




Office of the City Manager

CONSENT CALENDAR

December 17, 2013

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From:  Christine Daniel, City Manager

Submitted by: Andrew Clough, Director, Public Works

Subject: Contract No. 9364 Amendment: Kitchell CEM, Inc. for Inspection and Assessment of City-Owned Buildings

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an amendment with Kitchell CEM, Inc., increasing the amount by \$50,000 for a total not to exceed \$150,000 for the existing contract term ending June 30, 2014.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

Funding will be identified and requested for appropriation as sites arise. Staff expects FY 2014 on-call inspection and assessment tasks will use the Marina Operation and Maintenance Fund (Fund 825) for facilities that will be renewing leases: the AKOL Building at 125 University Avenue; Skates on the Bay building; and Hs Lordships Restaurant building.

The Contract Management System number for this amendment is CMS No. L6BY2.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

**Contract Amendment**

The on-call inspection and assessment task is being added to the consultant's contract to include inspection and assessment of leased facilities that will be renewing their lease within the next year. By performing the inspection and assessment at this time any deficiencies or repairs identified can be added to the new lease agreement to be completed during the term of the lease by the lessee.

**Update on Project**

Phase I of this inspection and assessment project focuses on 16 facilities that would have a critical use as shelters or for City operations after a disaster incident; and 8 of them will also have a seismic evaluation. Other City facilities will be evaluated in future phases. The consultant has completed the inspections of the following initial facilities, and will submit the draft report for staff review by early December. A report will be submitted to Council by March 2014 with the results of the inspections and assessments.

**Public Works Facilities**

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. 1947 Center Street                              | Seismic evaluation |
| 2. North Berkeley Senior Center                    | Seismic evaluation |
| 3. South Berkeley Senior Center                    | Seismic evaluation |
| 4. West Berkeley Senior Center                     | Seismic evaluation |
| 5. Health Clinic – 830 University Avenue           | Seismic evaluation |
| 6. Transfer Station Tipping Floor Building         |                    |
| 7. Transfer Station Equipment Maintenance Facility |                    |
| 8. Corporation Yard Equipment Maintenance Facility |                    |

**Parks Recreation & Waterfront Facilities**

- |                               |                    |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Berkeley Yacht Club        | Seismic evaluation |
| 2. Art & Garden Center        |                    |
| 3. Cragmont Park Restroom     |                    |
| 4. Live Oak Recreation Center | Seismic evaluation |
| 5. Marina Corp Yard           |                    |
| 6. Grove Recreation Center    | Seismic evaluation |
| 7. Frances Albrier Center     |                    |
| 8. Cedar Rose Park Building   |                    |

**Purpose, Building Elements Studied, and Methodology**

The purpose of this inspection and assessment project is to conduct a comprehensive review of the maintenance and repair (M&R) needs of the City-owned capital facilities. The primary objectives are to: 1) Establish a list of M& R priorities and incorporate said list into five pre-determined M&R periods; 2) Analyze budget implications based in part on a facility life-cycle cost analysis prepared for each facility; and 3) Develop a protocol for on-going monitoring of facility conditions, work performed and record information for City facilities.

Elements that were studied include:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Life Safety  | 7. Mechanical (HVAC)  |
| 2. Accessibility  | 8. Plumbing (supply and waste systems)  |
| 3. Exteriors, including fenestrations                     | 9. Fire/Life safety protection systems  |
| 4. Roofing  | 10. Electrical (supply and distribution, Lighting and low-voltage)            |
| 5. Interiors (walls, doors, flooring, finishes, painting) | 11. Specialties (kitchen, laundry, and other specific-use capital equipment). |
| 6. Structural (only selected buildings)                   |   |

The methodology used in this project includes: reviewing the original construction drawings and any renovation drawings; conducting visual non-destructive inspection of the building; conducting interviews with the tenants and maintenance staff; and performing analysis based on available documentation and visual inspections.

The information obtained was used to develop costs broken into categories of Priority 1 through Priority 5, with Priority 1 being the category that needs immediate attention.

Priority 1 (Immediate): Conditions require improvement within 1 year in order to prevent imminent failure, correct a cited safety hazard, and return a facility to operation.

Priority 2 (Critical): Conditions require replacement and will become Priority 1 within 1 – 2 years to prevent intermittent operations, rapid deterioration, and potential life safety hazards.

Priority 3 (Impending): Conditions require expected maintenance in order to avoid predictable deterioration, potential downtime, associated damage or higher costs if deferred further. Items in this category should be addressed in 2 – 3 years.

Priority 4 (Necessary): Conditions are in need of improvement but are not function of the facility, overall usability improvement, and long term maintenance cost reduction. Items in this category should be addressed in 3 – 5 years.

Priority 5 (Discretionary): Conditions include cyclical maintenance, physical and cosmetic improvements. Items identified under this category do not have a cost to repair or refurbish.

The City will use the Facility Condition Index (FCI) to determine each facility's overall condition and rank them with other City facilities. FCI is an industry standard asset management tool which measures the "constructed asset's condition at a specific point in time." It is a functional indicator resulting from an analysis of operation indicators (such as building repair needs) to obtain an overview of building's condition as a numerical value. FCI is obtained by aggregating the total cost of any needed or outstanding repairs, renewal or upgrade requirements at a building compared to the current replacement value of the building components. It is the ratio of the "repair needs" to "replacement value" expressed in percentage terms. Land value is not considered when evaluating FCI. The lower the value of FCI the better conditions of the facility. A Best Management Practice is to target repairs or deficiencies in order to achieve a facility's FCI rating between the mid-fair (Fair FCI rating – 6%-10%) to mid-good range (Good FCI rating – 0%-5%).

## BACKGROUND

The contract with Kitchell CEM, Inc. was approved by Council on April 30, 2013\* and executed effective June 1, 2013 for a term ending June 30, 2014. The initial phase has focused on 16 facilities identified as essential for use in case of emergency or disaster situations. As mentioned in the April report, the City needed to update the facilities condition assessments done between 1997 and 2000, as staff was working off the list of deficiencies listed in those existing reports. There was a critical need to re-evaluate the

---

\* April 30, 2013 Council report: [www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City\\_Council/2013/04Apr/Documents/2013-04-30\\_Item\\_16\\_Contract\\_Kitchell\\_for\\_Inspection.aspx](http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2013/04Apr/Documents/2013-04-30_Item_16_Contract_Kitchell_for_Inspection.aspx)

facilities and establish a new priority list for maintenance and repairs. The new condition assessment is conducted in an electronic format that uses checklist type forms for rapid evaluations and specifies deficiencies observed, and probable repair costs. A life-cycle cost analysis is included for each facility as the basis for an operating plan, preventive and deferred maintenance planning, and schedules for short-term maintenance and repair priorities and long-term needs.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The team assembled by Kitchell is highly qualified with particular expertise in inspection and condition assessments. They have developed customized facility assessment spreadsheets and field data entry sheets that result in processes and procedures that are efficient, cost-effective and accurate that will maximize the benefits of the project.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None

#### CONTACT PERSON

Phil Harrington, Deputy Director, Public Works, 981-6661

Lorin Jensen, Supervising Civil Engineer, Public Works, 981-6411

#### Attachments:

1: Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

CONTRACT NO. 9364 AMENDMENT: KITCHELL CEM, INC. FOR INSPECTION AND  
ASSESSMENT OF CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS

WHEREAS, Kitchell CEM, Inc. was selected through the City's competitive bid process, and in June 2013, the City Manager executed the contract to provide inspection and assessment of City-owned facilities in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for a 1-year term; and

WHEREAS, technical assistance is needed to provide on-call inspection and assessment services for properties the City leases to tenants, in order to include identified deficiencies and repairs into lease agreements to be completed during the term of the new lease; and

WHEREAS, funding will be identified and requested for appropriation as facility sites arise and the amendment has been entered into the contract database and assigned CMS No. L6BY2.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the City Manager is authorized to execute an amendment to Contract No. 9364 with Kitchell CEM, Inc. for on-call inspection and assessment of City-owned buildings, increasing the contract amount by \$50,000 for a revised not-to-exceed authorization and contract amount of \$150,000 for the existing term ending June 30, 2014.

