

City of San Rafael

Critical Facilities Committee

Final Report

April 18, 2005

**City of San Rafael
Critical Facilities Committee**

**Report to the City Council
April 18, 2005**

Executive Summary

The Critical Facilities Committee –

The twelve volunteer members appointed by the City Council of the City of San Rafael spent roughly 7 months studying the City's need for a capital development program to replace or renovate facilities deemed critical to public safety, staff safety and operational effectiveness, and the maintenance of the quality of life in San Rafael, as currently perceived by its citizenry. Those facilities included:

- Police Station and City Hall
- Six Fire Stations
- Two Community Centers
- The Downtown Library

The Group 4 Architects Study –

An August, 2003 three volume study by Group 4 Architects of these same facilities defined a core for the Committee's undertaking. After undertaking its own investigations of Group 4's findings, and conclusions, those findings and conclusions were confirmed, and expanded upon, by the Committee.

San Rafael Staff Participation –

The Committee was briefed extensively and in some cases more than once by City staff with expertise in finance, public safety and other operations in our effort to incorporate the observations and thinking of the best and most experienced minds in our pursuit of an effective strategy to renovate and/or replace the City's critical facilities.

Consultants –

The Committee met with outside experts on polling and public motivational strategies.

Findings –

- The City faces a serious structural operating deficit.
- The City has failed over a very long period of time to provide for the capital necessary to regularly maintain, upgrade and replace critical facilities.
- The City needs, in the relatively short term, to replace the Police Station, Fire Station # 1, and Fire Department Headquarters with a new combined public safety facility, and that project should include renovation of City Hall and construction of additional parking.
- Five of the remaining six fire stations are in need of either complete replacement, or significant renovation. Station # 6 requires some upgrades, but is otherwise in very good condition.
- The Terra Linda community center is a strong candidate for replacement while the San Rafael Community Center needs relatively less renovation.
- Increasing local revenue is the only possible solution to covering either the budget shortage, or the capital facilities needs, but no single solution is likely to do both.
- A Transaction and Use Tax (TUT) has a reasonable likelihood of approval by San Rafael voters. It's estimated that a ½ cent TUT would generate \$4.6 million annually.
- Covering the operating deficit is regarded as the highest priority.
- The major capital replacement projects will require long term debt financing backed most likely by a parcel tax.
- The Downtown Library, although a great community asset, was not deemed a critical facility and was not studied in depth by the Committee.

Recommendations –

- We recommend the City Council take steps to educate San Rafael citizens of the City's dire financial condition and needs.
- We recommend the City Council take steps to place a ½ cent TUT on the November, 2005 ballot.
- Assuming passage, the funds generated should be first allocated to covering the estimated \$3.1 million operating deficit.
- Remaining funds should be allocated either to a limited capital renovation program immediately, or to an accelerated broad program as detailed.
- The Council should begin, at the earliest practical time, to prepare for and propose a capital replacement bond program. That program should encompass all of the facilities replacement and renovation discussed in this report, in the priority order recommended.

City of San Rafael Critical Facilities Committee

History –

The Critical Facilities Committee was established by the City Council on September 7, 2004 to review a study undertaken for the city of the it's essential public safety facilities, and, to recommend to the council “financially sound and politically viable strategies that will assure the ability of San Rafael’s public safety facilities and library to meet current and future needs.”

The committee consists of 12 San Rafael citizen volunteers, from differing backgrounds, and differing neighborhoods.

With few exceptions, the committee has met weekly for two, or more, hours to hear from experts in various areas, to deliberate, and to discuss potential strategies. In addition, committee members made site visits to all six fire stations, the police station, two community centers and the library.

The City Manager, Rod Gould, and Public Works Administrator, Richard Landis attended most of our meetings and working sessions. They have been exceptionally helpful to the committee, providing regular briefings on relevant issues, providing requested information and materials, and by making city staff available to the committee where specific expertise was required. It was also very helpful that Council members sat in periodically and were able to provide the committee with the Council’s perspective when we had specific concerns or questions.

We read the reports of Group 4 Architects on the state of San Rafael’s critical facilities. We reviewed their discussion of the city’s options. We reviewed documents provided by staff relating to the City’s fiscal situation, the results of public opinion polling, and the success of various tax and bond measures put before voters in California.

Our work falls into three broad categories, each of which will be discussed in greater detail below. Those categories are:

Research and Education
Findings and Analysis
Summary and Recommendations

Research and Education –

The first task we assigned to ourselves was one of education and research.

Group 4 Architects Study –

The City of San Rafael commissioned Group 4 Architects to conduct a study of essential city facilities. As a result of that study Group 4 presented a three-volume report in August 2003.

The [Library Feasibility Study](#) evaluates the San Rafael Downtown Library.

The [Facility Evaluation Report](#) evaluates six city fire stations, two community centers and City Hall, the facility that also houses the Police Station. Areas covered include seismic safety, code compliance including such things as building code, ADA, and back-up electrical generators, life safety including such things as hazardous materials decontamination facilities and fire sprinklers, and modernization needs including such things as mixed gender living accommodations and electrically operated equipment bay doors.

The [Strategic Analysis](#) analyzes and summarizes the [Facility Evaluation Report](#) findings and presents a smorgasbord of options for the city to consider, either mitigating, or fully resolving, the problems found. This section also includes cost estimates and funding options.

Based on the Council's charter the committee made the Group 4 study its core document. We confirmed Group 4's findings with field visits to each of the sites, adding our own impressions to Group 4's work.

During our site visits, and in meetings that followed, we were able to augment our own observations with those of Fire Chief Martin and Police Chief Rohrbacher, and a number of their line firefighters, police officers, and their command staffs.

Briefings by San Rafael City Staff –

Another very important part of our research and education effort was hearing from city staff with expertise in the city's finances, budgets, and operational needs. During the course of our review and deliberations we received briefings and perspective from Assistant City Manager Ken Nordhoff, Fire Chief Bruce Martin, Police Chief John Rohrbacher, and Economic Development Director Nancy Mackle, and other staff.

Briefings by Consultants -

We also heard from representatives of Group 4 Architects, and consultants with expertise on opinion polling, tax measures and political campaigns.

The committee was able to hear from, and to a degree participate in, the interviewing process conducted by staff, and the Council, to select consultants with expertise in public opinion polling and tax initiative measures. In the process, and upon the selection of these experts, the committee was also able to take into consideration their initial opinion survey results, and to benefit from their experience in guiding initiative measures from inception through election.

The committee received a very helpful briefing from the Tramutola organization on the process whereby the City might proceed with a ballot measure of some sort to address revenue needs.

Committee Research -

Committee members also conducted their own research seeking data on relevant topics including possible sites for the development of needed city facilities, public and editorial comment on San Rafael governance and the state of the city, the success or failure of revenue measures in surrounding communities, and strategies for winning public finance initiatives.

Member Expertise -

The committee began its analysis of the state of San Rafael's essential facilities with a review of Group 4's in depth study of the facilities themselves, followed by our own site visits to verify what Group 4 had found. A significant number of the committee members are employed in either structural or geotechnical engineering, architecture, or the building construction industry. Thus the committee was able to bring to bear the considerable expertise of its own members to evaluating the facilities, and Group 4's findings.

Findings and Analysis -

Methodology –

Site visits were a part of both our education and our analysis since members of the committee have the expertise and experience to form conclusions independent of those presented in the Group 4 study. Group 4's findings and analysis were compared with the member's own observations and conclusions. Both were discussed in some detail by the committee.

The committee, in general, concurs with Group 4 as to the deficiencies noted and with the options presented to either resolve the deficiency completely, or to significantly mitigate the deficiency. As is often the case, some members were especially concerned about a particular deficiency and gave that greater emphasis than perhaps did Group 4. Examples include the lack of automatic back up generators at some critical locations, lack of fire sprinklers at most locations, and the lack of any facilities for the proper decontamination of personnel or equipment exposed to hazardous materials.

The committee, in general, concurs with Group 4's prioritization of needs. Where we extended Group 4's work was in developing a series of recommended choices from among the alternative strategies presented by Group 4. To arrive at our own path among the forest of trees, we held several sessions in which the merits of various combinations were discussed. We conducted a number of exercises through which a consensus finally emerged.

In one such exercise members were asked to assume that only half of the funds projected by Group 4 as necessary to fully resolve all the deficiencies noted in the best possible way were available. (i.e., \$25 million available of \$50 million needed.) Members were asked to come up with their recommended plan under the limited budget, and to provide the pros and cons of their choice. A sample response is included in the attachments.

After debate, we conducted a form of internal poll in which members were asked to vote choices from among a range of solutions presented for each critical facility. The choices ranged from minimal seismic and life safety renovation, to full replacement with new construction. This exercise was useful in determining both a prioritization as well as a range of costs. A copy of the results (Conceptual Recommendations) is included in the attachments.

We also conducted what is known as a "Delphi" exercise. In a Delphi exercise a series of questions or issues are posed to a group. The members each respond to the question or issue anonymously. The group then reviews and discusses the results and arrives at conclusions. In this case we responded to a series of issues synthesized from the Group 4 study, our own observations, and concerns that arose in discussion. Each issue was ranked as either a top priority, and key issue, or a low priority. The results allowed the committee to develop a consensus on priorities. A copy of Delphi exercise results is included in the attachments.

Fire and Emergency Medical -

The committee agrees with Group 4's findings, both generally and specifically, that San Rafael's essential public safety buildings are in serious need of either replacement, or significant upgrades, in order to ensure that those facilities will remain safe, and operational, in the event of a major disaster such as a large

earthquake. Those considerations are particularly vital with respect to fire stations because they provide not only fire suppression, but also the first line medical response our community has come to depend on. Seventy percent of the calls for service to the San Rafael Fire Department are for medical assistance. Imagine the consequences if our fire service, and emergency medical responders, were unable to fully respond in the wake of a major disaster.

A first responder's first responsibility is to ensure their own safety so that they will not become victims themselves and will remain able to help others.

The City of San Rafael must accept it's responsibility to ensure that our first responders are safe in their quarters, and that their quarters remain intact and operational, so that those dedicated first responders remain able to help others. We own them no less.

City Hall and Police Station -

The committee also concurs with Group 4's findings with respect to City Hall and the Police Station. The current Police Station is overcrowded and insecure. It fails to provide an adequate degree of separation between detainees and the public, risking public safety, and has totally inadequate facilities for evidence storage, armory, and other essential law enforcement needs. There are no facilities for decontamination and disposal of the hazardous materials routinely found in police work. The department has simply outgrown its allotted space resulting in the use of rented office space apart from the headquarters staff, and the use of various storage containers kept in the police parking lot.

The committee is very aware that the Council Chambers in City Hall must function as the city's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in the event of a major disaster. While Group 4 concluded that City Hall rated fair in terms of seismic safety, fair is hardly acceptable considering the role it will be expected to play in a time of great need. The entire building is in need of seismic upgrading, as well as significant upgrades to systems including electrical, HVAC and communications, and the addition of fire sprinklers and building security.

Community Centers -

The committee reviewed the Group 4 analysis of the two community centers and concurred that those facilities, while not perfect, are in reasonable structural condition, and, would likely serve acceptably if pressed into service as shelters in an emergency. We note that the San Rafael Community Center serves as a backup emergency operations center in the event that the City Hall is too damaged to serve that role in a disaster.

In evaluating the two community centers, the committee's focus is on their function as essential facilities in the event of a disaster, and not as community amenities. While not discounting the importance of the community centers as important to San Rafael civic life, the committee determined that they should be accorded a lower priority than fire, police and emergency operations facilities in the allocation of what are sure to be limited resources.

Downtown Library -

The Downtown Library presented the committee with a particularly difficult choice. Members of the committee are fond of libraries, and it was difficult to decide upon a strategy.

However, in the end, the committee concluded that the downtown library represents a different enough problem that it should not be encompassed in the recommendations of our final report. We believe that the library issue should be the subject of a separate review, and that the solution to whatever is done about the needs of the library be apart from the solution found for public safety facilities. The library should not compete with public safety facilities for available resources in the same measure, or action, taken by the Council.

We will not include a specific funding proposal for the library as part of our final report. But, we are able to say that we wrestled with the difficult problem of whether to preserve the original 1908 Carnegie building, or, to start over with a new building. As the Group 4 report details, the existing library complex has been added to, upgraded, and renovated several times in its nearly 100 year life. Every addition or renovation resulted in significant compromises. Any new renovation or addition would result in many more.

Modern libraries function very differently than their antecedents of only a few decades ago. Their design and construction should attend to the needs of the future, even while respecting the past.

The consensus of this committee is that the City will be best served by building a new library, either on the site of the present one, or, on an alternate site located in the core of the city.

Operational Needs -

The committee requested a briefing on San Rafael's financial condition in order to better understand the resources available to provide for the significant capital needs outlined in the Group 4 report. Assistant City Manager Ken Nordoff provided that in depth briefing. Members were very disappointed to learn the extent of San Rafael's structural operating deficit, and its impact on services.

We concluded that in addressing the city's capital needs we would also have to address the operating deficit. We asked the Council for authority to do so, and you granted us that authority.

We asked many questions of staff focused on whether there is any possibility of saving on costs. We are as confident as we can be that staff has made responsive and responsible cuts in every area possible, while striving to maintain service levels. We are also confident that staff is prepared to make responsible choices for additional cuts, sacrificing service levels if necessary, in order to continue to operate within the available funding levels.

We also note, and acknowledge with great respect, that the Council, senior management, and non public safety line personnel have all accepted reductions in pay in an effort to help resolve City's the financial crisis.

We concur with staff, and the Council, that balancing the city's budget by making further cuts in services would be counter productive, and would have serious undesirable effects on the quality of life for San Rafael residents. We believe that further cuts in service levels would undermine property values, and business activity, both of which would further reduce city revenues. We also believe that further cuts in funding for building, street and other maintenance would have an accumulating multiplication effect making for far greater problems in the future. Therefore, rather than further cuts in spending, we find that the solution must lie in increasing city revenue.

Our concerns over the operational deficit are as complex as the problem itself. We are very concerned that building new facilities and at the same time cutting staff and reducing service levels, undermines public confidence in city leadership.

Cause and Effect -

We inquired into the question of how the City of San Rafael, which is by almost every possible measure very well managed, and very well regarded by a substantial majority of our citizens, could have gotten into such financial difficulties. We are satisfied that the causes are circumstantial and historical in nature and not in any way due to poor husbandry on the part of present city officials or staff.

In an effort to provide the citizens of San Rafael with the lowest possible tax burden the City of San Rafael has historically under funded capital replacement and facilities maintenance needs. The problem was exacerbated by the passage of Proposition 13. The result is an accumulation of unfunded capital replacement needs with no capital reserve to meet them. These needs should have been addressed over a period of time, rather than accumulating to the degree we face today.

Funding options –

The committee considered a variety of funding options including those presented in the Group 4 report, and those suggested by staff or consultants during the course of our studies and deliberation.

We looked at a variety of revenue sources including a parcel tax, increases in the business license, property transfer and hotel taxes, utility taxes, sales taxes and a transaction and use tax (TUT). We considered not only the amount of revenue that would be generated by each, but also effect on the taxed community, and, the likelihood of receiving voter approval.

Summary and Recommendations -

San Rafael's Financial Condition -

The City of San Rafael is suffering from the financial impact of a general recession, significant taking of local tax revenue by the state, and historically low tax rates. The Council should take strong measures to restore San Rafael's financial health by increasing locally generated revenue that will stay within the city. We envision that this should involve a number of steps put forward over a period of time.

Faced with the prospect of yet further cuts in service as the City's reserves are depleted in 9-12 months, we find that the City's most urgent need is to address the operating deficit.

Critical Facilities -

Our original charter from the Council was to study capital replacement needs for the City's critical facilities. We have done so, and determine that those needs are significant.

Facility Rehabilitation or Replacement Priorities-

We recommend that the following facilities (listed in order of priority) be replaced, or completely rehabilitated and modernized:

New Public Safety Building

We recommend that a new Public Safety Building be constructed on the “Blue House Block” across 5th Avenue from City Hall. (Group 4 report Strategy IIIb) to house the following functions:

- Police Department
- Fire Station 1
- Fire Department Administration
- EOC
- Joint Fire and Police Dispatch

The City will need to acquire and demolish one private property, and demolish Fire Station 1 and the Blue House for this project.

City Hall / Additional Parking

Construction of a new Public Safety Building as recommended above involves complicating factors such as the loss the building currently housing the Redevelopment Agency, moving the Police Department from City Hall and other leased space, loss of a surface parking lot, etc. Taken together the sum of those factors advance the need to seismically upgrade and renovate the City Hall building, and to construct additional parking as suggested in the Group 4 report.

These two measures are accorded the highest priority in part because they do the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Together, a new Public Safety Building, City Hall upgrades and additional parking also represent the largest single cost undertaking.

New Fire Station # 2

Due to its age, condition, and lack of space, we recommend that Fire Station 2 be demolished and rebuilt on the existing site.

We acknowledge that incorporating the department’s training center on the existing site poses additional challenges. We encourage the Council to explore the possibility of acquiring additional adjacent land such as what is now the San Rafael School District’s corporation yard, or to consider alternate sites for the training facility.

A separate facility might be located near the Public Works Department, for instance, and should include many of the department’s maintenance operations. The costs for structural and other improvements to the training facilities at Station # 2 are included in the Group 4 study, but costs for a separate training and maintenance facility are not.

Fire Stations # 4, 5, and 7

All three of these stations require expansion, seismic reinforcement and modernization. All three should stay in their current locations. The Department has a goal of being able to house any 2 out the three possible service units (truck, engine, or ambulance) at any station. The size of the apparatus bays, therefore, (all are smaller than the benchmark of Station 6 that was used in Group 4's analysis) may determine whether these stations need to be partially or completely rebuilt.

Fire Station # 6

Station 6 is of recent construction but needs to have decontamination facilities, improved storage and minor seismic upgrades.

Community Centers

We recommend that the San Rafael Community Center on "B" Street be given seismic and life safety upgrades, but that the Terra Linda facility receive either major renovation or replacement. We note that the proximity of the Terra Linda Community Center to Fire Station # 6 should afford the Fire Department convenient use of that facility for some training or other functions, and will afford the Community Center the advantage of immediate access to the firefighters and paramedics should that center be needed for either mass casualty or shelter missions in a disaster.

Library -

After considerable discussion and debate, the committee finds that the issue of what to do about the San Rafael Downtown Library is significantly different in character from the other facilities encompassed in our work. All the other facilities have public safety as either their sole purpose, or, in the case of the community centers, play a role in the event of a major disaster. The library does not and we find it impossible to weigh its needs against those of public safety.

Having said that, we wish to acknowledge the importance of the library to the City of San Rafael, indeed to many members of this committee. We believe that the library has its own constituency and community of experts. We recommend that the question of what to do about the library be addressed by a body selected for that purpose.

Master Plan -

We recommend that the Council direct that a master plan be prepared to achieve these objectives over a specified timeframe, and that the resulting plan be adopted as a stated goal.

Facilities Funding –

As previously discussed we find no solution that would address both the City's operational needs and the capital needs for critical facilities replacement in one trip before the voters. We are therefore recommending that the Council address operational needs first.

Our first recommendation is that the Council place on the November, 2005 a measure aimed at creating a one half cent transaction and use tax (projected revenue of \$4.6 million annually), and that those funds first be applied to covering the projected deficit to prevent further service degradation.

If successful, this measure would cover the projected \$3.1 million annual operating deficit and would leave a "surplus" of approximately \$1.5 million annually. That "surplus" would be insufficient to fund the substantial cost of critical facilities infrastructure needs.

The amount of detailed study and planning needed for the critical facilities replacements outlined above, before the first shovel of dirt is turned, is significant and time consuming. We recommend that the Council begin the study and planning process for the first steps in a critical facilities master plan as soon as practical, following shoring up service levels, so that the first phase of that plan can be put into motion as expeditiously as possible once funding is secured.

At the earliest practical time, and based on more specific plans and cost estimates, the Council should undertake a long term funding program through a parcel tax backed bond issue. Bonds should be issued and projects funded in the priority order presented above.

The remaining question then is how to best apply the potential "surplus" from a successful half-cent transaction and use tax. On that question we offer the council two alternatives along with their potential benefits, and our thoughts.

The first choice is to apply any and all new revenue, above and beyond what is strictly needed to cover current deficits, to attacking on a one-by-one basis those critical facilities needs that can be accomplished with the available funds on an ongoing basis. Under this scenario it should be possible to perform seismic retrofits for fire stations # 4, 5, and 7, and to provide emergency generators in many cases. The objective would be to accomplish as much facilities operational security as possible with the available funds every year on an ongoing basis until

the entire remaining critical facilities replacement program can be funded and completed. This option has the advantage of addressing some critical facilities problems reasonably quickly. The downside is that they would be problems considered lower in priority.

The second possible alternative for the use of a potential “surplus” is to apply some of those funds to an highly accelerated critical facilities replacement planning process, apply anything remaining to restoring services already cut, with the objective of arriving at a completed planning process and bond issue date earlier than might otherwise be possible. This approach might well get the City to a fully developed plan for all critical facilities needs, and to a bond issue, faster than might otherwise be possible, but, there would be no short term resolution of any significant critical facilities problems.

The weight of the committee support falls behind the first choice, but both are presented because both have merit.

Other Measures -

We note that studies place San Rafael’s tax rates below those of comparable cities in several areas. We recommend that the Council adopt a strategy to increase the City’s tax structure to be on par with comparable cities.

We note that over a significant period of time the City has failed to fund, or under funded capital replacement reserves, and has failed to regularly and systematically invest in keeping facilities up to date. As noted previously, this is a long established situation, and does not originate with this Council.

We recommend that the Council adopt a policy directly aimed at preventing that oversight in the future, and ensuring that facilities are systematically upgraded to meet operational needs. In furtherance of that objective, we suggest the Council consider establishing a permanent citizen’s advisory committee to help evaluate and prioritize departmental needs and requests for funds.

Note Regarding the Dollar Amounts Presented in This Report –

The Critical Facilities Committee did not perform independent analysis of the City’s budget, nor of the projected potential revenue from revenue measures, nor of the projected costs of the capital replacement projects presented. The figures cited herein were taken from projections provided to us by staff, consultants, and the Group 4 Architects reports.

We caution that these figures are only estimates based on the information available at the time this report was prepared. In the case of the costs taken from the Group 4 report, those were preliminary conceptual budget estimates at the

time the Group 4 report was prepared. At the date of this report those are now nearly two years old.

Our message is this: the actual figures may vary considerably from those we have used. The Council is urged to make it's own analysis of each element before taking action.

Acknowledgements –

The committee wished to acknowledge the support of Mayor Boro, the entire City Council, Rod Gould, Richard Landis, Ken Nordoff, Brian Martin, John Rhorbacher, Nancy Mackle, Larry Tramutola, Group 4 Architects, San Rafael firefighters and police officers who helped us understand the complexities of the City and its needs.

San Rafael Critical Facilities Committee Members

Lionel Ashcroft
Bill Ballas
Kate Colin
Jack Devlin
Marie Fisher
Gladys Gilliland
Larry Luckham
Charles Pick
Rob Ward
Pat Webb
Alex Volmer
Iraj Zolnasr

Attachments

San Rafael Critical Facilities Committee
Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Given a \$25 million budget for critical facilities I would recommend allocating the entire sum to building a new public safety facility on the Blue House site.

PROS

- Doing so provides the “greatest good for the greatest number of people” in that it addresses both police and fire department critical needs while also freeing up space for city administrative uses.
- Such a project would be more easily “packageable” for presentation to the voting public than a more diverse assortment of remedies spread over a number of facilities.
- A new public safety facility would be clearly visible and tangible to the public whereas seismic upgrades to an assortment of facilities provide a lesser degree of satisfaction of “getting something for the money.”
- Although not directed at the operating costs question, a new public safety facility would at minimum relieve the city of the burden of rent for overflowing police and fire personnel.
- A new public safety building would also provide a more secure and fully functional Emergency Operations Center for the city.

CONS

- This approach puts all the apples in one basket and does nothing for the many other fire stations and their personnel.
- This approach may also be resented by the personnel at the remaining stations.

Delphi Exercise Results

Below is the summary from the 11 members who participated in the Delphi exercise on January 11th. Note: This was not a statistical study.

- The "top" column indicates the number of people who indicated that the issue was a "top 3" issue.
- "Key" issues are the 10 issues that are key for the critical facilities.
- The "low" column indicates the issues that were the lowest 3.

<u>Top</u>	<u>Key</u>	<u>Low</u>	
7	9	0	Conditions for firefighters are unacceptable and depressing.
4	11	0	Police department doesn't fit in the current police station.
3	8	0	Conditions for police officers at the City Hall facility are obsolete, unacceptable, unsafe and unsanitary.
4	8	0	Lack of generators at almost all critical facilities including the community centers.
2	9	0	San Rafael needs to be able to attract, hire and retain top quality, dedicated public safety officers.
2	7	0	Library too small and crowded for a city our size.
1	8	0	Deferred maintenance cannot be deferred any longer.
3	8	0	Fire and police stations would be crippled by a large, local earthquake.
1	7	2	Emergency evacuation shelter plan is not to code and possibly not adequate in an emergency.
1	4	4	San Rafael deserves excellent libraries with excellent hours.
0	3	3	Police may no longer be pro-active due to budget cuts (drug abatement, traffic issues, etc.).
1	2	3	Community deserves better.
1	4	4	Library needs to be updated.
0	8	0	Police and fire officers will not be able to respond in time of disaster.
0	4	6	Inadequate space for training firefighters.
0	0	8	Library does not serve the residents of San Rafael equally.

Conceptual Recommendations

Facility	Action	Projected Cost	Ashcroft	Ballas	Colin	Devlin	Fisher
PD/FD/FS#1	seismic & life safety	N/A					
(Blue House site)	full modernization	N/A					
	new construction	\$24,100,000	x	x	x	x	x
FS#2	seismic & life safety	\$563,000					
	full modernization	\$5,375,000					
	new construction	\$5,817,000	x	x	x	x	x
FS#4	seismic & life safety	\$611,800			?		
	full modernization	\$2,321,000			?	x	
	new construction	\$3,169,000	x	x	?		x
FS#5	seismic & life safety	\$473,000					
	full modernization	\$3,000,000	x	x	x	x	x
	new construction	\$3,842,000					
FS#6	seismic & life safety	\$398,000	x		x	x	x
	full modernization	\$1,344,000		x			
	new construction	N/A					
FS#7	seismic & life safety	\$482,000					
	full modernization	\$2,635,000		x			x
	new construction	\$3,489,000	x		x	x	
B St. CC	seismic & life safety	\$757,000	x		x	x	
	full modernization	\$1,133,000		x			x
	new construction	N/A					
TLCC	seismic & life safety	\$538,000	x		x		
	full modernization	\$2,633,000		x			x
	new construction	\$3,781,000				x	
Totals							

Gilliland	Luckham	Peck	Vollmer	Webb	Ward	Zolnasr	Totals	Min. \$	Max. \$
x	x	x	x	x	x	x	12	\$24,100,000	\$24,100,000
x	x	x	x	x	x	x	12	\$5,817,000	\$5,817,000
	x	x	x		x		5	\$2,321,000	
x				x		x	6		\$3,169,000
		x					1	\$473,000	
x	x		x	x	x	x	11		\$3,000,000
	x		x	x		x	8	\$398,000	
x		x			x		4		\$1,344,000
		?							
	x	?	x		x		5	\$2,635,000	
x		?		x		x	6		\$3,489,000
x	x	x	x	x		x	9	\$757,000	
					x		2		\$1,133,000
	x						3	\$538,000	
x			x				4		
		x		x	x	x	5		\$3,781,000
								\$37,039,000	\$45,833,000