

Objectives

- Review options at current site based on budget constraints
- Provide additional options for alternate sites
- Receive direction from the Board on next steps

Budget (as presented on 1/31)

Initial Budget	\$7,293,978
T-Kennel Purchases	(134,362)
Land Purchase	(453,277)
Architectural Services Agreement	(453,152)
CEQA Document	(50,000)
General Services Labor & Misc.	(180,538)
ROW - Easement Exchange Agreement (Staff)	(28,000)
Environmental (staff and consultant)	(23,000)
Labor (DOT design and project management)	(213,142)
Budget remaining (Tobacco Settlement Account)	5,758,507
DOT Estimate of remaining costs to complete project	7,890,158
Budget Shortfall	2,131,651

Options for Current Site

- Option 1 Continue with current design 17,600 square feet
 - Pros
 - Plans and specifications are almost complete
 - County owns the site
 - Cons
 - Current estimate is \$2.1M over budget with little contingency built in (This is the minimum amount based on current estimate, could be more)
 - Delays due to Oak Woodlands push project completion out to 2014 or beyond
 - Would need to seek extension from the City for special use permit at temporary site
 - New shelter would have higher operating costs due to increased utilities related to sewer lift station

Options for Current Site

- Option 2 Investigate alternatives to build within budget
 - Pros
 - County owns site
 - Cons
 - DOT estimates new shelter would be approximately 9,000 square feet
 - Questionable as to if this would meet our current needs and definitely would not meet long term needs
 - Redesign and environmental review could push shelter construction out to 2014 or beyond
 - Would need to seek extension from the City for special use permit at temporary site and extend lease agreement
 - New shelter would have higher operating costs due to increased utilities related to sewer lift station

Alternate Site Parameters

- Existing building with commercial or industrial zoning
- Minimum of 13,000 square feet
- Adjacent land available for large animals
- Limited residential bordering property
- Proximity to Highway 50 and 49
- Feasibility of tenant improvements to meet shelter requirements

Alternate Sites

Pros

- Time frame to move into alternate sites could be as short as a year to 18 months thus saving annual rent costs of approximately \$150,000
- Potential for lower annual operating costs
- Purchase of building and tenant improvements can be accomplished under current budgeted amount
- Looking at vacant buildings in existing industrial areas
- Alternative sites are easily accessible to the public
- Potential for adjacent vacant lands to be used for large animals Savings of \$10,000 to \$25,000 annually
- No issues with extending special use permit with the City

Cons

- County may still be obligated to build the road on the existing property, so road costs are included in the fiscal analysis for alternate sites
- Money invested to date in plans and specifications at current site will be lost

Alternate site A

- Pros
 - Building square footage is adequate for 20-50 year facility
 - Zoning is Industrial
 - Close proximity to Highway 50 and 49
 - Adjacent land for large animals
 - Current estimate leaves a \$700,000 budget surplus/contingency after building purchase and tenant improvements
 - Does not include potential purchase of additional land for large animals or cost for barns and fencing
 - Does include worst case scenario of \$1.4M in road costs
- Cons
 - Limited residential borders property
 - Adjacent land is highly visable which increases security risks for large animals

Alternate site B

- Cons
 - Building square footage is only adequate for 10-20 year facility
- Pros
 - Room for future expansion
 - Zoning is Industrial
 - Close proximity to Highway 50 and emergency vet clinic
 - Adjacent land for large animals
 - No residential bordering property or adjacent land
 - Adjacent land is sheltered creating more security for large animals
 - Current estimate leaves a \$2.1M budget surplus/contingency after building purchase and tenant improvements
 - Does not include potential purchase of additional land for large animals or cost of barns or fencing
 - Does include worst case scenario of \$1.4M in road costs

Options - BOS Direction

 Move forward with current site, dedicating at a minimum, \$2.1M in additional funds.

Or

2. Move forward with re-design of current site.

or

3. Move forward researching alternative sites A and B.