

**NOTICE OF MEETING
REGULAR MEETING**

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The Audience may comment on matters on the agenda not scheduled for public hearing 3 minute time limit

4. RECONSIDERATION

5. SYNOPSIS APPROVAL

A. August 28, 2018 Synopsis

Page 3

6. VISITORS (5 minute limit per presentation)

A. Dr. Marley, Homer resident

7. STAFF REPORTS & Committee Reports (5 minutes)

A. Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner

Page 11

8. PUBLIC HEARING

9. PENDING BUSINESS (20 minutes total)

A. Remodeled or New Recreation Facility Update/next steps

B. Report on other rec facilities

C. City of Homer Needs Assessment

10. NEW BUSINESS (10 minutes per item)

A. Recap of building condition, demolition costs

Page 13

B. Operating and maintenance expenses; Dave Derry's work

Page 17

C. City Council Work Session Report

Page 25

D. Building Use Discussion - Upstairs portion

Page 27

E. Next Steps

11. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

12. COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

The Audience may comment on any item. 3 minute time limit

13. COMMENTS OF CITY STAFF

14. COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

15. ADJOURNMENT NEXT REGULAR MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers, 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

Session 18-05 a Regular Meeting of the Homer Education and Recreation Complex Task Force was called to order by Chair Matthews at at 3:00 p.m. on August 28, 2018 at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: Task Force Members Derry, Haines, Knight, Lowney, Marks, Matthews, Reiss, Slone

STAFF: Deputy City Planner Engebretsen
City Clerk Jacobsen Jacobsen

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The Audience may comment on matters on the agenda not scheduled for public hearing 3 minute time limit

Chair Matthews asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

SLONE/MARKS SO MOVED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE: NON OBJECTION: UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

RECONSIDERATION

SYNOPSIS APPROVAL

A. August 14, 2018 Synopsis

DERRY/LOWNEY MOVED TO APPROVE THE SYNOPSIS AS WRITTEN.

There was no discussion.

VOTE: NON OBJECTION: UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Motion carried.

VISITORS

A. Todd Hindman, Fireweed Academy Principle

Mr. Hindman explained that Fireweed Academy has been around for over 20 years, beginning as two rooms, two teachers and 30 kids. He shared a brief overview of Charter schools beginning in Alaska in 1997, that they fall under the umbrella of the school district in Alaska, they have control of their own budget, in comparison to the other district schools that share expenses between schools. Fireweed's budget is built on their student numbers, currently they have seven full time classroom teachers and 115 students currently enrolled.

In response to questions from the task force Mr. Hindman explained their goal of wanting to have one campus. Currently they have grade K-2 classes at Little Fireweed on East End Road and grade 3-6 classes on the West Homer Elementary campus, but they'd like to build a consistent K-6 school culture. He explained their operating and maintenance difference between their Little Fireweed leased location and shared services MOU at West Homer. They're on on a one year extension at the leased property and have been approved for operation by the State and the District for a ten year term for their contract. The school has an Academic Policy Committee (APC), which is a group of parents who act as their board and oversee operation of the school.

Specific to the HERC building, Mr. Hindman explained if modifications upstairs can be made to the areas that have been subdivided in to smaller offices and created into classrooms, they would just have room enough upstairs. They would want access to the kitchen, gym, and the multi-use room downstairs as well.

There was also brief discussion about the possibility of being able to use portions of the building after hours for community members and for after school programs, usage of the facility grounds, and accessibility needs.

STAFF REPORTS & Committee Reports (10 minutes)

A. Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner

Deputy City Planner Engebretsen reviewed her staff report and discussed upcoming meeting dates, worksessions, and Brown Bag Lunches at the library.

B. Brown Bag at the library report

PUBLIC HEARING

PENDING BUSINESS (20 minutes)

A. Goals (formerly Scope of Work)

Mr. Slone commented there seems to be some concern over the meaning of the term and thinks some might feel it's impeding the ability to explore other areas and issues. After doing research on the term he'd like to propose a changing scope of work to goals, related to the four items in the resolution from Council.

Mr. Derry concurred that it's worth clarifying.

DERRY/LOWNEY MOVED THAT WE RENAME OUR ADOPTION FROM SCOPE OF WORK TO GOALS.

There was no discussion.

VOTE: YES: HAINES, KNIGHT, MATTHEWS, REISS, DERRY, LOWNEY, MARKS, SLONE

Motion carried.

B. Remodeled or New Recreation Facility Update

Mr. Haines updated the group on their project work plan. He explained the efforts to connect with people and groups for data collections had a goal of completing this by the end of August, but due to people's availability, it's moving into September. They are attempting to look at products and services that meet the need of a HERC building, whether new or remodeled, in terms of being able to justify the expenditures and the space. The two primary focuses are one, where space is needed for activities and products that are fast growing. A good example is the Community Recreation Program where they have a number of service offerings that are growing from 200% to 300% over a three year period, and eventually they will need additional space. The other area is products and services that are not available yet in the community or not provided by the private sector, an example from talking to library staff is offering tech related activities for senior citizens get a better understanding of technology.

Mr. Haines added that he is working on a mission statement to bring back to the group for approval and the economic impact assessment. Regarding the assessment he's attempting to create a model that shows the increase in economic activity due to a refurbished or new HERC building.

Lastly he recalled at the last meeting they discussed the cost of approximately \$400+ per square foot for a new building. Now the focus will be working through the refurbished HERC building.

C. Report on other rec facilities

Mr. Slone reported that he's reached out to the cities of Kenai, Soldotna, Seward, Cordova, and Valdez by submitting questions via email, and phone with some. Seward has responded and he anticipates receiving input back from the other cities.

In response to questions, Mr. Haines suggested a report should be ready for the task force to consider by their first meeting in October.

NEW BUSINESS (20 minutes per item)

A. Budget Considerations, City funding mechanisms

Deputy City Planner Engebretsen reviewed her memorandum, the capital funding resource information, and financing information from the police station project that was provided in the packet. Administration's standpoint is if we want more community recreation in the sense of a building and more programs, we'll need more revenue to pay for it. The police station information shows what a sales tax increase or mil rate increase could look like and the stance is that there will probably need to be a vote of the people to raise taxes to pay for the building and maintenance.

Discussion points included

- The Needs Assessment showed at least a segment of the population was willing to pay for recreation.
- Our fees for recreation have been stagnant for years and possibly raising the fees would bring some revenue, another component is potentially charging people who don't live in the city a slightly higher fee.
- There is the potential of demo-ing the HERC and having land to be used as an outdoor park with recreation in an outdoor setting.

Regarding the capital funding resources Deputy City Planner Engebretsen explained a lot of the funders typically don't want to be the 20% that get a project started, they want to be the 20% that get you to the end. The community has to be invested and have a good portion of the funding in place before attracting other dollars. She explained processes the city went through for other loans, like the USDA funding for the library building and the half percent sales tax increase to pay for the new building and for community recreation. She also touched on impacts to the general fund from loss of sales tax revenue with the seasonal sales tax on non-prepared foods. In her opinion the city would be most successful in having citizens interested in either a sales tax or property tax proposition, followed up with addressing fees.

Point was raised that it's more than just building a building, there are ongoing maintenance costs as well. Brief discussion ensued regarding contracting for operation of the facility, and

targeted taxes on things like alcohol and tobacco. It was suggested that they need to look at funding sources other than the taxation model, the more options we have will be beneficial.

It was suggested that at the next meeting they discuss the Needs Assessment surveys and the criteria utilized because it's somewhat misleading when talking about the number of people who support building a facility, for example.

B. Fire Marshal conversation, building code and occupancy considerations

Deputy City Planner Engebretsen touched on incremental use of the HERC, as has been previously discussed. The building codes are being updated over time and one thing that will become an issue is the way the stairwell is constructed. She understands now it's considered a fire break. When the building code changes in about two months, the stairwell may not be considered a fire break. One of the recommendations of the Fire Marshal was to have an architect look at it to help determine if it's okay, needs to be remodeled, or if doing anything is the major remodel. Her idea of incremental use appears to be dying down.

Mr. Reiss concurred and reviewed his discussion with the Fire Marshal's office that is outlined in the packet. They are unsure if the stair well is considered a fire break and the codes are tightening up on that. Essentially the only way to have a use upstairs and a separate use downstairs is if the stair well can be considered a fire barrier. An individual architect who is certified to look at those issues could review it, it doesn't have to be Stantec. If it can be certified, or easily configured into a fire barrier, then the upstairs can have one use factor and the downstairs with the gym can have a second use factor. If not, the building takes on the more stringent determination for the use. In discussion with Mr. Fisher from the Fire Marshal office, what they need to know for their determination is what the use is, then they can apply what's outlined in statute to determine if it meets certain fire code parameters. They don't want to do the work at this early stage, but will when the use is determined, and drawings are available at about 90-95%. He reviewed some information about costs and options related to minor and major modifications and potential sprinkling upgrades.

In discussion about demolition, it was suggested the smaller HERC 2 building it could potentially be \$250,000 on the low end, as a contractor could possibly salvage items to help keep the cost down. HERC 1 is almost three times the size and could be upward to \$1 million, worst case.

Discussion ensued on the need to establish whether or not the stairwell can be considered a fire barrier as that will help determine what can be done regarding the use of the building. There was back and forth discussion about timing for an architect to come in, whether to wait on taking action until after the upcoming September 5th worksession with Public Works, and different architectural needs that need to be addressed.

MARKS/LOWNEY MOVED THAT WE APPROVE USE OF FUNDS TO HIRE A FIRE CERTIFIED ARCHITECT TO GO THE HERC AND LOOK AT THE ISSUE OF THE FIRE BARRIER AT THE STAIRS, WITH THE IDEA WE WILL BE HIRING THAT PERSON AFTER SEPTEMBER 5TH.

There was brief discussion regarding the need to include a date.

LOWNEY/MARKS MOVED TO AMEND INSTEAD OF USING THE TERM HIRE TO SAY WE WOULD ACTIVATE A HIRING IF THE NEED AROSE AFTER THE WORKSESSION ON SEPTEMBER 5TH.

Discussion moved in the direction of needing to establish a use.

SLONE/LOWNEY MOVED TO AMEND TO ADD FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEWING FOR B OR E OCCUPANCY.

There were comments that there isn't a need to review for a specific use related to this action for review of the stairwell.

VOTE (secondary amendment re: b or e occupancy): YES: SLONE
NO: MARKS, REISS, KNIGHT, LOWNEY, MATTHEWS, DERRY, HAINES

Motion failed.

VOTE (primary amendment re: activate hiring): YES: MARKS, REISS, LOWNEY, HAINES, DERRY,
KNIGHT
NO: SLONE, MATTHEWS

Motion carried.

VOTE (main motion as amended): YES: DERRY, MARKS, REISS, KNIGHT, HAINES, MATTHEWS,
LOWNEY
NO: SLONE

Motion carried.

C. Next Steps

Deputy City Planner Engebretsen noted in interest of time, she will work with the Chair on next steps to outline the next few meetings. At the next meeting there will be more discussion on use, the needs assessment and the statistically valid survey, what questions we have answered at this point, what's left, and our worksession with Council on the 24th.

It was requested a tentative date be set to do a public forum in the evening. Chair Matthews noted Dr. Marley was in the audience and she thought he might have something to share based on comments he made at the Chamber meeting. She asked if staff could reach out to him to provide his comments in writing or have time on the agenda to share.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

The Audience may comment on any item. 3 minute time limit

None

COMMENTS OF CITY STAFF

None

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Mr. Derry commented that he's done some expense analysis on operating costs for the building and will consult with Julie on when to talk about it.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. at the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

MELISSA JACOBSEN, MMC, CITY CLERK

Approved:_____



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Planning

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Planning@ci.homer.ak.us
(p) 907-235-3106
(f) 907-235-3118

To: HERC Task Force
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: September 7, 2018
Subject: September 11 staff report

Whew! This task force keeps me busy for sure! Many great things happening and I appreciate your time and efforts.

Topics that are bubbling up include, how much do people value the HERC building, VS the land and location? Ask people this question when you are talking to community members.

I participated with Karin in a meeting with HACA – Homer Arts and Culture Alliance. In brief, four members – the college, the Pratt, Homer Council on the Arts and Bunnell Street Arts, all said that they either plan to keep operations mainly in their own spaces for the next 5 years, or the HERC would not provided the space they needed (college needs welding and mechanics type space). They did offer to continue the conversation and provide guidance on what a non-profit model would look like for a recreation center. You will recall at our last meeting when we talked about taxation, the TF had some consensus that Homer is unlikely to support new taxes. In the government model of ownership/operations, we need tax revenue or user fees to pay for a facility. HACA has offered to continue talking with Karin and I about what a non-profit model would be for a recreation center. These are successful nonprofits in what they do; this is a great opportunity to knowledge share within our community. We hope to have a HACA member give a brief presentation at the September 24th meeting. I envision this information as being included in our final report on how things could be paid for.

Below are a few technical items deemed from the 30 Aug site visit and the 5 Sep Work Session charrette with PW. Generally, the session focused on the current condition of the building by lower & upper levels with a lookout toward a 5-year and 10-year occupancy. But the session touched on other items/issues pertinent to use of the building. Of course, problems with systems or specific items probably will arise over time given minimal renovations, what I call “limp along”.

I recommend Items in red font be addressed within the 5-year window.

Notes from charrette talking points:

Site/Civil:

No significant issues but depends on use of the building

Fencing: **Some minor repairs to existing fences need to be fixed by PW**, (potential H&S issues) If for young kids (e.g. Fireweed Academy) may require additional fencing and fixes to existing fences. Also, fixes and/or reconstruction of fence and gate around fuel oil tank.

[Reiss – **Recommend repairs to fuel tank fence soon**]

Drainage around perimeter okay – did fixes in the recent past

Fuel tank is double walled and no apparent leaks or spills during fueling

Parking lot and building lights do not work – probably a contactor issue. Lights are not on photosensors and will be addressed by PW if the lights are turned back on.

[Comments by audience, Kathy Hill: The site/building has not suffered from vandalism including graffiti. The skate board should be serviced by a Porta Potty]

Structural:

Building foundation is in good condition. Will need earthquake upgrades if alterations to building.

[Reiss – bones of the build are good and earthquake upgrades will need to be made over the long term]

Architectural:

Exterior flashing & siding – okay

Roof – very concerned:

PW fixing as problems arise

Requires taking out the low spots in the roof out so water can flow to roof drains

Hot mop is a longer-term fix that can be done by PW

[Reiss - Recommend take care of now and use a roof contractor to address depressions and hot mop. Some flashing adjustments may be required. The cost would be under a Capital Project threshold and my rough-order-of-magnitude, (ROM), \$18,000-\$20,000 but need a contractor's estimate. Could be as much as \$40,000.

“Longevity: The average life of hot mop roofing is around 20 years but may last as little as 15 years or longer than 30 years given proper maintenance and conditions.”

Given HERC application which would be a minimum coating for cost to be under Capital Expenditures cap and condition of existing roof on which the hot mop is directly placed. I presume the 10 to 15-years at best]

Windows are old and have lost heat capacity

[Comment by audience, Larry Smith: consider using “plastic window insulation film” covering. I looked on-line. At the bottom of these notes is a Google search response]

Interior walls – 2” x 8” walls:

Upper level – walls appear ok. Probably lead based paint that has been covered by other paints, (encapsulated)

[Reiss - Best for general H&S and psychology to add another coat of paint]

Lower level – Fire issues at Zumba room currently being addressed and should be done in approx. two weeks. Once done will notice FM for certificate. The gym is under a FM certificate, but kitchen and storage room are not covered by FM certification

- Central stair well – both PW and me, to the best of our non-fire knowledge, considers it is not a “fire barrier”. The stair well can be made into a fire barrier with construction of fire rated separation walls

Lower level women’s restroom – has a wooden ramp will and may require replacing with concrete ramp

Mechanical:

Lower level – boiler room:

Water infiltration from below slab not a significant problem and does not affect the use or operation of system in the room. The old boiler’s asbestos coat was encapsulated. The new boiler can be converted from fuel oil to natural gas and may provide an operational cost savings.

[Reiss – Per memo to City, installation of piping for natural gas ROM cost is approx. \$35,000. Need to check if cost includes boiler conversion]

Water (domestic) piping – A mixture of copper (from change out repairs) and galvanized:

Galvanized pipe changed as it fails. Failure due to flaking of galv. that constricts water

flow. The restrooms water closet and urinals are generally okay. Some sinks have restricted flow and the showers (lower level) are inoperable.

Heating & heat – piping:

Pipes above drop ceiling are wrapped with asbestos and not encapsulated.

The ceiling & ceiling tiles act as a barrier

Pipes are galvanized with some replaced by copper at ventilators

Upper level – ventilators will require to be brought on-line by a mechanical (HVAC) contractor

Air handlers are old but okay

Electrical:

Panels & wiring – generally okay. Some breaker failures are experienced. PW replaces breakers as required

Florescent lighting – some have been replaced and “no PCB” in ballasts noted on the older replaced units were

Telephone blocks exist

Computer case exists but not guts/units

[Reiss – recommendation is to service building with wireless system]

Notes pertinent to items requesting PW thoughts:

◇ Isolating upper level from lower:

Is possible, but cost would be large by placing valves in-line, since a looped system etc. Probably would not be a good solution. Currently have minimized service to upper level, the trickle of water running through system to prevent freezing, ventilators insulated from outside, electric lights are only on in hall way, air handler on upper level services gym, etc.

◇ Roof can accept hot mopping. Would require leveling in areas of ponding water to move water toward roof drains. The roof drains are not blocked and no overflows currently in line

◇ Systems and items requiring immediate attention – depends on use. The roof will need attention, gym doors may need to be replaced, piping in bathrooms

◇ Question by TF – can the upper level be demolished?

Yes, but at great cost: need to build a structural wall to support the roof (east side of main entrance stair well), water service would have to be relocated, utilidor may need to be maintained, etc.

[Reiss - The cost to demo the upper portion of the HERC potentially would lead to problems not recognized at this time and would necessitate an A/E plan. The demo could be on the order of \$800,000 to include structural adds and would not be cost effective over a 10-year operational period]

◇ Given a 5-year time frame – opinion is this building can limp along. Ten years, more deterioration and more effort by PW to maintain building.

[Reiss – PW stated they have 2.5 workers assigned to operations & maintenance functions for several buildings. They are stretched. HERC is a high maintenance facility given current conditions but is mitigated by the low use that is isolated to the lower level]

Daily News Miner, Fairbanks, 21 Oct 2010

“FAIRBANKS - Q: I am thinking of putting plastic film over my windows for the winter. Is there any value in this?

A. Yes, but mostly for windows that are old or are in bad condition. If installed well, using plastic heat shrink films can provide three key areas of benefit. Putting plastic film over a window is almost equivalent to adding an extra pane of glass on the window. This could mean up to a 50 percent decrease in heat loss through the glass of your window, but little to no reduction in heat loss through the window frame.

The better your windows, the less benefit you'll get in using plastic films.

Applying a plastic layer can help limit condensation on window panes by helping to keep the interior window surfaces warmer.

If you can see a haze or droplets of water near the bottom of your windows, this is a sign that your windows could use an upgrade or that the humidity in your house is too high.

Finally, the plastic film can also help to reduce discomfort from cold window surfaces by reducing convective currents that form when air is cooled by the glass surface, causing it to fall and create a draft. If positioned well, plastic films can sometimes be used to help reduce cold air coming in past window edges and seals.

All of these benefits rely on a correct installation method. The common plastic films available at the grocery or hardware store do not insulate by themselves, but instead add insulation by trapping air between the glass and the plastic film. The optimal air gap to create with a plastic film is between 3/8 and 3/4 of an inch.

The seal of the double sticky tape and the window frame surface must be continuous and smooth to trap air effectively, otherwise air and water vapor will move between the glass surface and the plastic film. This will become apparent quickly, as condensation will build up behind the plastic film. This will eventually undermine the point of installing it.

Use plastic on widows that house pets and children can not get to, because puncturing the plastic will ruin it.

Unfortunately, covering windows with plastic limits visibility somewhat, depending on the quality of the installation and the lighting. The finishing touches done with a hair dryer are crucial to achieving the best light transmittance, so take your time and work carefully.”



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Planning
491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Planning@ci.homer.ak.us
(p) 907-235-3106
(f) 907-235-3118

To: HERC Task Force
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: September 7, 2018
Subject: Operations and Maintenance expenses

I have had questions from a few members about how much time PW spends maintain the HERC building./ I hope to have a time estimate at the meeting.

I'd like to spend some more time with the numbers that Dave Derry has provided, and get consensus from the Task Force on what information you'd like in the final report. From my perspective, it would be great to have O&M estimates for a new facility. I recognize those figures came out pretty late in the conversation for the police station, and may not have been considered very much when the library was built. It would be great to turn over anew leaf and consider these expenses from the start of a new project! I'd also like to include the table that shows what the status quo costs are for the City – Scenario 1 minimum/holding.

Attachment: 9 5 18 spreadsheets by Dave Derry

Property Name: HERC 1											
Date: 8/1/2018											
Building GBA: 16,800 sq. ft.		Breakdown:				Gym: 5,700		Lower: 2,800		Upper: 8,300	
		2009	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2010	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2011	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	
Occupancy:		full; Upper-UAA, Gym-B&GC			full; Upper-UAA, Gym-B&GC			prt.; Up-UAA out, City in, Gym-B&GC			
Electricity		\$ 20,600.75	\$ 0.102	\$ 1,716.73	\$ 18,110.14	\$ 0.090	\$ 1,509.18	\$ 18,139.42	\$ 0.090	\$ 1,511.62	
Water/Sewer		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fuel Oil/gas		\$ 37,266.42	\$ 0.185	\$ 3,105.54	\$ 35,824.29	\$ 0.178	\$ 2,985.36	\$ 38,177.32	\$ 0.189	\$ 3,181.44	
Refuse		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Lawn Care		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Snow/sand		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Janitorial		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
total		\$ -	\$ 0.287	GBA	\$ -	\$ 0.268	GBA	\$ -	\$ 0.279	GBA	
		2012	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2013	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2014	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	
Occupancy:		prt.; Up-City out 3/12, Gym-B&GC			prt.; Up-Enstar in, Gym-B&GC out			lmt.; Up-vacant, Gym-CPRP			
Electricity		\$ 14,688.71	\$ 0.073	\$ 1,224.06	\$ 11,617.38	\$ 0.058	\$ 968.12	\$ 9,867.49	\$ 0.144	\$ 822.29	
Water/Sewer		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fuel Oil/gas		\$ 32,413.97	\$ 0.161	\$ 2,701.16	\$ 24,673.44	\$ 0.122	\$ 2,056.12	\$ 16,416.78	\$ 0.240	\$ 1,368.07	
Refuse		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Lawn Care		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Snow/sand		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Janitorial		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
total		\$ -	\$ 0.234	GBA	\$ -	\$ 0.180	GBA	\$ -	\$ 0.384	GYM only	
		2015	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2016	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	2017	\$/sf/mo.	\$/mo.	
Occupancy:		lmt.; Up-vacant, Gym-CPRP			lmt.; Up-vacant, Gym-CPRP			lmt.; Up-vacant, Gym-CPRP			
Electricity		\$ 11,248.28	\$ 0.164	\$ 937.36	\$ 10,915.40	\$ 0.160	\$ 909.62	\$ 10,948.32	\$ 0.160	\$ 912.36	
Water/Sewer		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fuel Oil/gas		\$ 11,533.91	\$ 0.169	\$ 961.16	\$ 8,660.38	\$ 0.127	\$ 721.70	\$ 10,217.78	\$ 0.149	\$ 851.48	
Refuse		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Lawn Care		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Snow/sand		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Janitorial		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
total		\$ -	\$ 0.333	GYM only	\$ -	\$ 0.286	GYM only	\$ -	\$ 0.309	GYM only	

Homer commercial buildings ~ operating expense comparables

Property Name: Building GBA: Occupancy type:	Beluga Prof Center 6,608 office, education		Confidential 1 Retail, mixed		Confidential 2 Retail, mixed		Confidential 3 Health care	
year	2017/18	\$/sf/mo.	2017/18	\$/sf/mo.	2017/18	\$/sf/mo.	2015/16	\$/sf/mo.
Electricity	\$ 5,585.51	\$ 0.252	\$ 20,624.82	\$ 0.064	\$ 63,874.63	\$ 0.161	\$ 9,434.87	\$ 0.160
Water/Sewer	\$ 1,934.19	\$ 0.024	\$ 7,210.21	\$ 0.022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,512.41	\$ 0.043
Fuel Oil/gas**	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,267.05	\$ 0.026	\$ 12,010.72	\$ 0.030	\$ 4,613.01	\$ 0.078
Refuse	\$ 789.56	\$ 0.010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,879.97	\$ 0.017	\$ 681.60	\$ 0.012
Lawn/yard Care	\$ 200.00	\$ 0.003	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,780.00	\$ 0.010	\$ 2,566.00	\$ 0.044
Snow/sanding	\$ 2,763.14	\$ 0.035	\$ 6,827.50	\$ 0.021	\$ 3,724.91	\$ 0.009	\$ 5,099.65	\$ 0.087
Repairs	\$ 850.00	\$ 0.011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Janitorial	\$ 2,600.00	\$ 0.111	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,462.50	\$ 0.484
**Heat type	Electric BsBrd		natl. gas		natl. gas		fuel oil	
Total		\$ 0.445		\$ 0.134		\$ 0.228		\$ 0.907

Property Name: Building GBA: Occupancy type:	Skiff Chick & Law office 1,532 retail & office		Confidential 4 2,300+/- Office		South Peninsula typical range; City of Homer Office & retail	
year	2018	\$/sf/mo.	2016/17	\$/sf/mo.	2011	\$/sf/mo.
Electricity	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,286.78	\$ 0.120	\$ -	\$ -
Water/Sewer	\$ 480.54	\$ 0.026	\$ 688.93	\$ 0.025	\$ -	\$ -
Fuel Oil/gas	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,657.87	\$ 0.097	\$ -	\$ -
Refuse	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 423.68	\$ 0.015	\$ -	\$ -
Lawn/yard Care	\$ 250.87	\$ 0.014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Snow/sanding	\$ 639.75	\$ 0.035	\$ 567.44	\$ 0.021	\$ -	\$ -
Janitorial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
**Heat type	\$ -	\$ -	fuel oil	\$ -	natl. gas	\$ 0.200
Total		\$ 0.075		\$ 0.279		\$ 0.240

City of Homer buildings

2017 FACILITY EXPENSES	Square Footage	FUEL/LUBE(*)		EQUIPMENT MAINT.		BUILDING & GROUNDS MAINT.		PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		ELECTRICITY		WATER		SEWER		W&S \$/sf combined		REFUSE-DISPOSAL		SNOW REMOVAL(2)		JANITORIAL		TOTAL** Cost per sq-ft. per month
		FUEL/LUBE	Cost per sq-ft. per month	EQUIPMENT MAINT.	Cost per sq-ft. per month	BUILDING & GROUNDS MAINT.	Cost per sq-ft. per month	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	Cost per sq-ft. per month	ELECTRICITY	Cost per sq-ft. per month	WATER	Cost per sq-ft. per month	SEWER	Cost per sq-ft. per month	W&S \$/sf combined	REFUSE-DISPOSAL	SNOW REMOVAL	Cost per sq-ft. per month	JANITORIAL	Cost per sq-ft. per month			
Airport Terminal	8,588	\$8,808	\$0.0855	\$2,558	\$0.1176	\$12,119	\$0.1176	\$5,666	\$0.3565	\$36,744	\$0.3565	\$2,143	\$0.0208	\$3,966	\$0.0385	\$0.0593	\$907	\$12,000	\$0.1164	\$22,892	\$0.22	\$0.74		
Animal Shelter	3,994	\$9,265	\$0.1933	\$0	\$0.1700	\$8,148	\$0.1700	\$4,000	\$0.1275	\$8,501	\$0.1275	\$650	\$0.0136	\$608	\$0.0127	\$0.0262	\$574	\$4,500	\$0.0939	\$10,646	\$0.22	\$0.67		
City Hall	13,321	\$6,843	\$0.0428	\$48	\$0.0742	\$11,860	\$0.0742	\$6,014	\$0.1774	\$20,389	\$0.1774	\$808	\$0.0051	\$835	\$0.0052	\$0.0103	\$696	\$9,210	\$0.0576	\$35,508	\$0.22	\$0.32		
Fire Station	9,000	\$8,229	\$0.0762	\$537	\$0.0433	\$4,675	\$0.0433	\$11,643	\$0.2517	\$27,181	\$0.2517	\$1,519	\$0.0844	\$1,531	\$0.0142	\$0.0985	\$1,132	\$7,375	\$0.0576	\$23,990	\$0.22	\$0.55		
Library	17,200	\$15,441	\$0.0748	\$2,239	\$0.0639	\$13,187	\$0.0639	\$8,599	\$0.1731	\$35,718	\$0.1731	\$1,294	\$0.0063	\$1,535	\$0.0074	\$0.0137	\$1,000	\$11,885	\$0.0576	\$45,848	\$0.22	\$0.39		
PH Harbormaster Office	4,784	\$8,822	\$0.1537	\$559	\$0.0859	\$4,933	\$0.0859	\$1,895	\$0.1785	\$10,249	\$0.1785	\$517	\$0.0090	\$414	\$0.0072	\$0.0162	\$1,100	\$9,000	\$0.1568	\$12,752	\$0.22	\$0.61		
Police Station	5,500	\$1,270	\$0.0192	\$4,314	\$0.1023	\$6,751	\$0.1023	\$6,996	\$0.3699	\$24,416	\$0.3699	\$930	\$0.0141	\$1,076	\$0.0163	\$0.0304	\$1,121	\$7,640	\$0.1158	\$14,661	\$0.22	\$0.65		
Mean-all facilities:			\$0.0922		\$0.0939		\$0.2335		\$0.2335		\$0.2335					0.0364						\$0.22	\$0.56	

(*)all buildings nat. gas except Police Station

(*)2 Fire Station & Library contracted out

Costs in red are out of the typical ranges for the expense item.

Buildings & grounds maintenance and snow removal are all excessive, based on comparable expenses for private commercial properties

**excludes
Janitorial & non
colored columns

HERC 1 building ~ Use scenarios

Scenario 1- Minimum/holding		Bldg area (sq.ft.)	Income	Expense	Difference
Use:	Gym & Zumba room only	6,300			
User:	Homer Community Rec		\$14,700	\$20,790	\$ (6,090)
Required repair/renovation cost estimate					
Separate utilities for cold status of upper level:					
	water/sewer			\$0	
	heating/ventilation system			\$0	
	Convert building to natural gas heat			\$0	
	Hot mop roof			\$0	
	Convert fluorescent fixtures to LED			\$0	
	Any ADA modifications for restroom use			\$0	
		Total		\$0	
Operating expense estimate (annual)					
	Heat			\$7,560	
	Electric			\$9,072	
	Water/sewer			\$1,512	
	Custodial				
	Snow/sanding			\$1,512	
	Lawn/yard			\$1,134	
		Total		\$20,790	

Scenario 2- Fireweed School occupancy		Bldg area (sq.ft.)	Income	Expense	Difference
Use:	Total building	16,800			
User:	Fireweed Charter School lease (@ \$1/sqft/month)		\$201,600	\$56,448	\$ 145,152
Required repair/renovation cost estimate					
	Fire Sprinkler system, entire building			\$0	
	Fire wall separation			\$0	
	Convert building to natural gas heat			\$0	
	Hot mop roof			\$0	
	Convert all lighting fixtures to LED			\$0	
	Repartition former UofA office area			\$0	
		Total		\$0	
Operating expense estimate (annual)					
	Heat			\$20,160	
	Electric			\$24,192	
	Water/sewer			\$5,040	
	Custodial				
	Snow/sanding			\$4,032	
	Lawn/yard			\$3,024	
		Total		\$56,448	



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Planning
491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Planning@ci.homer.ak.us
(p) 907-235-3106
(f) 907-235-3118

To: HERC Task Force
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: September 7, 2018
Subject: City Council Work Session Report

The Task Force has made a lot of progress and has a lot of information. For the meeting with the City Council, I would suggest a presentation of the highlights so far. I would like this staff report to be the beginning of a memo to City Council for their packet and the joint meeting. Your thoughts and edits are welcome! For the actual presentation to Council, I suggest each TF member 'adopt' a section of the memo to talk about. (FYI Karin will not be present). We will talk more on the 11th on how the meeting with Council will go.

Begin draft memo:

Resolution 18-xx tasked the TF with several items: *(Julie will fill in reso # and rephrase the questions)*

1. Can the upstairs of the HERC be used without capital expense?
2. What is the minimum needed to fully use the upstairs?
3. What would be nice to have for full use of the upstairs?
4. How much would demolition cost?
5. How much would a new building cost?
6. How can these items be paid for?

#1 Can we use the upstairs as is?

This question has taken a lot of time and effort to answer. The short version is maybe – the TF is still working out the final details. If the city wishes to use the upstairs again, it will need to be reviewed by the fire marshal. There may be some use that will be allowed without a major building renovation. The final report of the TF will address this item more clearly.

#2 &3 What is the minimum needed to use the upstairs, and what would be nice to have?

These questions really morph into one; renovations to the HERC are do it all or do nothing proposition. Once the City begins major renovations to the building, or changes to occupancy classification (such as for a school) then the whole building would need to be brought up to current codes. This includes sprinklers, new roof, electrical, mechanical including heating, plumbing and ventilation, possibly structural upgrades, likely hazardous material abatement, potentially seismic upgrades, and ADA access. Rough cost estimate is \$2.5 - \$3 Million. Further upgrades to the building envelope such as insulating the roof and walls and exterior improvements, would likely bring the costs up to \$4-\$4.5 million.

#4 Demolition

Demolition costs for HERC 1 are estimated at \$750,000, and HERC 2 at \$250,000. This estimate does not include trucking costs to the Central Peninsula Landfill, nor does it address unforeseen expenses such as an underground fuel spill, etc. Both building may have items that would be salvageable, such as the fuel tanks and interior wood doors. The value of these and other salvage could decrease the cash cost to the City of the demolition.

#5 New Building – How much would it cost? ~\$4,800,000 for 12,000 square feet

A good number for the cost of new government construction is \$400 per square foot. Sterling has a community center with a gym, kitchen, an office space and a community meeting room/library, weight room, and restrooms. *(Mike Haines correct me here!)* This building is approximately 12,000 square feet, and is a good starting point for a new Homer recreation center discussion. Should the community decide to build a new facility, the layout and exact use of the building would addressed during project planning and budgeting.

Do we want to add some operations and maintenance numbers here? Dave?

#6 How do we pay for it?

Julie will write up the TF discussion on taxes, and include comments from HACA. We are still working on this one!

Recurring themes

There are a few themes that keep coming up in conversations with community members.

1. The value of the land to the public is high for a public use. The location at the gateway to Pioneer Ave and the size of the property lends itself to many options for community use (park, new rec facility, etc) now and in the future. The sentiment that the land was donated for a school remains important to community members.
2. The value of the HERC building may not be high. Task Force is continuing to gather input on whether the HERC building is valued an asset.
3. With some roof maintenance, HERC 1 could be viable for the short term – 3-5 years. Beyond that timeframe, this aging building will have systems in a degrading state, and repairs are likely to be extensive and expensive. See #2/3 above.
4. Continue to use HERC 1 as it is now for the next 3-5 years. If a large funding source materializes, it may be worth fixing the building. If money does not appear, the city should plan to demolish the building. In either scenario, the city should be saving some funds because the building will not remain without significant cost in the future.
5. If HERC 1 and HERC 2 are going to be demolished, the community could choose to keep mowing the lawn and enjoy the open space. When there is community drive and funding to build a new recreation center, this is an ideal location. Removing the buildings does not change the fact this location is very viable for a community recreation center.
6. The need for childcare comes up in almost every conversation. It is possible that to gain broad community support, a new facility may need to include a Boys and Girls Club, or other large scale afterschool programing.



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Planning

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Planning@ci.homer.ak.us
(p) 907-235-3106
(f) 907-235-3118

To: HERC Task Force
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: September 7, 2018
Subject: Building Use Discussion

Staff recommends postponing this discussion and having a work session on October 4th or 5th. A local architect has offered to work with the HERC Task Force. I think the 'use' conversation would benefit from some professional knowledge beyond what I can offer!

Recommended action: Schedule a work session on October 4th or 5th (Wednesday or Thursday), to talk about building uses.

