

CITY OF ASHLAND  
FACILITIES MASTER PLAN  
COMMITTEE REPORT

30 JUNE 2008

## City of Ashland Facilities Master Plan Committee Report

### Table of Contents

#### Volume 1- Master Plan

1. Introduction .....	1-1
a. Background .....	1-1.1
b. Purpose and Intent .....	1-1.2
c. Acknowledgement of Citizens Advisory Committee .....	1-1.3
2. Executive Summary and Consultant’s Recommendation .....	2-1
3. Description of Process .....	3-1
4. Space Needs Analysis - Existing conditions (organized by department) .....	4-1
5. Space Needs Analysis - New program of spaces (5, 10, and 20 year projections) ..	5-1
a. By department .....	5-2
b. Specific needs Fire Station #2 .....	5-42
c. Specific needs of the Yard .....	5-45
d. Affordable housing .....	5-47
6. Master Plan Options .....	6-1
7. Potential Costs .....	7-1
8. Time Schedule .....	8-1

#### Volume 2 – Appendices

Appendix 1. Sample questionnaire .....	A-1
Appendix 2. Conference reports .....	A-6
Appendix 3. Standard office layouts .....	A-31
Appendix 4. City Property Inventory with zoning .....	A-33
Appendix 5. Property Acquisition .....	A-37
a. The yard	
b. Fire Station # 2	
c. Affordable housing exchange opportunities	
Appendix 6. Cost Data .....	A-51

TAB 1

## **City of Ashland Facilities Master Plan and Updated Space Needs Analysis**

### **Part 1 - Introduction**

#### **Background**

During the 2007-2008 fiscal year budget process, the Ashland City Council directed that major facility improvements be put on hold, pending the development of an updated Facilities Master Plan and Space Needs Analysis. ORW Architecture of Medford was selected to assist the city in this process, working in conjunction with the Community Facilities Master Plan Committee.

In 1993, the City convened an Ad Hoc Space Needs Committee to address concerns over the locations of city facilities, overcrowding of staff at various sites, the desire to maintain a viable presence in the downtown area, and to make recommendations on future space needs for the City. The Space Needs Analysis was updated in 1999, and many of the recommendations have since been addressed through new or renovated facilities.

The city faces similar issues today, and many of the prior recommendations are still valid. Additionally, there are new concerns related to an expanding employee base, their functions at various facilities, and the ability to combine and/or share spaces. Most of all, this Facilities Master Plan must look at overall needs with a long-term vision, in order to develop a Master Plan that will serve the city well into the future.

## **Intent and Purpose**

The intent of the new Facilities Master Plan is to guide the city in the effective use of its properties, and to provide a strategic vision for the development of current and proposed properties.

The stated purpose of the Facilities Master Plan is multi-fold:

1. Update the Space Needs Analysis conducted in 1993 and updated in 1999, including:
  - a. An evaluation of current locations and their proximity to other departments and City functions, future staffing, and growth expectations for the next 10 to 20 years.
  - b. An exploration of various options to meet these needs, in conjunction with city staff and the Community Facilities Master Plan Committee.
2. Evaluate the physical location of all City facilities with regard to their current and potential best use, including under-utilized and undeveloped properties in the City's portfolio of real estate assets.
3. Evaluate duplication of services, identify pros & cons of combined uses, and make recommendations for or against combining these uses.
4. Conduct Open Houses / Community Meetings to solicit community input and to discuss the proposals and their impact on the community.

Additionally, ORW Architecture emphasized the critical importance creating a Master Plan that would be implemented, rather than just "gathering dust" on a shelf. ORW also noted that the Master Planning process should be driven by the Community Facilities Master Plan Committee. The role of the consultant was to facilitate of the process, document the existing conditions, gather information from the stakeholders and user groups, and develop options for further exploration by the committee.

## **Acknowledgement of Community Facilities Master Plan Committee**

ORW Architecture acknowledges the key role played by the following members of the Community Facilities Master Plan Committee, and extends its appreciation for their commitment and dedication to the Facilities Master Planning process:

### City Staff:

Ann Seltzer (project manager)  
Mike Broomfield  
Joe Franell  
Mike Morrison, Jr.  
Jim Olson  
Lee Tunenburg  
Keith Woodley

### Citizens-at-Large:

John Fields  
George Kramer  
Don Mackin  
Dale Shostrom  
Carol Voison

### City Council:

Alice Hardesty

Thanks to the input, enthusiasm, dialogue, and creativity of these committee members, this Facilities Master Plan will serve the City of Ashland for years to come.



TAB 2

## **Executive Summary**

The process of creating an Updated Facilities Master Plan for the City of Ashland yielded valuable information about the ways in which existing city facilities are outdated, undersized, or otherwise ill-suited for their current and future use. In particular, most city departments expressed a need for additional storage of all types, additional meeting space, and improved proximity to other city departments and functional groups with which they interact on a regular basis.

This Master Plan provides for three variations in its implementation, to address the current fiscal realities facing the city. The following options will provide the city with a wide range of possibilities, based on fiscal realities, long-term Council goals, and real estate variables.

The three options are described in detail later in this report, and can be summarized as follows:

### **Option 1- Reuse and or redevelopment:**

This option involves the relocation of various city functions, allowing for phased implementation. However, with multiple small projects and inflation factored in, this piecemeal approach actually costs more in the long run.

### **Option 2 - Limited expansion / remodel and new development:**

This option relies upon redevelopment of the Civic Center property, in conjunction with renovation of other properties.

### **Option 3 - Exploration of entirely new structures:**

This option involves the total replacement of several existing facilities with new buildings that are designed to meet current and future needs. The existing buildings will be re-purposed to accommodate other uses for which they are better suited.

These options run the gamut from conservative to aggressive. Option 1 is the most conservative approach, and provides only interim solutions to the city's overall facilities needs without significant capital expenditures. Option 3, on the other hand, is the most aggressive approach, and provides a more long-term solution with the associated significant capital improvement costs. Option 2 combines elements of the other two options, and is included as a compromise solution that addresses long-term facilities needs with more modest capital expenditures.

The members of the Facilities Master Plan Committee that created this report consciously decided not to recommend any of these options, but rather to present all three options as viable alternatives. The committee felt that the final selection of an option should rest with the City Council, so that an option can be selected within the larger framework of budgetary realities, public support, and council goals. It is important to note that the committee finds merit in all three of these options, but defers to the city council's judgment and guidance in both the selection and implementation of an option.

As part of its original charge from the city, OgdenRoemerWilkerson Architecture is pleased to make a recommendation that supports our professional opinion of the option that best suits the city's needs. Our recommendation also reflects ORW Architecture's commitment not only to the Master Planning *process*, but also to the successful *implementation* of the Facilities Master Plan.

This recommendation is based on an objective evaluation of the three options from a cost / benefit standpoint, and does not take into account the limiting factors of popular opinion, political climate, or current financial constraints. Rather, this recommendation provides a starting for further consideration by the City Council.



## **Consultant's recommendation**

OgdenRoemerWilkerson Architecture encourages the Ashland City Council to consider option #2. The placeholder in the Capital Improvement Project Budget designated for the construction of a new storage building would provide sufficient funds to address many of the immediate needs of the downtown departments, which in turn would create the swing space needed to vacate the spaces while construction is underway. This money will be invested in improving existing facilities, and the needed storage will now be provided on site. The Grove will be remodeled to house Finance and its athletic space converted to a large group presentation and meeting space.

The departments now located at the Civic Center ultimately will be housed in facilities more suitable for their technical functions. The proposed new development at the Civic Center can be achieved in two phases, allowing the Police Department to remain operational while half of the addition is constructed. After the first phase is completed, the Police department will be able to move into the new space while the second phase is constructed.

The Civic Center site included in Option #2 provides more flexibility for development compared to a downtown site. Also, this site will not reduce the availability of parking spaces in the downtown core. The Council Chamber and Courts function can be relocated temporarily to the Grove's new meeting facilities while renovation of City Hall is underway. All other departments will be unaffected during the course of construction.

Upon completion of the new Civic Center Building, the employees of the Electric Department and Information Technologies can vacate the warehouse, thus opening up additional space for the Yard's storage needs.

Although this plan does not create the optimum space requirements of the Yard, it does create substantially more storage space there. This central location maintains more efficient travel throughout the city and reduces staff time by consolidating all the city's Yards onto one site. This solution also eliminates the need for extremely costly land acquisition and the site development costs associated with the relocation of the yard.

The floor plan and site plan developed previously for Fire Station # 2 represent a valid solution. We recommend that the building design and materials be simplified as a way to reduce costs, yet maintain durability. This design should relate to the neighborhood context rather than the more costly civic vernacular of the city's downtown buildings.

TAB 3

### **Description of Master Planning Process:**

In developing the Updated Space Need Analysis and Facilities Master Plan, ORW Architecture and the Community Facilities Master Plan Committee utilized the following process:

1. Analysis and documentation of existing facilities, (many facilities drafted up from plans provided by the city, not actually as-built measured)
2. Interviews with department heads to development needs and define existing constraints. Questionnaires distributed to all staff. Information gathered and returned to department heads for confirmation of information.
3. Programs developed and reviewed with department heads
4. Conceptual plans generated to verify spaces will fit into designated spaces, these plans not intended to suggest the actual layout of what might be designed, rather verify the program elements can fit into the designated buildings. Plans distributed to dept heads for confirmation of layout.
5. Committee roles and input
  - a. Facility and Property tours
6. Community input
  - a. Open houses May 12, 13, 15<sup>th</sup>.
7. Council review and approval