

CELPSC Project Memorandum
From: Councilors Stephenson, Crowder and Gaylord
To: City Manager & City Council

2 February 2010

Evaluating current plans for the CELPSC in light of the current unprecedented economic recession has focused our efforts to make sure this project provides high quality, reliable and efficient emergency services without requiring a property tax increase. After careful review of the building design, program and back up information provided by staff, we offer these comments. Our review began with value engineering for the current design and progressed to an analysis of the main program functions and alternate scenarios.

Value Engineering

We understand value engineering is an ongoing effort by the designers, staff and the CMAR. Accordingly, the design documents provided to us do not reflect a number of elements that have already been modified or eliminated. It would be helpful to have an updated list or marked-up drawings identifying these items. Here are items we noted in meeting with the designers.

911 Call Center

We continue to question the need for a 30+ foot tall space enclosed largely by floor-to-ceiling laminated frameless glass, with a viewing gallery.

Semicircular Stair

The corner stair between floors 14 & 15 seems redundant.

2nd floor Multi-Purpose Assembly Room

This sort of large space and pre-function area is probably available elsewhere.

3rd Floor Fitness Center replaced

We understand this fitness center may be replaced with a credit union, but rather than adding functions unrelated to emergency operations, consider reducing the building size.

Curtain Wall Extension Details

The building envelope is well proportioned, but may be over-designed for this context.

Building Inset at 3rd Floor

Reduces useable square footage by about 3000sf. Green roof justification seems marginal.

Interior Finishes & Fixtures

Except in public spaces, finishes and fixtures should be durable and economical. This is not typically the case in the current design. Furnishings may also need to be studied.

6000sf Storage Mezzanine, Building Maintenance Division, Locker Rooms, Café

These items need further discussion

Analysis of Functions

Emergency Operations versus Central Offices

The most expensive elements of the proposed building are necessary to protect emergency operations (defined in the state building code as *critical services*) in time of emergency. These elements include ballistic building envelope, blast-resistant structure, internal power generation and specialized environmental systems. While we agree there may be some functional efficiencies gained by housing central office functions for fire and police in the same building, we believe that there are premium costs associated with housing non-emergency functions – accounting for roughly half of the proposed habitable space - in an emergency operations structure.

Performance Improvements Reports

The January 29 staff reports indicate that most projected fire and police performance improvements would be achieved by consolidating central office functions. Few listed improvements require central office functions to be housed in an

emergency operations building. In fact, the projected information technology performance improvements emphasize the location independence of communications and information access.

Secure Functions versus Public Functions

The September 2008 *Threat Assessment Report* Conclusions states "The loading dock, the interior sally port and the public space on the first two floors are three areas primary vulnerabilities in the current design." (p.8) The report describes hand-delivered bombings as "commonplace" in the U.S. (p.24) and "[w]ith both the exterior grounds and the ground floor of the facility open for un-screened public access, the hand-delivery of an improvised explosive device in these areas such as in a backpack or briefcase is a serious concern. Similar attacks could also be carried out using incendiary devices. If such an attack were carried out, the potential exists for casualties in the immediate vicinity of the event, as well as an increased potential for progressive collapse of the structure if an explosive device was placed near a structural column." (p.31)

Our understanding is that that some or all columns have been redesigned to resist hand-delivered explosives, but that un-screened access is still planned for public spaces on the first two floors.

Alternate Scenario

Staff has identified functional benefits in combining emergency operations with police and fire central office functions, as well as urban benefits of combining an inviting series of public spaces on the bottom floors of a high-security emergency operations building. It appears, however, that these benefits may be outweighed by associated cost increases and safety compromises.

In order to understand the potential savings of housing central offices and highly public spaces separate from emergency operations, we would like to have cost breakdowns for this alternate scenario:

- a. Renovate 110 S. McDowell St building for standard office use
- b. Keep non-emergency police central office functions (evidence storage, detectives, administration, training, etc.) at Six Forks Rd or relocate to renovated 110 S. McDowell building
- c. Keep non-emergency fire central office functions (fire prevention, fire training, administration, etc.) at Martin Street or relocate to renovated 110 S. McDowell building
- d. Build new Emergency Operations Center (no un-screened public areas or non-emergency functions) on alternate site.

Other variations might include replacing the 110 S. McDowell building with private development fronting Nash Square and either consolidating police and fire central office functions into a future new office building or relocating some to existing decentralized stations around the city.

As design and construction professionals, we take very seriously our responsibility to help meet the challenges presented to this project and to the citizens of Raleigh by this deep and prolonged recession. At a time when some are calling for burdensome tax increases and others are calling for painful service cuts, we believe there is a middle path that is responsive to our long-term emergency services needs - without raising taxes or overshadowing other important current and future needs of our citizens.

Russ Stephenson
At-Large Councilor

Thomas Crowder
District D Councilor

Bonner Gaylord
District E Councilor