



# County of Monterey

Item No.

## Board Report

Board of Supervisors  
Chambers  
168 W. Alisal St., 1st Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901

Legistar File Number: 25-723

October 17, 2025

Introduced: 10/8/2025

Current Status: Agenda Ready

Version: 1

Matter Type: General Agenda Item

- a. Receive a presentation on departmental space need projections for the next 20 years, and development options in the draft 2025 Facilities Master Plan for County facilities;
- b. Provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on final space development options to incorporate into the Final 2025 Facilities Master Plan.

### RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Capital Improvement Committee:

- a. Receive a presentation on departmental space need projections for the next 20 years, and developments options in the draft 2025 Facilities Master Plan for County facilities; and
- b. Provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on final space development options to incorporate into the Final 2025 Facilities Master Plan.

### SUMMARY

Public Works, Facilities and Parks (PWFP) is leading development of a Facilities Master Plan (FMP) prepared by M. Arthur Gensler Jr. & Associates (Gensler), a subject matter expert with extensive experience developing FMPs for California counties. Data collection and department input is complete, and Gensler has prepared master plan options for the Capital Improvement Committee (CIC) and Board of Supervisors' consideration. Following direction from the Board, Gensler will prepare the final FMP for adoption. The adopted FMP will provide the County with guidance on future capital infrastructure investments and development priorities.

### DISCUSSION

#### **Background**

The County last completed a FMP in 2001. County population growth and a trend of increased government staffing and services require a review of current space allocations and locations to align County facilities with resident needs. More than 75% of the County's facilities are over 30 years old and require significant investment to address end of life systems replacement and deferred maintenance. It is critical that the County identify facility priorities for investment and development over the next 20+ years. As noted in the draft FMP, *"the focus of the FMP is to make recommendations that prioritize department needs and make the most effective and economic use of County owned and leased facilities and land of the next two decades."*

The FMP is identified in the County's Strategic Plan as a key part of future planning decisions. It is intended to be one of several guides and reference tools, along with the Capital Improvement Program 5-Year Plan, and Board Strategic Goals, for staff to reference when developing capital project

recommendations, and for the Board to reference when making significant capital project financing and approval decisions.

### **Project Scope and Procurement**

In July 2024, PWFP received funding to prepare a new FMP. PWFP contracted with Gensler for FMP development and services by leveraging federal Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Contract 47PF0023D0003 to piggyback award and negotiate County standard terms and conditions. Gensler prepared the County's last FMP in 2001, and has extensive experience preparing FMPs for California Counties, including Napa, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and more.

The FMP covers major campuses throughout the County, including in Salinas, the Peninsula, North and South County, and focuses on utilization of general office space and public interfaces within these areas. In total, 65 sites are included in the FMP, covering over 1,600,000 square feet of building space.

The Natividad Medical Center campus and County Parks are the subjects of separate, specialized master planning efforts. The FMP team collaborated with these other efforts when locations or interests overlapped. Other specialized facilities such as libraries and jails will require separate analysis. The FMP also provides recommendations related to Board referrals 2023.03 (Affordable Housing at Laurel Yard), 2023.13 (Laurel Yard Master Plan,), 2024.12 (1220 Natividad Road Alternative Uses) and 2024.18 (970 Circle Dr. Alternative Uses), which are included as Appendix G in **Attachment A**.

### **Data Collection and FMP Development**

The FMP development process was led by Gensler as the subject matter expert, with oversight and involvement throughout the process from department heads, County employees, the County FMP Steering Committee, CAO's Office, and PWFP staff.

Gensler conducted extensive department surveys to identify how existing space was impacting County staff experience. Department heads were interviewed and surveyed to gather projected space and services needs over the next 20 years. Gensler conducted in-person site tours of many County facilities across the County. Steering Committee meetings were held with representatives from the County Administrative Office (CAO), Information Technology, Human Resources, PWFP and Housing and Community Development. Gensler also conducted interviews with individual members of the Board of Supervisors.

### **Analysis and Preliminary Findings**

The Gensler team analyzed this information and other data provided by the County and developed a number of options to address projected County space needs. The next step in the FMP process is to provide the findings and draft development options to the CIC, followed by a workshop with the Board of Supervisors for consideration and final direction. Based on the direction provided by the Board, Gensler will prepare the final FMP for adoption.

Based on the data collected, Gensler identified 8 Key Findings which inform solutions development:

1. Growth is expected, particularly in Health, Social Services, Public Safety and Justice functions.
2. Current space utilization aligns with typical government benchmarks but could be more

efficient.

3. Many departments are leveraging telework but are not yet fully aligned on seat sharing.
4. Most operational and service adjacencies are met, but opportunities exist for improved workflow and privacy.
5. County facilities are aging, and some require substantial repairs, replacements, or seismic retrofitting.
6. Employee experience can be improved with more privacy, wellness support, parking, and a consistent workspace.
7. Service gaps remain in South and North County; several departments are interested in expanding their presence.
8. To support housing development, potential properties were identified for highest and best use analysis.

To address these Key Findings, Gensler identified the following County regions and developed associated options/priorities for consideration. Each option is presented in detail in **Attachment A**.

#### **South County**

- Option 1: Invest in existing County-owned parcels, focus on expanding service delivery of key services, consider moderate new construction where needed, no disposal of owned properties, no acquisition of new properties.
- Option 2: Consolidate properties where possible to create a County campus in King City, focus on expanding service delivery of key services, consider moderate new construction where needed, some disposal of owned properties for affordable housing, acquisition of new property to create King City campus.

#### **North County**

- Renovate the Pajaro Mansion (in progress)
- Identify new leasing opportunities for larger community space and/or justice services.

#### **Salinas and Peninsula Regions**

- Option 1: Invest in existing department locations and facilities, minimal new construction, limited disposal of underutilized properties, focus on densifying office space by investing in workplace standards and telecommuting policies.
- Option 2: Consolidate County services to align adjacencies largely by service groups, moderate new construction, targeted disposal of underutilized properties, improved workplace efficiency through a combination of renovation, new construction and investing in workplace standards.

While departments and the Steering Committee have provided input which informs the draft FMP, staff looks to the Board of Supervisors to make final determinations on priorities and direction. PWFPP will work with Gensler to incorporate the Board's direction to staff into the final FMP, which will be brought back to the Board for final adoption.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

PWFP engaged County departments throughout development process to collect information on staffing and services needs. A Stakeholder Committee consisting of representative from the CAO, Information Technology (ITD), Human Resources (HRD), PWFP and Housing and Community Development (HCD) provided feedback on Key Findings and options development. County Supervisors were interviewed by Gensler to review their office space needs and any District considerations they had. FMP options are being presented to the CIC for recommendations to the Board.

FINANCING:

The FMP project was funded in the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Capital Improvement Plan. This project is budgeted in the Capital Projects, Fund 404 and expenditures are reimbursed from Fund 478, Building Improvement and Replacement as they are incurred.

The Gensler team has performed a preliminary financial analysis for development options outlined in the FMP. The preliminary analysis focuses on estimating the additional capital and debt service costs to implement each option. These estimates are based on projected renovation or new construction costs provided by KPJ Consulting, the FMP consulting team's cost estimator. Both Option 1 and Option 2 focus on renovation, remodeling, or new construction scenarios. However, the analysis notes that acquiring an existing office building could result in significant cost savings, provided that suitable acquisition opportunities align with the county's space needs and other FMP goals.

The total estimated occupancy cost over 20 years for existing facilities studied in the FMP is \$865 million, including \$524 million in operating costs, \$225 million in capital expenditures (estimated \$11.25 million per year in Building Improvement Fund set asides), and \$116 million in existing debt service and interest reimbursements.

Option 1 focuses on refurbishing existing facilities and minimal new construction, and is estimated to increase the County's occupancy costs by approximately \$375 million above existing status-quo obligations. The additional cost is primarily driven by new capital investments and debt service payments.

Option 2 adds more new construction to the plan, increasing County cost an estimated \$454 million above existing obligations.

Both Option 1 and Option 2 have been developed to accommodate a future county workforce that is approximately 14% larger than today. This accounts for some of the additional cost over 20 years. Throughout the FMP development process, Gensler has acknowledged that the County may choose to combine elements from both Option 1 and Option 2 proposals, and a final cost analysis will reflect the direction provided by the Board. The Gensler team will incorporate alternative approaches, beyond those outlined in Option 1 and Option 2, based on guidance and priorities established by the Board, ensuring that the final master plan aligns with County needs.

Additional financial analysis by the CAO will need to be prepared once the Board provides direction on specific actions to prioritize. The CAO would need to consider implication of the options within the context of the County's other existing and future debt obligations.

Prepared by: John Snively, Administrative Operations Manager, 831-759-6617

Reviewed by: Florence Kabwasa-Green, Chief of Facilities

Lindsay Lerable, Assistant Director of Public Works, Facilities and Parks

Approved by: Randell Ishii, MS, PE, TE, PTOE

Director of Public Works, Facilities and Parks

Attachments:

Attachment A - Draft Facilities Master Plan Key Findings and Options