



Staff Report

File #: 24-0544

REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

DATE: 07/03/2024

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: City Manager's Office

SUBJECT:

RELOCATION OPTIONS FOR THE CORONA DEPOT BUILDING LOCATED AT 150 DEPOT DRIVE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This staff report asks the City Council to provide direction on one of the four options to relocate the Corona Depot Building at 150 Depot Drive.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

That the City Council:

- a. Provide direction on one of four options to relocate the Corona Depot Building located at 150 Depot Drive.
- b. Depending on the option chosen, authorize the creation of new Capital Improvement Project titled, "Corona Depot Building Relocation," authorize an estimated revenue increase up to an amount of \$50,000, and an appropriation up to an amount of \$500,000 within the General Fund 110.

BACKGROUND & HISTORY:

During the City Council meeting on May 1st, 2024, the City Council and residents expressed support for preserving the Corona Depot building. During that same meeting, the City Council directed the City Manager to have staff research options for relocating the Corona Depot building. At that same meeting, a representative of the owner of the building, Ganahl Lumber, committed to donate \$50,000 towards the relocation costs if it was accomplished in a reasonable amount of time.

City staff contacted six (6) building movers to provide options and anticipated costs for moving the building or portions thereof. These efforts resulted in four options for the Council to consider.

ANALYSIS:

Staff contacted six (6) building movers to provide options and cost estimates for moving the building. When provided details about the building (i.e. age of structure, masonry on slab, height, width,

length, etc.) only two indicated an ability to do the work. One of the movers was able to inspect the building and provide options and tentative costs. The other was pending approval for the required California licenses.

Four potential options were identified:

1. Take no action.
2. Relocate the "Waiting Room" area.
3. Relocate the "General Office" and "Baggage" areas.
4. Relocate all moveable portions of the building (waiting room, general office, and baggage areas).

Option 1: Has no cost

Option 2: The "Waiting Room" area of the building has four structural walls and a number of archways that could be used for lifting the building off its foundation. The dimensions of this segment would allow it to be moved on an average street. The cost of moving this structure would be approximately \$100,000

Option 3: The "General Office" and "Baggage" areas of the building have three structural walls and would require significant bracing before being able to be moved. The dimensions of this segment are wider than the "Waiting Room" area and would require some additional consideration in route planning and public infrastructure avoidance (i.e. temporary moving of power lines and light poles during transit).

Option 4: The "Waiting Room," "General Office," and "Baggage" areas could be moved in two separate sections, as described above. These would be rejoined when placed on a new foundation.

In addition to the cost of moving the structure(s), other relocation costs will apply to all options. These include a contractor for the separation of the building structures, demolition and transportation permits, engineering and constructing a foundation at the new location, and securing the building to the new foundation.

When considering the additional costs, the total estimate for each option are:

Scope of Project Options	Moving Cost	Relocation Costs	Total Cost of Option
1. Take no action.			\$0
2. Relocate the "Waiting Room"	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$250,000 (approximate)
3. Relocate the General Office and Baggage areas	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$400,000 (approximate)
4. Relocate all 'moveable' portions of the building (waiting room, general office, and baggage areas)	\$350,000	\$150,000	\$500,000 (approximate)

It is important to note that the building movers indicated that they would not move the "Freight Room" area (west end of the building) or the "Enclosed Patio" area (east end of the building). The

"Freight Room" is stick-framed on an elevated foundation, which would require additional structural bracing. Both responsive building movers indicated that they would not move that portion of the building. The "Enclosed Patio" was originally an open-air patio that is attached to the eastern edge of the "Waiting Room" area. Leaving the "Enclosed Patio" attached to the "Waiting Room" structure would make the building too wide to traverse an average street. Because the "Enclosed Patio" was historically a set of columns with a tile roof, it would be difficult and cost-prohibitive to move. The "Shade Roof Structure" is a metal patio that was added around 2008. Therefore, options two through four only consider portions of the building that were deemed practical to move by the movers.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no cost associated with Option 1 since no action would be taken. Options 2 through 4 have a financial impact associated with relocating and reconstructing the building structure(s), transporting the structure(s), contractor costs, construction of the foundation for relocated structure (s), and obtaining the necessary transportation and demolition permits. Option 2 has an estimated cost of \$250,000, Option 3 has an estimated cost of \$400,000, and Option 4 has an estimated cost of \$500,000.

All options would be funded through the City's general fund. An offset of \$50,000 from the owner of the building, Ganahl Lumber, is anticipated if the relocation occurs within a reasonable amount of time.

Depending on the option chosen, approval of the recommended actions will potentially result in the creation of new Capital Improvement Project titled, "Corona Depot Building Relocation," an estimated revenue increase up to an amount of \$50,000, and an appropriation up to an amount of \$500,000 within the General Fund 110.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

This action is exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which states that a project is exempt from CEQA if the activity is covered by the commonsense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. This presentation is solely seeking direction from council, therefore, no environmental analysis is required.

PREPARED BY: AMINAH MEARS, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER

Attachments:

1. Exhibit 1 - Location Map of 150 Depot Drive
2. Exhibit 2 - Resolution No. 2024-071- City's Desire to Preserve the Corona Depot Building Located at 150 Depot Drive