City of Tukwila
Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study

Phase 3 City Council Worksession
Today’s Presentation

- Process Refresher
- Phase 1 Refresher
- Phase 2 Refresher
- Phase 3 Presentation
  - Alternatives and Recommendations
  - Community Outreach and Engagement
- A look forward to Phases 4 and 5
- Review Project Workplan/Timeline
**Process**

**City of Tukwila**  
**Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study**  
**PHASE 3 WORKSESSION**

**Phase One**  
*What are the facilities needs?*
- Identify current use  
- Estimate current space needs  
- Project future space needs

**Phase Two**  
*How suitable are our current facilities?*
- Inventory existing facilities  
- Assess suitability for use  
- Assess condition

**Phase Three**  
*What's the best plan for Tukwila?*
- Identify alternatives (buy, build, lease)  
- Assess alternatives  
- Identify the preferred approach

**Phase Four**  
*How do we get there?*
- Phasing and Funding Plan

---

*All Staff Feedback*  
*Community Outreach and Engagement*  
*Staff Feedback*
Phase 1

ASSESSING NEEDS

Identify current use

Estimate current space needs (2014)

Facilities Planning Target (2040)
A conservative estimate of future needs:
Tukwila Population and Employment Projections

- Residents
- Employment
- Actual Trend
- PSRC Forecast
- Historical-based Forecast

49,979 Employees in the year 2040
24,452 Residents in the year 2040
Phase 1

A growing population, aging facilities

Tukwila Population Change Over Time, 1910 - 2010

City of Tukwila
Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study
PHASE 3 WORKSESSION
Space Needs Estimates, 2014 & 2040

**STAFFING-BASED ESTIMATES**

- **DCD**: 9,630 / 10,120
- **Finance**: 3,870 / 4,354
- **Fire Admin**: 4,515 / 4,999
- **HR**: 1,200 / 1,451
- **IT**: 2,580 / 3,903
- **Mayor**: 5,483 / 5,483
- **Parks & Rec Admin**: 8,708 / 9,836
- **PW - Admin**: 7,095 / 7,179
- **Police**: 33,170 / 40,140

**PROGRAM-BASED ESTIMATES**

- **Council**: 4,440 / 4,440
- **EOC**: 6,032 / 6,032
- **Parks & Rec Maint**: 7,300 / 7,478
- **PW - Shops**: 62,919 / 71,698
- **Fire Ops**: 43,826 / 53,159
- **Courts**: 5,626 / 5,715

Legend:
- Current Need
- Future Need

Square Feet
Phase 2

Evaluation of Current Facilities

- Operating and Maintenance Costs
- Property Value
- Work Place Efficiency
- Facility Quality
- Location
- Public Image
- Customer Service
- Quality of Work Life
- Seismic Deficiencies
- Operational Flexibility
- Expansion Potential
- ADA Deficiencies
- Acoustics

Facility Evaluation Criteria

1. Property Marketability
   - Operating and Maintenance Costs
     The operating costs of a building are significantly affected by the energy expenses incurred to heat, cool and illuminate the building. These expenses typically comprise the thermal efficiency of the building envelope and efficiency of its lighting and HVAC systems.

   - Location
     The cost to maintain a building includes personnel and routine maintenance, corrective repairs, deferred maintenance, insurance, and replacement of equipment, fixtures, and furnishings as they wear out or become obsolete.

   - Facilities that cost more to operate and maintain are less valuable than those that are more efficient. In general, operating and maintenance costs rise with the age of the building. This necessitates renovation in the structure until these improvements no longer cost effective.

2. Property Value
   - Property Value
     Property value is the sum of both the structure (building) and the property value.

   - Value of the structure is affected by the original quality of construction, level of on-going maintenance, and its current condition.

   - Value of the property is affected by its size, shape, location, visibility, and road access, as well as the utilities and any infrastructure that serve it.

   - Consideration of property value becomes relevant if and when consideration is given to surplus a subject property. If the asking value of a property is high, it is likely to replace instead of remodel in many the more cost effective approach.

3. Property Attributes
   - Work Process Efficiency
     Consideration is given to the physical design and layout of the building floor plan and how the building is configured. How accommodating the property is in facilitating the nature of the work performed has been evaluated, as well as the magnitude of improvements required to improve the overall efficiency.

   - Weight is given to work process efficiency since efficient delivery of service equates to lower costs in providing it.

   - Facility Quality
     Consideration is given to the level of construction quality utilized when the facility was initially built. Higher-quality materials almost always have higher flexibility and last longer, which means routine maintenance costs are less and replacement of worn-out materials is less frequent.
# Facility Evaluation Matrix

## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Marketability</th>
<th>Property Attributes</th>
<th>Public &amp; Staff Experience</th>
<th>Facility Specifics</th>
<th>Evaluation Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Hall (1977)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300 Building (1978)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center (1995)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Golf Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minkler Building (1972)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Long Shops Building (1965)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 51 (1973)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 52 (1971)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 53 (1995)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 54 (1961)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purpose
As part of the needs assessment, we have assessed the suitability and condition of these City facilities. This assessment will help determine the City’s plan for each of the facilities such as remodeling, selling, repurposing, or redeveloping.

## Key
- Suitable Condition
- Unsuitable Condition

---

### Phase 2

City of Tukwila
Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study
PHASE 3 WORKSESSION

---

9
# Square Footage Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>2013 Needs</th>
<th>2040 Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Government Services</td>
<td>144,044</td>
<td>205,237</td>
<td>235,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire, Police, Finance, Mayor’s Office Council, Courts, City Clerk, DCD, HR, IT, Public Works, City Attorney</td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>88,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Supporting Facilities</td>
<td>232,292</td>
<td>293,485</td>
<td>323,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Community Centers, Park Restrooms and Shelters, Golf Course Associated Structures, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staff Engagement**

- **Strategy**
  - Drop-in workshops
  - On-line tools
  - Posted materials

- **Staff comments and recommendations**

- **Additional feedback**
Phase Three

What’s the best plan for Tukwila?
CRITERIA IN EVALUATING ALTERNATIVES:

✓ Public Safety
✓ Customer Service
✓ Efficient Delivery of City Services
✓ Development Cost
✓ On-going Operating Expenses
✓ Location
✓ Flexibility
Phase 3

Relationship Diagrams
Evaluation Groupings

✓ City Hall / Public Safety Facilities

✓ Fire Department Facilities

✓ Public Works Facilities
Phase 3

6.75 acres

City Hall Campus Property
Current Conditions
Alternatives – City Hall Campus

Option 1

City Hall
Significant interior reorganization and renovation of the existing City Hall building.
Square Footage: 25,000 sf +/-.

Staff & Overflow Parking

Public Parking

Current City Hall

Police / Staff Parking

6300 Building
Gut entire building down to structure only; all new internal systems; new windows, siding, and roofing; convert underground parking into finished interior space.
Square Footage: 49,000 sf +/-.

City Hall Campus Property

Option 1
Alternatives – City Hall Campus

Option 2

City Hall
- Significant interior reorganization and renovation of the existing City Hall building.
- Square footage: 25,000 sf +/−

City Hall Addition
- 6300 Building demolished and replaced by a 48,000 sf, 2-story addition to the existing City Hall building.
- Square footage: 80,000 to 85,000 sf +/-
Alternatives – City Hall Campus

Option 3(a)
Alternatives – City Hall Campus

Option 3(b)

City Hall
- Significant interior reorganization and renovation of the existing City Hall building.
- Square footage: 25,000 sf

Staff/Overflow Parking

Public Parking

Current City Hall
Future City Hall Addition

6300 Building
- Existing 6300 Building to be demolished and initially replaced by additional parking, and eventually serving as expansion space for City Hall.

City Hall Campus Property

Option 3(b)
Phase 3

Alternatives – City Hall Campus

New Construction & New Property Acquisition
Property Size: 8 to 10 Acres
Square Footage: 91,300 to 103,000 sf

Hypothetical Site Diagram

Option 4

City Hall Campus Property

Option 4
### Evaluation – City Hall Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 - Retain City Hall and 6300 Building</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2 - City Hall Addition in place of 6300 Building</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3(a) - 6300 Building replaced with a New Public Safety Building</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3(b) - New Public Safety Building / New Property</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 4 - New City Hall &amp; New Public Safety Building / New Property</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 5 - Acquire and Remodel another Facility</th>
<th>Public Safety (x6)</th>
<th>Customer Service (x5)</th>
<th>Efficient Delivery of City Services (x4)</th>
<th>Development Cost (x3)</th>
<th>Ongoing Operating Expenses (x2)</th>
<th>Location (x1)</th>
<th>Flexibility (x1)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- 5 Opportunity for substantial improvement; high value, cost effective
- 4 Likely to be somewhat improved; better; lower cost than comparable projects
- 3 Maintains current; status quo; average
- 2 Likely to be somewhat diminished, or compromised; below average; higher cost than comparable projects
- 1 Clearly lower than current; significantly below average; expensive

R Raw Score
W Weighted Score
Recommendations – City Hall Campus

Option 3(b)

✓ Function of City Hall remains on the current site

✓ Current City Hall be retained and renovated
  *(if feasible and cost effective)*

✓ Police & Courts be relocated to a new Public Safety Building

✓ Police & Courts be located elsewhere than current site

✓ Dispose of the 6300 Building after utilizing it as ‘interim’ space while building a new Public Safety Building and renovating the current City Hall.
**Recommendations – City Hall Services**

**Option 3(b)**

- Retain Current 24,000 sf City Hall Building
- Construct addition(s) over time to City Hall to eventually accommodate:
  - DCD 9,000 sf
  - Finance 3,900 sf
  - Human Resources 1,300 sf
  - Information Technology 2,600 sf
  - Mayor’s Office 5,500 sf
  - City Council 4,400 sf
  - Public Works Admin 7,100 sf
  - Parks & Rec Admin 8,700 sf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCD</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Admin</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec Admin</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Square footages as determined during Phase 2.
Considerations – Public Safety Building

Option 3(b)

New Public Safety Building to house:
- Courts 5,000 sf
- Police 33,100 sf
- Emergency Operations Center 6,000 sf

Considerations in locating a new Public Safety Building (Phase 4):
- Centrally located
- Highly visible to community
- Commercially zoned property
- Relatively flat site, and 4 to 5 acres in size
- Convenient access to a major arterial
- Outside flood plains and soils subject to liquefaction
Alternatives – Fire Department
Alternatives – Fire Department

Merge with Kent Regional Fire Authority?
Phase 3

Recommendations

- Fire Station 53
  - Retain in current location
  - Minor improvements

- Fire Station 54
  - Replace/Relocate – Northwesterly
  - Investigate partnership with City of Seatac

- Fire Station 52
  - Replace/Relocate – Southeasterly
  - Administrative Headquarters

- Fire Station 51
  - Replace/Relocate – South 180th St
Public Works – Phase 2 Conclusions

✓ Minkler and George Long Shops should both be replaced
  ▪ Both are currently located in floodplains
  ▪ Both are currently located on soil subject to liquefaction
  ▪ Both are significantly undersized for today’s needs
  ▪ Both facilities have significant deferred maintenance issues

✓ Minkler and George Long Shops should be co-located
  ▪ Co-locating affords higher efficiency
  ▪ Co-locating is likely less expensive to build
  ▪ Co-locating is likely less expensive to maintain
Public Works - Alternatives

What might a new co-located facility look like?
Public Works - Recommendations

Seek property for a new consolidated Public Works Campus that would accommodate all of the City services currently located at the Minkler and George Long properties.

Ideally, the new subject property would have the following characteristics:

- Size of 8 to 10 acres of ‘usable’ land area
- Outside any floodplains and floodways
- Outside areas of liquefaction soils
- ‘Industrial’ zoning designation
- Efficient access to all areas of the City
Recommendations – Summary

- New Public Safety Building on a new property.
- New Public Works Campus that consolidates Minkler and George Long Shops on a new property.
- Fire Station 51 to replaced on property already acquired by the City of Tukwila.
- Fire Station 52 to replaced on a new property south of the current location.
- Fire Station 54 to replaced on a new property northwest of the current location, potentially in partnership with City of Seatac Fire Station 47.
- City Hall services to remain on current City Hall Campus with modest additions to the current building.
An informed public is a supportive public.

A **Communications Plan** to ensure consistent and effective messages about the *Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study*
Recent outreach efforts.

► Road Show
TIBAC, COPCAB, Tukwila Rotary, Southcenter Rotary, Southwest King Chamber of Commerce, Tukwila Historical Society, Equity and Diversity Commission, Library Advisory Board, Arts Commission, Parks Commission and Sustain the Pool

► Website
Phase 1 and Phase 2 documents
Narratted video of Road Show
Phase 3

So far...

► Announce the project
► Describe purpose and objectives
► Communicates the benefits of a comprehensive assessment

…and for the next steps

► Share preliminary findings (which buildings are in most need of repair or replacement)
► Decision criteria for moving forward
► Long-term plan and priorities
What’s next?

► What does the preferred scenario cost?
  • Costs to build the facilities?
  • Short-term construction phase costs?
  • Changes to on-going operations costs?

► How can the City implement the scenario?
  • What are the phasing and sequencing options?
  • How might the City pay for all of this? (developing a funding strategy)
Goal:

*Development of a preferred Funding and Phasing Strategy that balances timing, impacts on capital resources, public safety, and customer service, among other considerations.*
Questions?