul. In these six cities, the performance management staff is consolidated within one central department that guides the data collection, analysis and reporting processes. Department-level city employees are engaged in the process by assisting with the selection of metrics to track, providing access to performance data and collaborating with performance management teams to make data-driven decisions that improve service delivery.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT OFFICE STRUCTURES



The decentralized model for performance management varies from the centralized model in that the responsibility for collecting and analyzing performance data is largely placed on the individual city departments. Performance management staff members provide guidance and training to department employees to help them identify and implement needed improvements in city service delivery. The performance management systems in Denver and Fort Lauderdale are more decentralized than those in the other cities we studied. In Denver, department heads are in charge of analyzing performance with an emphasis on achieving strategic goals at the departmental level. At the same time, the city's Peak Academy trains city employees on how to pinpoint and eliminate inefficiencies in their departments. Fort Lauderdale is launching a similar program called the Structural Innovation Academy, which is designed to provide continuous improvement training on project management and performance management to departmental employees.

The hybrid model combines elements of both the centralized and decentralized models. While this model does have a centralized office of staff dedicated to performance management, there are systematic efforts that also diffuse these responsibilities to individual city departments. Hybrid performance management systems are used in Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. In Los Angeles, the Innovation and Performance Management Unit oversees performance management, strategic planning and other data-driven processes both citywide and within city departments. The core function of this team is to act as "expert consultants" to city departments on how to track, analyze and report data as they develop their own performance systems and processes. The ultimate goal in Los Angeles is for each city department to manage its own performance management operations in the near future. The Citywide Performance Management program in Washington is a centralized office that oversees the city's DCStat program, data warehouse team and performance management specialists. The performance management specialists housed within each of the city's 73 agencies help coordinate departmental performance management activities and also constitute the city's Performance Management Council.

Cultivating Buy-In Across Departments

Performance management programs rely on the problem identification, operational expertise and collection of data from city departments. That doesn't mean, however, that city departments are always immediately onboard with new performance management programs. An initial barrier that new programs may face is pushback from city department staff who are already occupied with the demands of their current programs and agendas.

Developing a collaborative working relationship between performance management staff and city departments is a critical step in building a performance management program. This particular challenge was cited frequently by interviewees in the 10 cities we surveyed. In our conversations, they shared methods for overcoming departmental resistance and getting city staff onboard, including developing personal relationships with staff and alleviating fear through communication.

Atlanta overcame resistance from city departments by developing relationships with department staff. The Focus on Results team cultivated trust and buy-in by helping departments with data analysis projects (projects unrelated to performance management) to demonstrate the value of the office. Team members said that they really turned a corner with getting buy-in after about six months, when they were able to show a measurable improvement in service delivery performance.

Washington, D.C., developed relationships with city departments by creating the Performance Management Council. The council is made up of at least one employee from each participating city agency who serves as a liaison between their department and the performance management team. Through the council's partnership, the performance management team is able to educate city departments on the benefits of using data to drive decisions and daily operations.

Denver's Peak Academy relies on the Lean methodology of identifying and eliminating waste for processes. Initially, city staff were concerned that "lean" referred to their jobs — that the city was going to cut positions. The Denver team reassured staff that while jobs might change through the process of innovating, no jobs would be lost as a result of their efforts at innovation, and the team has been able to keep that promise. Denver was also able to overcome individual fear of change by creating a module within the Peak Academy called "I Want to Innovate BUT." The module was a 1.5-hour closed-door session in which city staff had the opportunity to voice their concerns and the Peak Academy trainers offered tools for removing barriers to innovation.

Kansas City's Office of Performance Management holds weekly meetings with the city manager to discuss data. Through these regular meetings, which rotate through departments, the departments have come to realize that the KCStat program is not just a short-lived fad but that data collection and analysis are now a part of the city culture. Over time, the departments have become engaged and proactive in the process.

Staff Skills

We asked the 10 cities to identify the types of skills and qualities that they look for in performance management staff. What we heard is that hard technical skills, such as the ability to crunch large amounts of data, are just as important as the so-called soft skills of communicating and building relationships with other city departments. The four key skills that performance management The performance management staff in Kansas City said, "The data analysis wasn't worth anything if we couldn't communicate out what it said effectively. We really honed our visualization skills, both in terms of charts but also just how to structure [the data] into a good PowerPoint presentation." Many of the performance management staff we interviewed also noted the value of understanding general city operations. For these reasons, rather than bringing on entirely new employees, several cities have hired from within to capitalize on the institutional knowledge of their staff.

efficiency.

Above all, performance management staff must be interested in problem solving and improving government operations. For the Las Vegas performance management staff, "One of the biggest qualities... is general curiosity. You've got to want to learn about all the departments and their operations and what data is going to help them make better management decisions."

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: THE BASICS

A performance management system is only as strong as the data it is based upon. Our analysis of the 10 local government performance management systems uncovered key lessons from the cities on data sources and data quality. Additionally, because performance management systems go beyond just simply measuring the performance of a city program to actually driving improvements in the program's performance, our analysis offers insights on other imperative aspects of the performance management process: performance targets, performance metrics, data analysis and data-driven decision-making about city service delivery.

Data Sources and Data Quality

Performance management systems collect and analyze data from a variety of sources, including city departments, their employees and residents.

City employees themselves, given their unique vantage point as the actual providers of city services, can offer information about how processes for service delivery can be improved. In fact, the Peak Academy in Denver and the Structural Innovation Academy in Fort Lauderdale are programs that train city employees on how to identify and fix inefficiencies in service delivery.

Cities are also collecting information directly from residents. One key approach to gathering data from residents is through community surveys, such as those administered in Fort Lauderdale, Kansas City and Dallas. These surveys are administered annually to gauge the communities' concerns, priorities and satisfaction levels with city services. Another method for collecting data from residents is through 311 call centers. Residents call their 311 centers to make public service requests that get transferred to the appropriate city department. These requests, and the amount of time it takes to complete them, are logged into a database that is accessible to the performance management team.

Lastly, data points from city departments are the bulk of what performance management programs review and analyze. This departmental data captures the



day-to-day functions of city programs and offices. As discussed in the next section, departments don't hand over all of their data, but only what is related to the specific performance targets the city is striving to meet. For example, a public works department could provide information about pothole requests and removals; a parks department might share information about the number of residents that visit a municipal pool or ice skating rink; and a housing department may track the number of requests for senior housing that are addressed within a certain time period.

However, the process by which departments collect and transfer data is not always perfect. Some of the cities we interviewed identified potential problems with the quality of the data they collect from city departments. Boston, Los Angeles and Kansas City mentioned that a pen-and-paperwork order system is still in place in some departments, which can cause data quality issues if orders get lost. To address this problem, some of those cities hope to transfer more of their departmental processes to smart phones and tablets to eliminate the "human error" aspect of data collection.

Another data quality issue is the need for more granularlevel data from city departments. For example, in one city, the departments provide the performance management team with high-level information about monthly trash pickup citywide. While that information is useful, the performance management office is striving to obtain more detailed data on daily trash pickup broken down by neighborhood in order to conduct a more robust analysis of waste-removal services in the city. Getting access to a more specific level of information will allow the performance management team to see if more trash trucks need to be dispatched to certain neighborhoods where the on-time pickup rate is lagging.

Setting Performance Targets

A performance target is the level of performance that the city is aiming to achieve. We observed that the 10 cities use two methods for identifying performance targets. The first approach is to set specific service delivery performance targets (e.g., improve on-time track pickup by 25 percent) during a systematic strategic planning or budgeting process. The other approach is not tied to a structured process; rather, when a problem area in service delivery is identified through either employee or resident feedback (e.g., a backlog in building permits), the city sets a general goal to increase performance through a process improvement intervention. Both approaches for setting performance targets are effective, and many cities use a combination to give them the flexibility to work on performance issues as they arise.

Among the cities we surveyed, the more common approach is for cities to set specific service delivery performance targets. In Kansas City, Dallas and Boston, each department establishes performance targets during the budget process. Similarly, in Las Vegas, each department has developed a business plan that maps out service delivery goals. The performance management programs in these cities track the progress toward these performance targets throughout the year.

Fort Lauderdale takes a community-centric approach to setting performance targets. The city staff created Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale, a community-developed longterm vision plan, and also Press Play Fort Lauderdale, a five-year strategic plan for achieving this vision. Annual priorities are established through community survey results and the city council's prioritization of strategic initiatives.

Meanwhile, several of the cities we surveyed also set performance targets separately from strategic planning and budget processes. For example, St. Paul established a process in which city employees can request assistance from the Innovation Team in solving chronic service delivery problems. City departments submit a problem statement and a goal for improvement, and the Innovation Team structures a data collection and analysis plan to address that specific issue.

Identifying Performance Metrics

Performance metrics are the specific data points, or "indicators," that a performance management program collects and analyzes. The cities we surveyed offered insight and advice into how to select the appropriate metrics to measure service delivery performance accurately. First, many of the cities suggested collaborating with city departments as a first step in identifying which performance metrics to use. Sitting down with department heads to understand their day-to-day operations and goals is a critical part of this process. The practice of selecting metrics is often iterative, with performance management staff meeting annually with department heads to make sure that those metrics accurately capture the department's work. The methods that performance management teams use to collaborate with city department staff range from one-on-one informal conversations to formal meetings that are part of the city's budget process.

Second, the cities provided guidance on choosing the appropriate metrics or data points to track in order to effectively measure the performance of city services. A key distinction they made is that metrics should measure outcomes as well as outputs. The difference is that an "output" simply measures actions taken or completed, while an "outcome" measures the long-term impact of an action. An example of an output is the "number of repairs made to city vehicles" while a related outcome is the "percentage of functioning city vehicles in the fleet."

To help illustrate the difference between outputs and outcomes, and to demonstrate what is considered a "good metric," we've compiled the advice below from the city performance management staff.

- Atlanta: A good metric is something that is an accurate proxy for performance. The best metrics measure the most important inputs, activities and outcomes that define performance

 for example, "percentage of 911 calls answered within 10 seconds." This measures a key outcome in the 911 center, is a good proxy for overall efficiency and indicates a critical part of the 911 call center's success.
- **Boston**: The ideal metrics are operational metrics that don't just count things but actually enable a city or department to gauge whether it is reaching its goal. If the goal is to keep city streets in good condition, just measuring the "number of sidewalk repairs" doesn't indicate

whether that goal is being achieved. Instead, a performance management team has to look at such things as "percentage of sidewalks rated safe," according to customer service ratings, or "percentage change in number of sidewalk repair requests."

- **Dallas**: An example of a bad metric is "number of videos produced to market the city on social media." The measure is not specific, and the goal of the videos is unclear. A better metric would be "percentage increase in viewership of marketing videos posted to the website and social media." This measure is more specific and provides insight into the outcome.
- Kansas City: A good metric can be measured without excessive effort, is relevant to city managers and staff, and is focused on the bigger picture. The best metrics are outcome-oriented

 for example, a street condition index or a citizen satisfaction rating for a particular service area. Bad metrics are arbitrary, do not produce anything meaningful and sometimes require more effort to collect data than yield value from the information – for instance, meetings held or phone calls received.
- Las Vegas: A good metric provides information that management can use to make decisions, such as whether to change existing internal procedures or the direction of focus, or whether to invest in new or improved technology. An example of a good metric is "number of recreation programs at minimum registration capacity." Minimum registration capacity might be set at the number of people needed in a class to fully pay for the cost of the class. If a parks and recreation department offers classes that don't meet this cost-recovery level, the people who run the centers have to make a decision: Do a better job promoting or marketing the class, or cancel the class altogether and offer something that will be more popular.
- St. Paul: A good metric should measure something meaningful and make progress

from an intervention (process improvement, technology enhancement, etc.) apparent. For example, in a project currently under way to implement live-in-the-field data for building inspectors, a metric being used is the "number of inspections per inspector per day." On the basis of calculations made before and after the intervention, this metric will clearly show how the intervention moved the needle. An example of a bad metric, as it relates to this issue, is the amount of building permit revenue collected each year. This metric has sometimes been used to justify the need for more inspectors, but it has nothing to do with measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of an inspector or the inspection process.

Types of Data Analysis

After the performance data is collected, cities can analyze them using several common types of data analyses. The data analysis process paves the way for city leaders to use the information to reprioritize spending, improve processes, and make data-driven budgeting decisions. Although certainly not an exhaustive list, common types of data analysis are time series analysis, comparative analysis and frequency analysis.

A *time-series analysis* looks at how well service delivery programs are performing on selected performance metrics at regular intervals in time, usually monthly or quarterly. The consistent collection and review of this data lets city leaders know whether departments are performing above or below their performance targets. Atlanta, for example, uses time-series analysis to focus on year-over-year performance and percentage changes in service levels. Tracking fluctuations in city service delivery can help pinpoint underperforming areas that either need an intervention – for example, increased staffing or funding – or should be eliminated.

A *comparative analysis*, on the other hand, helps uncover how city service delivery might vary across geographic regions or demographic groups. Comparing the performance data across different neighborhoods in a city, for example, might reveal that city services are lacking in specific communities. Comparative analysis is particularly useful for data from community surveys because it can reveal whether certain segments of the population are less satisfied with particular city services or whether service delivery in a specific neighborhood could be improved. Dallas' performance management office conducts a comparative analysis of its citizen survey data to identify specific neighborhoods where services are lagging and extra resources might be needed.

Service delivery performance can also be examined through a frequency analysis. A frequency analysis examines how long, on average, it takes to complete a specific service request. The Kansas City performance management team ran a frequency analysis on the number of days it took to complete initial code enforcement inspections and found that it sometimes took up to 150 days. The frequency analysis helped identify these outliers and prompted the city to change its operational tactics to prevent such delays in the future. By identifying and tracking the time frame for completing initial inspections for code enforcement, the city significantly reduced outliers without adding additional resources, moving from completing 90 percent of inspections in 120 days to completing 90 percent of inspections in 10 days.

Data-Driven Decisions on Priority-Setting, Process Improvements and Budgeting Decisions

The goal of performance management programs in local government is to help city leaders maximize their city service delivery budgets, reduce inefficiencies in local government and improve the overall quality of city service delivery. The final and most important step of the performance management process is using performance data to drive decision-making related to funding and managing city service delivery.

Our analysis found that there are three types of decisions driven by the performance management programs: setting priorities, making process improvements and budgeting.

Both Dallas and Fort Lauderdale used community surveys to prioritize funding for specific city service areas. In Dallas, survey responses indicated that residents' number one priority was street maintenance and infrastructure. This prompted the city to develop a 10-year commitment to improve the city's road conditions. Similarly in Fort Lauderdale, a recent survey highlighted citizens' low levels of satisfaction regarding the availability of bike paths and amenities (34 percent) and feelings of safety for walking (43 percent) and biking (30 percent) in the city. As a result, the city council prioritized a number of improvement projects, including a Connecting the Blocks Plan, a Downtown Walkability Plan and a Sidewalk Program. The city routinely collects and examines performance data in this area, from pedestrian injuries to public transit usage to bike rental ridership.

The analysis of performance data can shed light on challenges in government operations and create opportunities to intervene with process improvements. City staff in Los Angeles monitored information from the city's 311 call center (e.g., call volumes, call wait times and staff schedules) and determined how to maximize staff resources to dramatically improve the center's performance. As a result, the average 311 call center wait time dropped from about six minutes to under one minute.

Denver's Peak Performance program aims to achieve greater efficiency across all city programs and saves \$10

million annually by empowering city staff to create process improvements. The city's emergency response team led a process improvement to save \$145,000 last year by reducing the number of times police officers responded to false burglary alarms. In Las Vegas, the city monitored transit data and discovered the 50 city intersections with the highest number of automobile accidents. The city intervened by re-engineering these intersections, and the total number of accidents decreased by 23 percent.

Performance management also informs the budgeting process. The analysis of performance data can help cities project future funding needs for city programs and departments. The Boston About Results team works side-by-side with budget analysts and departments every spring to plan for the next fiscal year. The performance data collected from prior years can be used to show changes in demand and departmental capacity, along with maintenance of service-level agreements, all of which factor into decisions on funding requests. For example, a funding request for more public works staff is more likely to be approved if there is data showing an increase in the number of pothole repair requests and an associated decrease in the number of requests responded to in a timely manner.

THE FUTURE OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS

As the field of performance management continues to develop, along with technological advances in city data infrastructures, there will be new opportunities to improve service delivery. An area of performance management that some cities are beginning to explore is predictive analytics. This emerging area of data analysis helps forecast potential service delivery needs and empowers city leaders to intervene proactively.

The process used by the city of Boston to address problem properties sheds light on the power of predictive analytics. Several years ago city leaders noticed a growing problem with properties that were blighted, targets for criminal activity and often owned by absentee landlords. The city formed a Problem Properties Task Force to examine this issue with the help of the Boston About Results team.

In partnership with the Mayor's Office, the Boston Police Department, the Boston Housing Authority and the Department of Neighborhood Development the performance management team began to quantify the problem by tracking – in real time – the number of crimes reported, police incidents, code enforcement violations and citizen service request calls associated with these problem properties. Once the city determined which indicators are associated with properties that are susceptible to crime, the task force began to work with the Boston About Results team to pinpoint potential problem areas and intervene before issues escalated to a point where they were costly and time-consuming to fix.

In the past two years, the task force saw a 70 percent reduction in 911 calls to designated problem properties. The city also passed the Problem Properties Ordinances, which codifies a "problem property" as one that receives four complaints within a 12-month period. The legislation empowers the city to take legal action against problem-property owners with fines and other corrective action.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Performance management systems in cities clearly take on many forms – from centralized to decentralized to hybrid offices; from structured processes for setting performance targets to individual problemfocused processes; from data gathered from handwritten inspectors' notes to responses to community surveys to 311 call center logs. These variations underscore the organic evolution of performance management in cities across the country, the problem-solving culture innate in many local governments and the need to better understand the experiences of early leaders of performance management.

Despite their differences, the cities in this report consistently note the imperative of city leadership in ensuring the long-term sustainability of performance management and service delivery improvements. Often, performance management has difficulty gaining traction among city staff because it can be viewed as a punitive review exercise instead of an exercise focused on holistic improvement. Support from the mayor, city manager and city council can help launch performance management programs, change the culture of performance management and maintain the momentum and commitment to the process. In several cities, programs were initiated after a new mayor or city manager came into office and spearheaded the process.

Several recommendations for mayors, managers and city councils to champion performance management emerged from the cities in the study, including the following:

• Lead by example: In Kansas City, the mayor and council used an ordinance to establish measurable council priorities, which were tied to indicators and metrics.

- Connect performance management to community vision: In Fort Lauderdale, the commission uses performance management data and information from community surveys to prioritize community projects.
- Commit political and financial capital: The mayor of St. Paul discussed performance management in a budget speech to highlight it as a priority for his administration and one to which he is committing resources.
- Make the budget process transparent: In Washington, city departments develop their own performance management metrics to support the broader city vision. Annually, the city council meets with each department to review measures and objectives, each tied to specific budget codes, to assess performance and prioritize budget requests.

With leadership, the right team and structure, and a commitment to data-driven decision-making, performance management can become the new way of doing business in cities across the country.

METHODOLOGY

NLC examined the performance management systems in 10 cities that represent a cross-section of regions and population sizes with demonstrated success in creating operational efficiencies, improving resident satisfaction with service delivery or identifying cost savings through performance management. Using a case study approach, NLC administered a survey and conducted semi-structured phone interviews with staff from the performance management offices in each city. The survey and interview questions were designed to extract information about the key characteristics and functionalities of each performance management program that can be adapted to other cities.

APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: City Name? (Open ended)

QUESTION 2: Does your city evaluate the performance of city services? (Yes/No)

QUESTION 3: What is the name of the department that is responsible for evaluating city services? (Open ended)

QUESTION 4: What is the goal or mission of this department? (Open ended)

QUESTION 5: When was the performance management department created? (Open ended)

QUESTION 6: How much did it cost to launch the department (including staff hires, new equipment, etc.)? (Open ended)

QUESTION 7: Has the department received private or public grant funding? (Yes/No)

QUESTION 8: What is the annual operating budget for the department? (Open ended)

QUESTION 9: What method(s) does your city use to collect data about city services? (Check all that apply: Staff in the Field; Sensors (ex: GPS on taxis); Web applications; Social media)

QUESTION 10: What software program(s) or data system(s) does your city use to store data on city service performance? (Open ended)

QUESTION 11: What software program(s) or data system(s) does your city use to conduct data analytics? (Open ended)

QUESTION 12: Are there local policies in your city that impact the evaluation of city services (e.g., data collection policies or evaluation frameworks)? (Open ended)

QUESTION 13: Does your city share data in an open data portal? (Yes/No)

QUESTION 14: Please briefly describe one example of how your city reduced spending and/or improved service delivery performance by analyzing data about city services. (Open ended)

QUESTION 15: In the example you provided above, what indicators/metrics were tracked and why? (Open ended)

QUESTION 16: Does your city have a case study on performance management or data analytics that you can share? (Yes/No)

QUESTION 17: Has your city observed any of the following benefits from the performance management and/or data analytics program? (Check all that apply: Increase in accountability; Increase in transparency; Improved customer service; Increase in citizen engagement; More cost efficient city services; Improved service delivery performance; Otherplease specify)

QUESTION 18: Thank you for completing this survey! May we use your answers to help create a profile on your city's achievements in evaluating city services that may be used in an upcoming NLC publication? (Yes/No)

Item 3.

APPENDIX B - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: What was the motivation for creating the office? Was there a particular event, problem, or opportunity that was a catalyst?

QUESTION 2: Were there any challenges in getting the office established? (e.g., accessing data from departments, getting buy in)? If yes, how did were these challenges addressed?

QUESTION 3: [If answered "yes" on survey] What external grant money has the department received?

QUESTION 4: How many staff currently work in the office? What skills sets do you look for in staff (data analysis, program management, etc.)?

QUESTION 5: You mentioned that your department collects data from [staff in field, sensors, web apps, social media] – can you provide a brief overview of these processes?

QUESTION 6: [If answered "yes" on survey] What are the local policies in your city that impact the evaluation of city services?

QUESTION 7: What type of analysis do you do on the data (e.g. predictive analytics, benchmarking against a strategic framework, etc.)?

QUESTION 8: How is the information that you gather shared with public officials? What do officials do with the information? Is there any form of accountability?

QUESTION 9: You mentioned that your city has seen has seen an increase in [accountability, transparency, customer service, citizen engagement, cost-efficiency, service delivery performance] – can you walk us through one or two examples in more detail?

QUESTION 10: How do you measure the benefits/success of the department?

Item 3.



1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 550 Washington, D.C. 20004 202.626.3000 | www.nlc.org



166



Staff Report

March 7, 2022 Council Workshop

American Rescue Plan Act Status Presentation Presenter: Cathy Huber Nickerson, Finance Director

Phone	Email
360.817.1537	chuber@cityofcamas.us

BACKGROUND: This presentation is to review the US Treasury Guidance for the American Rescue Plan Act funding and continue the discussion of potential uses for the funds.

SUMMARY: The United States Congress approved the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) on March 11, 2021 to provide a \$1.9 trillion package to provide direct relief to states, counties, cities and towns as well as public utilities, libraries and transit agencies. As a community of 50,000 or less, the City of Camas will receive a distribution of these funds over four years from the Washington State Department of Commerce.

Council approved Resolution 21-005 to accept the City of Camas \$6,816,235 allocation of Coronavirus State and Local Relief Funds (CLFRF). The City received the first tranche of \$3,408,118 on June 30, 2021.

These funds can be used for:

- To respond to public health emergency caused by COVID-19
- To provide assistance to households, small businesses, and nonprofits related to the negative economic impacts of COVID-19,
- For premium pay (hazard pay) up to \$13/hour, not to exceed \$25,000 to any individual employee, to eligible government essential workers,
- To provide government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue of such cities/counties due to COVID-19 relative to revenues collected in the most recent full fiscal year prior to the emergency (for cities in Washington, the baseline would be the calendar year 2019 budget),
- To make necessary investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure.

On January 6, 2022, the U.S. Treasury issued Final Guidance for the use of ARPA funds. The most significant changes is the expansion and simplification of the Revenue Lost category. For jurisdictions less than 50,000 in population, the U.S. Treasury allows for the option for jurisdictions so opt for the "standard allowance" not to exceed \$10 million. This option allows Camas to opt for the whole \$6.8 million as a standard allowance or a portion. The funds would be used for any traditional government service with simplified reporting requirements and federal audit considerations. Staff will review how this option may change the use of allocation of CLFRF.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS: What are the desired results and outcomes for this agenda item? The intent of the presentation is to provide City Council on ARPA status and uses.

What's the data? What does the data tell us? The US Treasury has provided final guidance.

How have communities been engaged? Are there opportunities to expand engagement? The City has had one round of public engagement in the Fall. The public was asked using Engage Camas to rank the priorities of Council's guidance for the use of the funds.

Who will benefit from, or be burdened by this agenda item? This agenda item is intended to benefit citizens and the community to offset the negative impact the pandemic has had the economy.

What are the strategies to mitigate any unintended consequences? Staff is monitoring for updates on ARPA daily and will plan accordingly.

Does this agenda item have a differential impact on underserved populations, people living with disabilities, and/or communities of color? Please provide available data to illustrate this impact. Yes, this agenda item helps all communities the City serves.

Will this agenda item improve ADA accessibilities for people with disabilities? N/A

What potential hurdles exists in implementing this proposal (include both operational and political)? As will any funding, it is difficult to ensure all needs are met and as a result some prioritization will need to occur.

How will you ensure accountabilities, communicate, and evaluate results? The Finance Department will provide updates of the ARPA to City Council.

How does this item support a comprehensive plan goal, policy, or other adopted resolution? This item is intended to bridge financial gaps due to loss revenue during the pandemic which impact ability to maintain service levels.

BUDGET IMPACT: The revenue to the City is \$3,408,118 in both 2021 and 2022 and to be spent in four years.

RECOMMENDATION: This item is for Council information only.

CITY OF CAMAS

MARCH 7, 2022

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) STATUS

169

WHAT IS ARPA?

ARPA was signed into law on March 11, 2021

Provides direct relief to all municipalities with \$350 billion for the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds.

HOW WILL CAMAS RECEIVE THE CLFRF FUNDS? AND HOW MUCH?

Through the State of Washington but unlike CRF funds, the aid to Camas is protected from state or county interference by statutes and penalties Camas as a City of a population below 50,000 was allocated per capita calculation of \$6,816,235 First Tranche \$3,408,118 in June 2021 and Second in June, 2022

WHO DECIDES HOW THE FUNDS ARE USED?

- City Council appropriates the funds with:
 - US Treasury Guidance (with updates)
 - Staff Proposals
 - Public Engagement
 - Balancing Act and Camas Engage



US TREASURY GUIDANCE

AS OF JANUARY 6, 2022 - FINAL GUIDANCE ISSUED, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2022

173

FISCAL RECOVERY FUNDS USES

Public Health Emergency/Negative Impacts

Premium Pay for essential workers in COVID-19

Revenue Loss

Water, Sewer or Broadband Infrastructure Item 4.

THE FINAL RULE

- Expands and simplifies the "Replace Lost Revenue" category
 - Adds a standard allowance for revenue loss, allowing the City to select a standard amount of revenue loss, not to exceed \$10 million vs the calculation of the elaborate formula outlined in the final rule. Think income tax standard exemption.
 - This category allows the broadest eligibility for expenditures of recovery of funds, namely the provision of any traditional government services.
 - Greater simplicity with regard to reporting, compliance with federal rules and single audit considerations
 - Saves staff time in reporting and tracking.

RESPONDING TO PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY

COVID-19 – broad range of services

- Vaccination programs
- Support such as medical care, testing, tracing contract tracing, access to healthcare, etc
- Public communication efforts
- Support in congregate living facilities
- Ventilation improvements in congregate settings
- Adaptions to public buildings to implement COVID-19 mitigation tactics
- Vaccine incentive programs

More restrictive public health payroll payments

NEGATIVE IMPACTS - HOUSEHOLDS



- Assistance to Households
 - Food Assistance
 - Rent or Mortgage
 - Utility Assistance
 - Counseling and Legal Aid for Prevent Eviction or Homelessness
 - Cash Assistance
 - Emergency Assistance for Burials
 - Home Repairs
 - Weatherizaiton
 - Internet Access or Digital Literacy Assistance
 - Job Training

NEGATIVE IMPACTS – CITIES, SMALL BUSINESS AND NONPROFITS



- Cities, Small Business and Nonprofits
 - Loans or grants to mitigate financial hardships
 - Supporting payroll and benefit costs
 - Costs to retain employees
 - Rent, mortgage or utilities costs
 - Loans, grants or in-kind assistance for prevention and mitigation
 - Enabling social distancing
 - Enhanced cleaning efforts, barriers, partitions
 - COVID-19 vaccinations, testing or contract tracing
 - Technical assistance, counseling or other services to support business planning needs

NEGATIVE IMPACTS – TRAVEL, TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY



Aid to tourism, travel and hospitality industries should respond to negative economic impacts of the pandemic

- Aid to support reopening
- Planned expansion or upgrade to tourism, travel and hospitality facilities delayed due to the pandemic
- More difficult to document

NEGATIVE IMPACTS - COMMUNITIES WITH DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACTS FROM COVID-19



- Addressing health disparities and the social determinants of health such as:
 - Community violence
 - Community health workers
- Building stronger neighborhoods and communities such as:
 - Supporting housing for homelessness
 - Affordable housing
- Addressing education disparities exacerbated by COVID-19 such as:
 - Early learning services
 - Increase support to schools for tutoring and afterschool programs
- Promoting health childhood environments such as:
 - Childcare
 - Programs for families with young children
NEGATIVE IMPACTS – BACK TO WORK INCENTIVES AND PUBLIC JOB PROGRAMS



- Incentives include:
 - Vaccination incentive programs
 - Job training or other efforts to accelerate rehiring
 - Reduce unemployment such as childcare assistance, transportation assistance, and incentives for newly employed workers
- Public Jobs Programs include:
 - Public job programs with schools
 - Subsidized employment combined education and onthe-job training
 - Job training to accelerate rehiring or address unemployment due to the pandemic

NEGATIVE IMPACTS – IMPROVING OUTDOOR SPACES



- Outdoor spaces such as parks and public plazas can be addressed if one of the following are addressed:
 - QCTs which Camas does not have
 - Stronger neighborhoods and communities
 - Assistance to small businesses
 - Increased use of parks during pandemic resulting in damage or increased maintenance needs

PREMIUM PAY TO ESSENTIAL WORKERS

THE CITY DOES NOT QUALIFY BASED ON THE CURRENT GUIDANCE.

REVENUE LOSS TO CAMAS

- Standard Allowance
 - Council w

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

- Drinking Water project examples
 - Treatment
 - Transmission including lead service line replacement
 - Source rehabilitation
 - Storage
 - New system development

- Clean Water project examples
 - Construction of treatment works
 - Nonpoint source pollution management
 - Stormwater systems
 - Water conservation
 - Watershed pilot projects
 - Energy efficiency treatment works
 - Security measures at treatment works
 - Technical assistance to ensure compliance with Clean Water Act
 - Stormwater projects must have a water quality benefit

BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE

- Projects must be designed to service unserved or underserved households and businesses to supply minimum level of broadband
- Modernization of cybersecurity including hardware, software, and protection of critical infrastructure of government services.

OTHER USES

Mental health services and substance abuse disorder services

• Community-based mental health and substance use disorder programs

• School-based social-emotional support and other mental health services

Road repairs and upgrades directly related to an eligible water or sewer project

Build or upgrade broadband connections to schools and libraries

Interest earning may be used to defray the administrative expenses of the City's ARPA program

Funds may be used to support effective management and oversight of the program such as legal, regulatory and other requirements.

STAFF IDEAS



RECOMMENDED PROCESS

 April 4th Workshop April 18th Resolution 		
Open Community Ideas		
• May 2-13		
Staff Packages		
Review ComplianceCouncil Preview		
Public Engagement		
 In Person (Events) Online Public Hearing 		
Budget Supplemental		

ltem 4.

QUESTIONS



CITY OF CAMAS – ARPA TIMELINE

Details about federal information releases, City decision points, stakeholder engagement, fund delivery, and development of a spending plan

2021	
03/11/2021	The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) is signed into law by President Biden, providing guaranteed financial relief to local governments.
05/24/2021	The Interim Final Rule (IFR) is released, giving early guidance on eligible expenditures. Some uses are enumerated in the rule, but overall the IFR is broad and non-exhaustive.
06/07/2021	Washington Cities receive their letter from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) asking for confirmation that the City wishes to receive its allocated amount. City officials indicate acceptance.
06/17/2021	The U.S. Treasury releases additional compliance and reporting guidelines.
06/27/2021	The City receives the first half (tranche), \$3.4 million, of the total \$6.8 million allocated to it.
07/22/2021	Staff meet with the Mayor and City Administrator to draft a tentative plan for public engagement on ARPA funds.
08/02/2021	Staff provide City Council with an overview of the IFR. The possibility of using some funds to address utility arrearages, which were approaching the end of a collection moratorium, is first introduced.
08/26/2021	Staff begin participating in monthly roundtables with cities across the state, the Association of Washington Cities (AWC), and the Municipal Research Services Association (MRSC) to gain clearer understanding of the IFR.
09/07/2021	Staff again update City Council on ARPA policy guidelines, alongside discussion of fund balance and structural deficit. Funding of a major ERP replacement is introduced.
09/20/2021	The community is notified that funding is available to assist with utility arrearages. This assistance is funded by ARPA funds, as directed by City Council.
11/01/2021	Staff update City Council on using ARPA funds to mitigate utility arrearages.
11/08/2021	The City launches the first stage of the public engagement plan on Camas Engage, asking users to rank a high- level list of City Council priority areas for ARPA spending.
12/13/2021	Staff provide Camas Engage results to the leadership team and provide a matrix to help them in identifying and narrowing down eligible projects that align with Council and community priorities for spending areas.

2022					
01/06/2022	The U.S. Treasury releases the Final Rule. This text provides clarity on the scope of how ARPA funds can be used, broadening some restrictions, and narrowing others. This threatened some projects under discussion for funding.				
01/19/2022	Staff learns of a "Standard Allowance" for revenue loss. This reopens the option of using funds to replace lost revenue, since proof of loss, which is complicated by factors like mitigation efforts and combined revenue streams, is no longer required.				
01/25/2022	Staff put a hold on the public engagement plans for February while the option to take a standard allowance is investigated, which could broaden the scope of eligible projects earmarked for funding with ARPA.				

02/07/2022	Item 4.
03/07/2022	and its ability to broaden eligible uses of funds.
4/30/2022	First report is due to the US Treasury. Currently, the City of Camas has spent \$80,600 for utility assistance and has tentatively pledged approximately \$1.4 million to the ERP system replacement. The City is likely required to submit the intention of whether to use the Standard Allowance in whole, in part or not at all.
06/27/2022	The City receives the second tranche, completing the total delivery of the \$6.8 million allocated to it.



American <u>Rescue Plan A</u> Relief Fund Spending

Revenue Loss Standard Allowance vs. Final Rule Pandemic Mitigation Categories





Staff Report

March 7, 2022 Council Workshop Meeting

Camas Ward Boundary Updates

Presenters: Jeff Swanson, Interim City Administrator and Shawn MacPherson, City Attorney

Time Estimate: 10 minutes

Phone	Email
360.834.6864	jswanson@cityofcamas.us

BACKGROUND: The City's three ward boundaries are required to be reviewed following each decennial census.

SUMMARY: Staff at Clark County GIS provided the City with information about population balance between the City's three wards. Boundary changes are warranted when the imbalance exceeds a 5% +/- tolerance.

2020 Population of Current City of Camas Wards

February 23, 2022 Clark County GIS

	Population	Percent of Total	Target	Deviation from	Deviation
Ward	(2020)	Population	Population *	Target	Percent
1	8,971	34%	8,688.33	282.67	3.25%
2	8,388	32%	8,688.33	(300.33)	-3.46%
3	8,706	33%	8,688.33	17.67	0.20%
Total	26.065	100%	26.065		

* Target population for 2020 redistricting

Given the information provided by Clark County, ward boundary changes do not appear warranted and are not recommended at this time.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS:

What are the desired results and outcomes for this agenda item?

To inform City Council and the community about the status and population balance of the City's ward boundaries and satisfy the periodic review requirement.

What's the data? What does the data tell us?

Data consists of 2020 US decennial census population figures for the City's three ward boundaries. The data demonstrate the population balance between wards is within the acceptable tolerance of +/- 5%.

- How have communities been engaged? Are there opportunities to expand engagement? The item is brought as information to the City Council for policy level input and direction, if any is warranted.
- Who will benefit from, or be burdened by this agenda item? The entirety of the community benefits from balanced geographic representation.

What are the strategies to mitigate any unintended consequences? N/A

Does this agenda item have a differential impact on underserved populations, people living with disabilities, and/or communities of color? N/A

Will this agenda item improve ADA accessibilities for people with disabilities? N/A

What potential hurdles exists in implementing this proposal (include both operational and political)?

No action is recommended. No implementation is required.

How will you ensure accountabilities, communicate, and evaluate results? N/A

How does this item support a comprehensive plan goal, policy or other adopted resolution? N/A

BUDGET IMPACT: There are no impacts to the City budget.

RECOMMENDATION: This item is for Council's information.

