

City of Sheboygan
2017-04-12

AL7SYG74F57A

CITY OF SHEBOYGAN

BUILDING USE COMMITTEE MINUTES

APRIL

12, 2017

Chair Alderperson Belanger

called the meeting to order at 5: 40 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alderperson John Belanger, Joe Clarke, Ray Haen, and Michael Langan

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Eric Jensen

STAFF/OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Michael Vandersteen, Alderperson Mary Lynne Donohue, Alderperson Bill Thiel, Alderperson Rosemarie Trester, City Administrator Darrell Hofland, Director of Public Works David Biebel, Director of Planning and Development Chad Pelishek, Director of Finance Nancy Buss

PUBLIC PRESENT: Debbie DeAmico, Henry Nelson, Janet Ross, Peter Mayer, Reed Schmitt, Dolcye Johnson, Marge Mattern, Maeve Quinn, Ryan Sorenson

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2.1 Approval of Building Use Committee minutes from November 29, 2016 meeting.

Motion by Joe Clarke, seconded by Michael

Langan to approve the minutes from the November 29, 2016 meeting. Motion carried.

2.2 Presentation by Bray Architects and City Staff on new building options.

2.3 R.O. 172 - 16 - 17 (Council Doc. 7.1) Submitting a summary of options regarding renovating the current City Hall or constructing a new City Hall.

Director of Public Works David Biebel: Option 1 has an inviting, friendly, customer service atmosphere all on the first floor. The spreadsheet has eight options. It should be mentioned with Options 3 thru 8, the building square footage meets what City Hall is occupying and using today, so Option 1 has the advantage of excess space. He thinks City Hall should be preserved and remodeled. There is 100 years of familiarity with the structure, which also happens to be centrally located in the downtown area. Option 4 is not an ideal layout and sharing the building with another tenant is a downfall. Option 4 building is 50 years old and is in need of updating which would be an additional cost for the city.

City Administrator Darrell Hofland: Option 3 floor plan is laid out but there is the constraint of two uses on that site. The use of this space could be efficiently arranged but it is a narrow building as presented. Space is tight and it would be asked the city widen the footprint or build up. Option 4 numbers on the sheet are vague. Discussions have not occurred and dollar amounts are rough (HVAC, electrical, structural, etc.). The intent is for the numbers to be on the high side with the expectation bids come in lower. Option 4 would include the city as the owner and as a condition of the city purchasing the property; the tenant would remain intact and would lease space back to the city. The city has over 50 percent reserves in the general fund. Current policy identifies minimum of 30 percent so city has additional 20 percent which could be reassigned, in part, for funding this project. For any additional fund source needed, city staff would recommend borrowing with a general obligation note of 10 years or less repayment schedule. Another advantage for issuing a note (versus a bond) is lower interest rates.

Aldersperson John Belanger: Option 4 has concerns. Alternate levels would have to be signed off for the city to reach an agreement. Signage is also an issue. Parking needs for the tenant and its customers would be needed along with parking for city staff as well as customers utilizing city services. Exterior costs, as related to Option 4, would be shared with the city. The city would allow the current tenant to enter into a 30 year long-term lease whereas utilities would be split. If City Hall is the option, then doing the cheaper option would be cheating the City Hall building.

Joe Clarke: Option 1 City Hall layout would breathe new life into the building but it comes with a high price tag. In Option 2, City Hall is still functional but needs tweaking. Option 3 is doing the opposite of creating a customer

friendly experience. The parking structure is also an issue. The basic description of Option 4 is not inviting and addresses uses for today and not future use and would need additional monies to compare apples to apples.

Bray Architect Steve Kuhnen stated the difference between Options 1 and 2 could be done right in terms of restoring the building. The difference is that Option

1 is looking at the shell and transforms the building into a modern work place. Option 2 would give the building another 100 year building. Option 1 is a one stop shop and customers can see what and where to get to. Option 2 loses the visual connection and the inviting aspect to the public; a completely different feel between the options.

Mike Langan: Questioned if the basement could be done at a later date? Steve Kuhnen stated the mechanical system could be left as is and could be done in the future. He also questioned which space would be most impacted with the different pricing. Steve thinks the 1 st floor would be easier to navigate with Option

1. Mike supports the \$11 million decision but questioned whether part or full renovation should be done. Renovation is a big expense. Everybody wants to spend less money but if the city is going to do this, do it right and not come back 15 years later and have building issues. If going down to the bones of the building, then the city should do it right. Option 4 has moisture, mold issues, and the cost effective is preliminary. Mike is also not a fan of multiple tenants in the building.

Ray Haen: Option 1 is his preferred option. Ray agrees with Joe Clarke and compared this project to the new Two Rivers City Hall and the community is very happy with the result of that building. Everyone should understand that even though this is an old building, it will be pricey to fix. The public may say to just build a new one instead of fixing this building at that price.

Aldersperson Mary Lynn Donohue: If City Hall is the choice, then all of City Hall should be done for \$11 million. The \$8 million will not bring back City Hall to its real historical value. Optimize space to make the building as efficient as possible for the future. The building right now is very constrictive in what to do. If City Hall is going to be gutted, then do it right the first time when it is all opened up and not make fixes years later. Political decisions need to be made for future long-term decisions, not just today's needs. If the decision is City Hall renovation, then do Option 1. The numbers can be refined once the decision is made.

Director of Planning and Development Chad Pelishek: Option 2 is a fix upon a fix. Option 1 would be the way to go. City Hall needs a complete renovation and not quick fixes as have been done over the years.

Henry Nelson thinks part of the equation is what people think. Most of the public he has spoken with preference to keep and use the City Hall building. This is an iconic building and should remain here.

2.4 Discussion and possible recommendation to the Common Council. Motion by Mike Langan, seconded by Joe Clarke to recommend Options 1 and 2, and discard Options 3, 4, and 5 but consider Options 6, 7, and 8 if City Hall remodeling is not viable. Motion carried.

ADJOURN Motion by Joe Clarke, seconded by Mike Langan to adjourn at 6: 48 p.m. Motion carried.