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CHARRETTE SCHEDULE

October 20, 2021
11 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

Workshop #0: Building and Site Orientation
- Welcoming of Stakeholders
- Introduction to the project Virtual Tour
- Schedule Review
- Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property

October 26, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

Workshop #1: Preliminary Research
- Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
- Outlining the possibilities of future programming of the project
- Further input from the stakeholders
- Interactive brainstorming exercises to begin to visualize the possibilities of potential schemes

November 4, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

Workshop #2: Preliminary Concepts Presentation and Feedback
- Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
- Further input from stakeholders on the designs
- Collecting this input for the next design stage

November 16, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

Workshop #3: Concept Refinement and Feedback
- Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop
- The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage
- Collecting & documenting the input

December 2, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

Workshop #4: Final Concepts and Feedback
- Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail
- Collecting & documenting the input
- Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders

PROJECT INTRODUCTION
# Project Introduction

## Charrette Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Kick-Off Meeting w/ GSA</td>
<td>7-Sep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Project Assessment and Organization Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Start-up Meeting</td>
<td>14-Sep</td>
<td>20-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Charrette Roadmap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stakeholder Research and Involvement Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stakeholder Identification and Analysis</td>
<td>24-Sep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholder Outreach and Engagement Plan</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Objectives and Measures</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assist GSA’s Office of Strategic Comm. with Communications Plan</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>12-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Base Data Research and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Base Data Research and Analysis</td>
<td>23-Sep</td>
<td>28-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Virtual tour materials</td>
<td>12-Oct</td>
<td>20-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre-charrette Project Brief</td>
<td>12-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Charrette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Charrette Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization, Education, Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initial Ideas Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preferred Concept Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public Presentations</td>
<td>26-Oct</td>
<td>4-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Post-Charrette Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Draft Report</td>
<td>4-Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Final Report</td>
<td>21-Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Charrette Timeline**

- **Pre-Charrette**
- **Charrette**
- **Post-Charrette**

---

**Note:**
- All dates are approximate and subject to change.
- Specific tasks and meetings will be scheduled and confirmed.

---

**Location:**

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING, LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA

**Architects:**

GRIFFIN ENRIGHT ARCHITECTS / ARG / ARUP

---

**Public Workshop Dates:**

- **Workshop #1:** 26-Oct
- **Workshop #2:** 4-Nov
- **Workshop #3:** 16-Nov
- **Workshop #4:** 2-Dec
CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
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GRIFFIN ENRIGHT ARCHITECTS / ARG / ARUP

A. Kick-off Meeting w/ GSA 7 – Sep

B. Project Assessment and Organization Tasks

1 Project Start-up Meeting 14 – Sep 20 – Sep

2 Charrette Roadmap Start-up mtg

3 Schedule

C. Stakeholder Research and Involvement Tasks

1 Stakeholder Identification and Analysis 24 – Sep

2 Stakeholder Outreach and Engagement Plan 1 – Oct

3 Project Objectives and Measures 1 – Oct

4 Assist GSA’s Office of Strategic Comm. with Communications Plan 1 – Oct

5 Public Kick-off Meeting 12 – Oct

D. Base Data Research and Analysis

1 Base Data Research and Analysis Site Visit Filming 1st cut 2nd cut Final video

2 Virtual tour materials 23 – Sep 28 – Sep 12 – Oct 20 – Oct

3 Pre-charrette Project Brief 12 – Oct

E. Charrette

1 Charrette Logistics

2 Organization, Education, Vision

3 Initial Ideas Development

4 Preferred Concept Synthesis

5 Plan Development

6 Public Presentations 26 – Oct 4 – Nov 16 – Nov 2 – Dec

Public Workshop #1 Public Workshop #2 Public Workshop #3 Public Workshop #4

Draft Report

Final

PRE-CHARRETTE CHARRETTE POST CHARRETTE

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

CHARRETTE SCHEDULE, CONTINUED
INTRODUCTION
Designed by Architect William Pereira, the Chet Holifield Federal Building has seven stories and is one million square feet. Constructed between 1968-1971, Laguna Niguel was undeveloped when the zigzag structure first appeared. Identified as a brutalist/late-modernist style building, it is locally known as the “Ziggurat”. The Chet Holifield Federal Building was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in 2015 for its association with architect William Pereira and the rarity of the ziggurat architecture.

The Community Design Charrette of the Chet Holifield Federal Building was a series of public workshops. This Charrette grew from GSA’s commitment to leveraging GSA federal real estate actions to support community goals. GSA has determined to sell the property, given the investment required for continued use. As GSA is disposing of the building, consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act was opened to explore alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects to historic properties. Ongoing discussions with the participating consulting parties led GSA to conclude there was a need to understand the possibilities for this property after federal ownership.

In performing this study, GSA aimed to collaborate with stakeholders and consider community goals to identify potential development concepts for the property, including adaptive reuse and demolition/construction. Further, GSA aimed to solicit feedback regarding the financial viability of these concepts. The workshops were attended by community members, developers, historic preservationists, and others. Each phase was a collaborative effort to help identify a potential future for the site. The schemes ranged from the adaptive reuse of the building to its full demolition, with some hybrid schemes in between. This was an informal, collaborative process with members of the public. GSA has no role in rezoning the site or developing the property after the sale. However, the insight from these sessions can help to inform the future of the property.

DESIGNING THE SCHEMES
Tasked with developing multiple master planning schemes, the design team delivered five different schemes for the Chet Holifield Federal Building site. Many members of the community felt passionately that the Chet Holifield Federal Building should be torn down. Alternatively, many members of the community felt passionately that the building should be saved and repurposed. Conscious of these different opinions, the design team presented and developed schemes including full demolition, adaptive reuse and hybrid solutions. These schemes were presented to the public across multiple workshops. The schemes were developed relative to the feedback of community members who attended the workshops. Attendees were polled about the needs and wants of the local community. Feedback from these polls was used to refine and finalize the five different schemes. Through the process of gathering and discussing live feedback, community members with opposing views were able to convene on certain matters such as green space on the site and potential program types.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Each of the five workshops were open to the public, advertised through the Orange County Register, GSA social media channels, and the GSA public website. Registration for the workshops was managed through Eventbrite. The workshops were run on the online meeting platform, Zoom. Participants were asked to mute their microphones but invited to write their questions and comments in the chat. Various stakeholders, identified by the GSA Office of Real Property Utilization & Disposal and the GSA Office of Historic Preservation, including the City of Laguna Niguel, were invited to register for the workshops. GSA’s goal was to provide an avenue for the public to participate and provide feedback, not to conduct a deep community engagement process. A more comprehensive and inclusive engagement process (including more diverse avenues for participating in terms of time of day, digital access and language barriers) may be desired by the city or future developers.

SOLICITING FEEDBACK
Attendees of the public workshop could submit live feedback using the online interactive polling software, Mentimeter. As an anonymous data collector, Mentimeter assigns a number to each individual, maintaining the privacy of their identities. The Mentimeter polls included a variety of different questions, including yes/no, multiple choice, ranking, and free response questions. Where appropriate, certain questions enabled participants to enter more than one response. Each workshop began with an initial set of questions inquiring about the demographics of the active participants and their interest in the project. Workshop participants self-identified as local community members, local business owners, developers, historic preservationists, and non-GSA affiliated government employees. As an alternative to Mentimeter, participants were invited to submit feedback through the chat, or through email to r9events@gsa.gov. Workshop moderators routinely addressed the questions and comments from the chat during the live presentations. Feedback received from these sessions do not constitute a scientific sample, and provide only a snapshot of how participants on the call responded.

FUTURE OF THE PROPERTY
The prospective and new owners of the building are responsible for doing their own due diligence, for developing their own designs, and for formulating their own opinions about the financial viability, market conditions, and suitability of this property as an investment. This report contains statements about costs and financial viability, however these statements do not guarantee future costs, profitability, nor any lack thereof.
PROJECT INTRODUCTION

VIDEO TOUR

In an effort to help all participants understand the existing site better, a video tour of the property and the building (exterior and interior) was filmed and edited by the video production company, Them Too. Seven minutes long, the short film was streamed at the first public workshop, and was made available to members of the public via this link: [https://youtu.be/FJVR5nu-49w](https://youtu.be/FJVR5nu-49w)

FILM NARRATIVE

Built between 1968 and 1971, the Chet Holifield Federal Building was initially designed to house the aerospace firm North American Rockwell Corporation for its corporate offices and as a manufacturing facility. This then-quiet and undeveloped Orange County parcel was chosen by Rockwell because it wanted an area of land that would be private and secure.

The building is situated on two parcels totaling approximately 89 acres of land bordered by Avila Road, Alicia Parkway, and El Lazo Road. The property’s size and access offer a unique development opportunity within the highly desired South Orange County community of Laguna Niguel, one of California’s first master-planned communities. The predominant land use surrounding the property include a mix of retail stores, small offices, and residential homes. Major employers within one mile of the Property include Costco, Walmart, Home Depot, and Kohl’s.

The Chet Holifield Federal Building is over 1 million gross square feet.
Located on the opposite side of Avila Road lies a detached chiller plant, water cooling tower and above ground thermal energy storage tank capable of holding 1 million gallons.

Designed by master architect William L. Pereira, the structure is an excellent example of a Brutalist Style of architecture, which is distinguished by weighty, massive forms; rough, exposed concrete surfaces; broad, expansive wall planes, and recessed windows.

Locally known as the “Ziggurat”, the building’s form takes on a similar appearance to ziggurats found in ancient Mesopotamia. This 7 story building is constructed of angled, painted, precast pebble-textured concrete panels. It also has a lateral force-resisting system consisting of concrete shear walls and single-level concrete moment frames.

Due to its relationship to Pereira and the rarity of its architectural style and type, the property has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), as the “landlord to the federal government”, has managed the building since the 1970s. Now GSA is working to sell the property in accordance with applicable law.

The Chet Holifield Federal Building has served its purpose for Federal mission needs and it is no longer financially viable as a Federal building. GSA is preparing to sell the building and associated property, offering a unique redevelopment opportunity of the largest remaining land parcel available in the local community.
The economy of Laguna Niguel employs 34.2k people. The largest industries in Laguna Niguel are Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services (4,426 people), Health Care & Social Assistance (4,093 people), and Retail Trade (3,583 people), and the highest paying industries are Management of Companies & Enterprises ($250,001), Manufacturing ($108,102), and Utilities ($107,083).

Data from the Census Bureau ACS PUMS 5-Year Estimate.
Photo courtesy of: cwdriver.com
Households in Laguna Niguel have a median annual income of $108,537, which is more than the median annual income of $65,712 across the entire United States. The following chart shows how the median household income in Laguna Niguel compares to that of its neighboring and parent geographies.

**MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

$108,537  
2019 VALUE

± $4,982  
1 YEAR GROWTH

± 5.76%

In 2019, full-time male employees in California made 1.26 times more than female employees. This chart shows the gender-based wage disparity in the 5 most common occupations in California by number of full-time employees.

**WAGE BY GENDER IN COMMON JOBS**

$78,556  
AVG. MALE SALARY  
IN CA

± $756

$62,156  
AVG. FEMALE SALARY IN CA

± $629

Data from the Census Bureau ACS PUMS 5-Year Estimate.
The most common employment sectors for those who live in Laguna Niguel are Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services (4,426 people), Health Care & Social Assistance (4,093 people), and Retail Trade (3,583 people). This chart shows the share breakdown of the primary industries for residents of Laguna Niguel.

From 2018 to 2019, employment in Laguna Niguel grew at a rate of 0.217%, from 34.1k employees to 34.2k employees.

The most common job groups, by number of people living in Laguna Niguel, are Management Occupations (5,589 people), Sales & Related Occupations (5,158 people), and Office & Administrative Support Occupations (4,040 people). This chart illustrates the share breakdown of the primary jobs held by residents of Laguna Niguel.

Data from the Census Bureau ACS 5-year Estimate.
COMMUTE TIME

**24.9 minutes**

Using averages, employees in Laguna Niguel have a shorter commute time (24.9 minutes) than the normal US worker (25.5 minutes). Additionally, 3.16% of the workforce in Laguna Niguel have "super commutes" in excess of 90 minutes.

COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION

In 2019, 77.2% of workers in Laguna Niguel drove alone to work, followed by those who worked at home (12.1%) and those who carpooled to work (7.27%).

The following chart shows the number of households using each mode of transportation over time, using a logarithmic scale on the y-axis to help better show variations in the smaller means of commuting.

Data from the Census Bureau ACS 5-year Estimate.
In 2019, the median property value in Laguna Niguel grew to $827,100 from the previous year’s value of $795,300.

The following charts display, first, the property values in Laguna Niguel compared to its parent and neighbor geographies and, second, owner-occupied housing units distributed between a series of property value buckets compared to the national averages for each bucket. In Laguna Niguel the largest share of households have a property value in the $750k - $1000k range.
2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs –
Laguna Niguel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Maximum Income</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
<th>Affordable Price (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>$40,350</td>
<td>$1,009</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>$67,250</td>
<td>$1,681</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$107,550</td>
<td>$2,689</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$128,050</td>
<td>$3,201</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above moderate</td>
<td>Over $128,050</td>
<td>Over $3,201</td>
<td>Over $500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*50% of the Very Low Income need (174 units) is assumed to be ELI units

Source: SCAG 2021

Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs, 2021 – Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Maximum Income</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
<th>Affordable Price (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>$40,350</td>
<td>$1,009</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>$67,250</td>
<td>$1,681</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$107,550</td>
<td>$2,689</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$128,050</td>
<td>$3,201</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above moderate</td>
<td>Over $128,050</td>
<td>Over $3,201</td>
<td>Over $500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: Based on a family of 4 and 2021 State income limits; 30% of gross income for rent or principal, interest, taxes & insurance; 5% down payment, 4% interest, 1.25% taxes & insurance, $350 HOA dues
Notes:
*For-sale affordable housing is typically at the moderate income level
Source: Cal. HCD; JHD Planning LLC

2021-2029 HOUSING NEEDS

The total additional housing need for the City of Laguna Niguel during the 2021-2029 planning period is 1,207 units. This total is distributed by income category as shown in the table.

It should be noted that the extremely-low-income category is included within the very-low-income category in the adopted RHNA. As provided in Assembly Bill (AB) 2634 of 2006, jurisdictions may determine their extremely-low-income need as one-half the need in the very-low category.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY CRITERIA

The Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs, 2021 Table shows affordable rent levels and estimated affordable purchase prices for housing in Orange County (including Laguna Niguel) by income category. Based on state-adopted standards, the maximum affordable monthly rent (including utilities) for extremely-low-income households is $723, while the maximum affordable rent for very-low-income households is $1,204. The maximum affordable rent for low-income households is $1,926, while the maximum for moderate-income households is $2,559.

Data from the Laguna Niguel 2014 Housing Element Adopted
PROPERTY TAXES

$3K+
AVG. RANGEd

This chart shows the households in Laguna Niguel distributed between a series of property tax buckets compared to the national averages for each bucket. In Laguna Niguel the largest share of households pay taxes in the $3k+ range.

RENT VS OWN

69%  70%
2019  2018
HOMEOwnERSHIP  HOMEOwnERSHIP

In 2019, 69% of the housing units in Laguna Niguel were occupied by their owner. This percentage declined from the previous year’s rate of 70%.

This percentage of owner-occupation is higher than the national average of 64.1%. This chart shows the ownership percentage in Laguna Niguel compared it’s parent and neighboring geographies.

Data from the Census Bureau ACS 5-year Estimate.
CITY DATA - DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION
Total Population: 67,208
Growth Rate 2010-2022: 6.71%
Projected Growth Rate 2022-2027: 1.82%
Average Household Size: 2.59
Median Age: 45.66
Average Household Income: $178,711

HOUSING
Number of Dwelling Units: 27,01
Owner Occupied: 18,740 72.53%
Renter Occupied: 7,069 27.47%
Median Home Price: $1,076,278

BUSINESS
Total Employed: 35,784
Self-employed Workers: 6,903
Civilian - Unemployed: 1,333, 2.35%
Largest Employers (Public-Sector):
Costco Wholesale Corporation: 577 employees
Capistrano Unified School District: 317 employees
Albertson's LLC: 380 employees
Largest Employers (Private-Sector):
Homeland Security: 1,553 employees
Smart & Final Stores, Inc.: 305 employees

EDUCATION
Some College: 19.61%
Associate Degree: 8.55%
Bachelor's Degree: 33.20%
Master's Degree: 14.13%
Doctorate Degree: 33.20%

Data from Laguna Niguel 2022 Demographic Overview
Collected from sources including: US Census, ESRI, GCR Marketing Network, Claritas, HDL, and City, State & County data.
RACE & ETHNICITY

THE 3 LARGEST ETHNIC GROUPS IN LAGUNA NIGUEL

1. White (Non-Hispanic)  
   43.8k ± 1.03k
2. Asian (Non-Hispanic)  
   6.73k ± 602
3. White (Hispanic)  
   6.14k ± 1.19k

In 2019, there were 6.51 times more White (Non-Hispanic) residents (43.8k people) in Laguna Niguel than any other race or ethnicity. There were 6.73k Asian (Non-Hispanic) and 6.14k White (Hispanic) residents, the second and third most common ethnic groups. 16.4% of the people in Laguna Niguel are Hispanic (10.8k people).

The following chart shows the 7 races represented in Laguna Niguel as a share of the total population.

Data from the Census Bureau ACS 5-year Estimate.
The most recent available Census data reported that approximately 2,970 people between 16 and 64 years of age, or about 7.2% of the working age population, reported a work-related disability. Of those aged 65 and over, 941 (about 17.1%) reported some form of physical disability. Reported disabilities included persons whose disability hinders their ability to go outside the home (3.8% of the working age population and 16.9% of the senior population).

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Recent Census Bureau estimates reported that of Laguna Niguel’s 7,175 households, 11.8% earn less than 30% of the area median income (compared to 24.2% in the SCAG region) and 26.6% earn less than 50% of the area median income (compared to 30.9% in the SCAG region).

Many elderly persons are dependent on fixed incomes or have disabilities. Elderly homeowners may be physically unable to maintain their homes or cope with living alone. The housing needs of this group can be addressed through smaller units, accessory dwelling units on lots with existing homes, shared living arrangements, congregate housing, and housing assistance programs.

**HOMELESS PERSONS**

The most recent Orange County “Point-in-Time” survey of the homeless population for which data is available was conducted in January 2019. That survey estimated that there were approximately 6,860 homeless persons in Orange County, of which 2,899 were sheltered and 3,961 were unsheltered. Of those, 7 unsheltered persons and 3 sheltered persons were reported in Laguna Niguel.

Data from the Laguna Niguel 2014 Housing Element Adopted
The Chet Holifield Federal Building ca. 1971 looking north. (Source: The Journal of San Diego History Volume 38 No. 2)

The Chet Holifield Federal Building under construction. (Source: General Services Administration.)

The genealogical research room located on the first floor, ca. 1974. (Source: The Journal of San Diego History Volume 38 No. 2)
**QUICK FACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA POINT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR BUILT</td>
<td>1968-1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT</td>
<td>WILLIAM L. PEREIRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE AREA</td>
<td>89-ACRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING AREA</td>
<td>APPROX 1-MILLION GROSS SQUARE FEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING STORIES</td>
<td>7 STORIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>24000 Avila Rd, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE STYLE</td>
<td>BRUTALISM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: GSA

Aerial building overview to west, ca.1971. Source Image: GSA
A $23 million facility is expected to become the largest single electronics manufacturing center. Construction is to start in October 1968.

North American Rockwell Corp. offered to exchange empty building for surplus government land. The federal government interested in total occupation of the building, rather than assuming part of it or leasing space to outsiders.

Rockwell made multiple attempts to find an industrial buyer with no luck, the building was then turned to the federal government. GSA and Rockwell negotiated a trade in which the government would obtain the Laguna Niguel building and Rockwell would get the surplus Defense Department property.

Federal officials in San Francisco have rejected all bids recently received for the federal building. Federal officials aren’t sure what to do. They may rebid the building, put it up for auction, try selling it through competitive negotiations or just keep the property.
Original building roof plan showing the stepped ziggurat shape, July 29, 1968. Source: GSA
Image 40: The original main lobby on the fourth floor. This space features original wood wall paneling and a decorative wood ceiling finish.

Image 41: A detail of the original wood ceiling finish at the fourth floor lobby.

Original wood wall paneling and a decorative wood ceiling finish

4th Floor lobby

Source Image: Them Too Productions
INTERIORS

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
Aerial photo of the Chet Holifield Federal Building site shortly after the completion of construction in 1971. The land surrounding the site is undeveloped.

Aerial photo of the Chet Holifield Federal Building site currently.

Source Image: (Left) GSA (Right) Google Earth
SITE ACCESS

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
As defined in GSA’s 2019 Historic Structures Report for the Chet Holifield Federal Building, the building retains multiple character-defining features dating to its original construction. A character-defining feature, also referred to as a historic feature, is a physical aspect of a building’s design, construction, or detail that is representative of its historically significant function, type, or architectural style. Historic features may include the overall shape of a building, its materials, craftsmanship, and decorative details and features, as well as the various aspects of the building’s site and environment.
Historic exterior and interior features of the Chet Holifield Federal Building include (but are not limited to) large-scale elements like its monumental scale; stepped ziggurat form and massing; integral designed topography and landscape; flat roofs with broad, deep, mansard eaves; textured precast concrete panel cladding; horizontal bands of fixed aluminum windows; smooth concrete angled entry volumes; open roof decks; and the guard station and maintenance building ancillary structures. Smaller elements also express the building’s original character, and include (but are not limited to) historic features like the configuration and finishes of the fourth floor main entry lobby; fully glazed aluminum double doors at secondary entries; the wood slat ceilings at the south entry and at escalator/elevator lobbies; and corridor configurations.
WORKSHOP #0

October 20, 2021
11 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

Workshop #0: Building and Site Orientation

- Welcoming of Stakeholders
- Introduction to the project Virtual Tour
- Schedule Review
- Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property

Workshop #1: Preliminary Research

- Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
- Outlining the possibilities of future programming of the project
- Further input from the stakeholders
- Interactive brainstorming exercises to begin to visualize the possibilities of potential schemes

Workshop #2: Preliminary Concepts Presentation and Feedback

- Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
- Further input from stakeholders on the designs
- Collecting this input for the next design stage

Workshop #3: Concept Refinement and Feedback

- Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop
- The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage

Workshop #4: Final Concepts and Feedback

- Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail
- Collecting & documenting the input
- Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders

Workshop Calendar:

- October 20, 2021
- October 26, 2021
- November 4, 2021
- November 16, 2021
- December 2, 2021
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Have you ever been inside the Chet Holifield building?

If this site could incorporate open space, what elements would be most important to include?

- Shade Tree Areas
- Gardens
- Bike Paths
- Plaza Spaces
- Water Elements
- Playgrounds
- Playfields

If not included on the prior list of open space elements, what could the community benefit from in this location?

- Naturalized open space
- Pickleball courts, community garden, amphitheater
- Gathering areas
- Tennis courts/pathways that safely accommodate fees, bikes, skateboards and dog walkers
- Shaded picnic tables
- Walking paths
- Outdoor art
- Private open space
- Parking areas

What is your relationship to this building?
WHAT DO YOU THINK MAKES LAGUNA NIGUEL UNIQUE?

- OPEN SPACE: 16
- SAFE: 17
- QUIET: 16
- FAMILY ORIENTED: 12
- COMMUNITY: 12
- COASTAL: 11
- LOCATION: 11
- SUBURBAN: 9
- PARKS: 7
- SCENIC: 6
- CITY PLANNING: 5
- WEATHER: 5
- HOUSING: 3
- CLEAN: 3
- HILLSIDE: 2

WHAT DOES THE COMMUNITY NEED MORE OF?

- RESIDENTIAL: 17
- MIXED USE: 16
- PARKS/OPEN SPACE: 15
- RESTAURANTS/RETAIL: 6
- OFFICE: 3
- INSTITUTIONAL: 2

IF NOT INCLUDED ON PRIOR LIST, WHAT COULD THE COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM IN THIS LOCATION?

- TOWN CENTER: 19
- AFFORDABLE HOUSING: 17
- ARTS CENTER: 10
- PARKS: 9
- CAMPUS: 5
- SPORTS: 5
- MIXED USE SPACE: 5
- DESTINATION: 4
- SENIOR HOUSING: 4
- APARTMENTS: 3
- MUSEUM: 2
- RETAIL: 2
- EVENT SPACE: 2
- LIBRARY: 2

IF RESIDENTIAL USE COULD BE CONSIDERED ON THIS SITE, WHAT TYPES ARE MOST NEEDED IN THE COMMUNITY?

- SINGLE FAMILY: 11
- APARTMENTS: 11
- CONDOMINIUMS: 5
- RESIDENTIAL TOWER: 5
- DUPLEX/TRIPLEX: 4

IF THIS SITE COULD INCORPORATE OPEN SPACE, WHAT ELEMENTS WOULD BE MOST IMPORTANT TO INCLUDE?

- SHADED TREE AREAS: 22
- PLAZA SPACES: 7
- GARDENS: 5
- BIKE PATHS: 5
- PLAY FIELDS: 2
- PLAYGROUNDS: 2
- WATER ELEMENTS: 2

IF NOT INCLUDED ON THE PRIOR LIST, WHAT COULD THE COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM IN THIS LOCATION?

- WALKING PATH: 14
- AMPHITHEATER: 11
- PICNIC AREAS: 7
- FOUNTAIN: 6
- SCULPTURE/COMMUNITY ART GARDEN: 5
- SPORT COURTS: 4
- GARDENS: 3
- DOG PARK: 3
- OPEN SPACE: 3
- FARMER’S MARKET: 3
- MULTIPLE USE PATH: 2
- OBSERVATORY: 2
- PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CENTER: 2

HAVE YOU EVEN BEEN INSIDE THE CHET HOLIFIELD BUILDING?

- NO: 35
- YES: 21

CAN YOU SEE THE CHET HOLIFIELD BUILDING FROM YOUR BUILDING OR RESIDENCE?

- NO: 14
- YES: 12

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE BUILDING?

- NOTHING: 19
- UNIQUE LANDMARK: 14
- FORM/SHAPE: 8
- HISTORY: 8
- LARGE SIZE: 2

WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE BUILDING?

- UNDER-USE OF SPACE: 14
- PARKING LOT: 10
- ARCHITECTURE/DESIGN: 7
- EVERYTHING: 5
- LOVE IT: 5
- TOO BIG: 4
- COLOR: 2
- FUNCTIONALITY: 2

IF YOU COULD KEEP ONE THING ABOUT THE BUILDING WHAT WOULD YOU KEEP?

- NOTHING: 10
- SHAPE: 8
- EVERYTHING: 6
- AMENITIES: 3
- STEPPED TOP: 2
- WATER INFRASTRUCTURE: 2
- OPEN SPACE: 2

IF YOU COULD CHANGE ONE THING ABOUT THE BUILDING WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

- PARKING LOT: 9
- COLOR: 6
- EVERYTHING: 5
- FUNCTION: 4
- LAND USE: 4
- SHAPE: 2
- MORE LIGHT: 2
- ROOF: 2

SHOULD THE BUILDING BE ADAPTIVELY REUSED, WHAT WOULD THE BEST USE FOR THE BUILDING BE?

- MIXED USE: 12
- CULTURAL CENTER: 10
- DEMOLISH: 10
- EDUCATIONAL FACILITY: 5
- MUSEUM: 4
- OBSERVATORY: 3
- RESIDENTIAL: 2
- VENUE: 2
- SHIPPING CENTER: 2

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP #1

October 20, 2021
11 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

Workshop #0: Building and Site Orientation

Workshop #1: Preliminary Research

- Welcoming of Stakeholders
- Introduction to the project Virtual Tour
- Schedule Review
- Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property
- Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
- Outlining the possibilities of future programming of the project
- Further input from the stakeholders
- Interactive brainstorming exercises to begin to visualize the possibilities of potential schemes
- Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
- Further input from stakeholders on the designs
- Collecting this input for the next design stage
- Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop
- The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage
- Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail
- Collecting & documenting the input
- Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders

October 26, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

November 4, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

November 16, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

December 2, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

Workshop #2: Preliminary Concepts Presentation and Feedback

Workshop #3: Concept Refinement and Feedback

Workshop #4: Final Concepts and Feedback
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Our Options

The design team is tasked with developing multiple Master Planning options for the site. We know that there are members of the community who feel passionately that the building should be torn down. We also know there are also members of the community who feel passionately that the building can be saved and repurposed.

The design team will be pursuing design options that include:
1. Full demolition
2. Saved & repurposed (adaptive reuse)
3. Hybrid solutions

Place your pin on the park element you would most like to see in this location.
### Workshops #1 - Survey Findings

**Are you a resident of Laguna Niguel?**
- **No**: 16
- **Yes**: 27

**If you are not a resident of Laguna Niguel, how far away are you located?**
- **0-5 Miles**: 7
- **5-20 Miles**: 13
- **Out of State**: 4
- **50+ Miles but in California**: 2
- **20-50 Miles**: 2

**What is your age range?**
- **20-40 years old**: 8
- **40-60 years old**: 20
- **60+ years old**: 15
- **Under 20 years old**: 1

**What best describes your interest in the Chet Holifield Building?**
- **Community Member**: 18
- **Developer**: 10
- **Historic Preservationist**: 8
- **Governmental Employee**: 3
- **Business Owner**: 2
- **Other**: 2

**What use type is most needed in your community?**
- **Downtown Center**: 18
- **Affordable Housing**: 7
- **Campus**: 7
- **Cultural Center**: 6

**What residential type does this community need more of?**
- **Town Homes**: 13
- **Mid-Rise Apartments**: 11
- **Duplex/Triplex**: 5
- **Single Family Homes**: 3
- **High-Rise Apartments**: 3
- **Low-Rise Apartments**: 3

**What park element would you most like to see in this location?**
- **Walking Trails**: 20
- **Gardens**: 5
- **Amphitheater**: 4
- **Fountains**: 4
- **Tennis Courts**: 1
- **Picnic Areas**: 1

**Of these programs you mentioned in the last workshop, which is your first choice for the adaptive reuse of the building?**
- **Mixed Use**: 22
- **Museum/Cultural Center**: 7
- **Residential**: 5
- **Shipping Center/Warehouse**: 2
- **Educational Facility**: 2
- **Observatory**: 0

**Of these other large single uses of the property, which would you most prefer?**
- **School**: 14
- **Business Park**: 14
- **Large Mall**: 5
- **Big Box Retail**: 1
- **Automotive Dealership**: 0

**How much open space do you think the site should have?**
- **10-25% Open Space**: 17
- **25-50% Open Space**: 14
- **Less than 10% Open Space**: 6
- **More than 50% Open Space**: 5

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
• Welcoming of Stakeholders
• Introduction to the project Virtual Tour
• Schedule Review
• Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property

• Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
• Outlining the possibilities of future programming of the project
• Further input from the stakeholders
• Interactive brainstorming exercises to begin to visualize the possibilities of potential schemes

• Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
• Further input from stakeholders on the designs
• Collecting this input for the next design stage

• Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop
• The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage

• Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail
• Collecting & documenting the input
• Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders
WORKSHOP #2

CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

Scheme 1
AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

Scheme 2
THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

Scheme 3
THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

Scheme 4
REDUCE CHET+PARK+SINGLE FAMILY

Scheme 5
A NEW MIXED USE COMMUNITY

Scheme 6
THE GARDEN CAMPUS
WORKSHOP #2

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
What best describes your interest in the Chet Holifield building?

Governmental employee 4
Historic preservationist 2
Developer 5
Business owner 1
Community member 26

What elements of Scheme 3 - The Pedestrian Beltway do you like?

- Courtyard and pathways
- Housing will need to be consistent with Sacramento mandates - so be careful
- Use apartments over retail
- Apartments, mixed use pathways
- Good use of building except 1 and 2 will need to be more than maintenance. Also believe adding med size buildings is a good idea for making property work.

Between the two adaptive reuse schemes, which do you think is more viable?

Scheme 1 - An Improved Ziggurat
Scheme 2 - A Ziggurat Repurposed

Aerial View
Total Gross Area
1,456,000 SF
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WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 1-AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT DO YOU LIKE?

1. Green Space
2. Courtyards
3. Renovating Structure
4. Open Space
5. Minimal disruption to surrounding areas

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 1-AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?

1. Too much office space
2. Too much parking
3. Lack of housing
4. Renovating structure
5. Too little green space
6. Not enough green space
7. Disconnected from community

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 2-A ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED DO YOU LIKE?

1. Entertainment
2. Reuses existing structure
3. Mixed use
4. Added green space
5. Parking

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 2-A ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?

1. Lack of housing
2. Too much office space
3. Traffic impact
4. Reuses existing structure
5. Not enough green space
6. Disconnected from community

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 3-THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY DO YOU LIKE?

1. The walkway
2. Mixed use
3. Apartments
4. Subterranean parking
5. Preservation of building
6. Courtyards
7. Green space

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 3-THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?

1. Apartments
2. Warehouse
3. Traffic impact
4. Too much office space
5. Preservation of building
6. Not enough green space
7. Too much parking
8. Too much green space
9. Not enough entertainment
10. Subterranean parking
11. Retail

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 4-REDUCE CHET + PARK + SINGLE FAMILY DO YOU LIKE?

1. Cutting the building
2. Single family housing
3. Multiple recreation options
4. Green space
5. Quad gardens
6. Open space
7. Reduced parking

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 4-REDUCE CHET + PARK + SINGLE FAMILY ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?

1. Single family housing
2. Keeping/cutting the building
3. Not enough mixed use
4. Office space
5. Not enough green space
6. Not enough walking trails
7. Too much parking
8. Scheme 2 a Ziggurat repurposed
9. Scheme 1 an improved Ziggurat

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
WORKSHOP #2 - SURVEY FINDINGS

BETWEEN THE TWO HYBRID SCHEMES, WHICH DO YOU THINK IS MORE VIABLE?
13 SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY
15 SCHEME 4 REDUCE CHET + PARK + SINGLE FAMILY

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 5-A NEW MIXED COMMUNITY DO YOU LIKE?
GARDENS 9
AMPHITHEATER 8
MIXED USE 6
APARTMENTS 6
DEMOLISHING BUILDING 4
RETAIL & RESTAURANTS 4
REDUCED PARKING 4
PLANNED COMMUNITY FEEL 4

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 5-A NEW MIXED COMMUNITY ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?
TOO MUCH APARTMENT HOUSING 12
DEMOLISHING BUILDING 6
REDUCTION OF CHET 2
DENSITY 5
NOT ENOUGH PARKING 5
NOT ENOUGH MIXED USE 5
TOO MUCH OFFICE/RETAIL 5
TOO MUCH TRAFFIC 5
DIRECT COMPETITION WITH ADJACENT AREAS 5

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 6-THE GARDEN CAMPUS DO YOU LIKE?
NOTHING 7
COULD BE TECH/MEDICAL CAMPUS 7
COURTYARD HOUSING 5
DEMOLISHING BUILDING 5
COULD BE A CORPORATE CAMPUS 3
ATHLETIC FACILITIES 2
BASIC DIVISION OF LAND USE 2
BLENDS WELL WITH SURROUNDING COMMERCIAL 2
JOB CREATION 2
LESS DENSITY ON PERIMETER 2

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 6-THE GARDEN CAMPUS ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?
DOESN'T SERVE THE COMMUNITY 7
DEMOLISHING OF CHET 4
NOT ENOUGH RESTAURANTS 2
NOT ENOUGH HOUSING 2
SINGLE USE 2
NOT ENOUGH OPEN SPACE 2
THE CAMPUS ASPECT 2
TRAFFIC IMPACT 2
DENSITY 2

BETWEEN THE TWO DEMO SCHEMES, WHICH DO YOU THINK IS MORE VIABLE?
14 SCHEME 5-A NEW MIXED USE COMMUNITY
9 SCHEME 6 THE GARDEN CAMPUS

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
• Welcoming of Stakeholders
• Introduction to the project Virtual Tour
• Schedule Review
• Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property

Workshop #0: Building and Site Orientation

October 20, 2021
11 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

• Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
• Outlining the possibilities of future programming of the project
• Further input from the stakeholders
• Interactive brainstorming exercises to begin to visualize the possibilities of potential schemes

Workshop #1: Preliminary Research

October 26, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

• Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
• Further input from stakeholders on the designs
• Collecting this input for the next design stage

Workshop #2: Preliminary Concepts Presentation and Feedback

November 4, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

• Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop
• The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage

Workshop #3: Concept Refinement and Feedback

November 16, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

• Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail
• Collecting & documenting the input
• Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders

Workshop #4: Final Concepts and Feedback

December 2, 2021
11 a.m. - 1 p.m. PST

• Presenting the Kick-off Meeting Report Review with participating stakeholders
• Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property
• Further input from stakeholders on the designs
• Collecting this input for the next design stage

October 20, 2021
11 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. PST

Workshop #0: Building and Site Orientation

Workshop #1: Preliminary Research

Workshop #2: Preliminary Concepts Presentation and Feedback

Workshop #3: Concept Refinement and Feedback

Workshop #4: Final Concepts and Feedback
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Scheme 1  
AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

Scheme 2  
THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

Scheme 3  
THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

Scheme 4  
REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWNHOUSE

Scheme 5  
A NEW MIXED USE COMMUNITY
Scheme 1
AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

Scheme 2
THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

Scheme 3
THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

Scheme 4
REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWNHOUSE

Scheme 5
A NEW MIXED USE COMMUNITY
WORKSHOP #3 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

What elements of the adaptive reuse schemes do you like the best?

1st: Adding courtyards to the existing building
2nd: Adding the pentwater green loop (walking path)
3rd: Changing the first two floors to entertainment use
4th: Renovating the existing office space
5th: Adding tree canopy to the parking lot

What elements of the hybrid schemes do you like the best?

1: Adding apartments
2: Repurposing the first floor as warehouse space
3: Adding restored retail
4: Adding theater
5: Replacing some surface parking with underground parking
6: Adding a tree canopy in the parking lot
7: Cutting the building
8: Adding a dome quad

What do you think of the partial demo of the existing building?

- Much better choice if the building must be kept.
- Best scheme if some of building "tox" to be kept.
- Allows for more housing.
- Prefers to keep the building. Save the architecture.
- Like the quad.
- Like the "courtyard".
- Prefer apartment complex instead of townhouses.
- Like the idea of the restaurants fronting the open space. Like available space for homes.

What types of companies could you envision using this office space and the courtyards?

- Google
- Architecture firm
- Tech
- Technology
- Startup
- Restaurants
- Technology and R&D
- Just about any
- Any and all
### Workshop #3 - Survey Findings

**Workshop #3 - Survey Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you a resident of Laguna Niguel?</strong></td>
<td>Yes: 24, No: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What best describes your interest in the Chet Holifield Federal Building?</strong></td>
<td>Community Member: 27, Developer: 10, Business Owner: 9, Other: 5, Governmental Employee: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would you be excited to use or think would be popular in this new green space around the perimeter?</strong></td>
<td>Walking Paths: 11, Community Garden: 10, Water Feature: 9, Weekend Farmers Market: 8, Pickle Ball/Bocce Courts: 7, Sculpture Garden: 7, Picnic Areas: 6, Dog Park: 6, Outdoor Work Space: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What elements of Scheme 1 do you like?</strong></td>
<td>Reuse of Building: 15, Tree Canopy: 11, Courtyards: 9, Walking Trails: 8, Green Space: 6, Creative Preservation: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What elements of Scheme 1 are you not a fan of?</strong></td>
<td>Not Enough Residential: 12, Does Not Engage Community: 7, Keeping the Building: 7, Too Much Office: 4, Nothing, I Like It All: 2, Parking Lot: 2, Too Much Open Space: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 2 ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?
5. NO HOUSING
4. KEEPING THE BUILDING
3. NOTHING, I LIKE IT ALL
2. LAND USE
1. TRAFFIC
1. TOO MUCH PARKING
1. EVERYTHING

WHAT ELEMENTS OF THE ADAPTIVE REUSE SCHEMES DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?
7. RENOVATING THE EXISTING OFFICE SPACE
7. ADDING COURTYARDS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING
6. ADDING THE PERIMETER GARDEN LOOP (WALKING PATH)
5. CHANGING THE FIRST TWO FLOORS TO ENTERTAINMENT USE
3. ADDING TREE CANOPY TO THE PARKING LOT

SCHEME 3: THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY (HYBRID)
WHAT TYPES OF RESTAURANTS, RETAILS, AND HOTELS COULD YOU SEE THRIVING HERE?
10. OUTDOOR DINING
6. INTERNATIONAL FOOD COURT
5. BOUTIQUE HOTEL
5. BREWERY
3. WINERY
2. LUXURY HOTEL
2. SPA
2. SUITE HOTEL
2. SMALL BUSINESS RETAIL

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 3 DO YOU LIKE?
10. HOUSING
8. REUSE THE BUILDING
7. MIXED USE
6. RESTAURANTS
4. WALKWAYS
2. CREATIVE PRESERVATION
2. HOTEL

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 3 ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?
10. WAREHOUSE
5. KEEPING THE BUILDING
2. DENSE HOUSING
2. NOT ENOUGH LOW INCOME HOUSING

SCHEME 4: REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWN HOMES (HYBRID)
WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE PARTIAL DEMO OF THE EXISTING BUILDING?
14. CREATIVE COMPROMISE
8. LIKE IT
8. LIKE NEW GREEN SPACE
6. ADVERSE IMPACT ON HISTORIC BUILDING
3. CONCERNED ABOUT FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY
2. SEEMS AwKWARD
2. LIKE THAT IT INCLUDES HOUSING

WHAT IS YOUR REACTION TO THE NEW TOWN HOMES?
11. LIKE THE HOUSING ASPECT
10. LIKE THE TOWN HOMES SPECIFICALLY
7. NEEDS COVERED PARKING
5. LIKE THE MIXED USE
5. GREAT
4. LIKE GREEN BUFFER
3. DON'T LIKE IT

WHAT ELEMENTS OF THE HYBRID SCHEMES DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?
9. ADDING A LANDSCAPE QUAD
5. ADDING RESTAURANTS AND RETAIL
5. ADDING A TREE CANOPY TO THE PARKING LOT
3. ADDING APARTMENTS
2. REPLACING SOME SURFACE PARKING WITH SUBTERRANEAN PARKING
2. CUTTING THE BUILDING

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
SCHEME 5: A NEW MIXED COMMUNITY (DEMO)
WHAT TYPES OF EVENTS COULD YOU ENVISION THE AMPHITHEATER AND GREEN SPACE BEING USED FOR?
7 PLAYS
5 MIXED USE
4 CONCERTS
2 BIG BANDS AND CONCERTS
2 DON'T NEED AN AMPHITHEATER

WHAT BUSINESS COULD YOU SEE IN THIS NEW MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT?
5 RESTAURANTS
4 HOUSING
2 BREWERY
2 HEALTHCARE OFFICES
2 EDUCATIONAL
2 SMALL BUSINESS
2 COMMUNAL OFFICES
2 COOP
2 RETAIL

WHAT ELEMENTS DO YOU LIKE ABOUT SCHEME 5?
2 DEMOLITION OF CHET
2 GREEN SPACE

WHAT ELEMENTS OF SCHEME 5 ARE YOU NOT A FAN OF?
1 DEMOLITION OF CHET
1 DENSE HOUSING

WHAT ELEMENTS OF THE DEMO SCHEME DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?
21 ADDING AN AMPHITHEATER
20 ADDING NEW PARK SPACE WITH WALKWAYS
18 ADDING RESTAURANTS AND RETAIL
13 INTRODUCING GREEN ROOFS ON THE NEW BUILDINGS
14 ADDING A HOTEL
11 ADDING APARTMENTS
10 INTRODUCING PV'S ON THE NEW BUILDINGS

IF THE BUILDING WERE TO BE DEMOLISHED, WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE A MEMORIAL INCORPORATED INTO THE DESIGN (EX. INFO KIOSK, PLAY STRUCTURE, ETC.)?
3 YES
4 NO

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
Welcome Stakeholders

Introduction to the project

Virtual Tour

Schedule Review

Listen to stakeholder concerns and ideas for the property

Presenting the first round of 3-5 schemes for the property

Further input from stakeholders on the designs

Collecting schemes for the next design stage.

Presenting the revised and further developed 3-5 schemes based on input from the stakeholders in the previous workshop

The design team will collect this input to be incorporated in the final design stage

Presenting the final 3-5 design schemes based on input from the stakeholders in Workshop #3 in detail

Collecting & documenting the input

Preparing the Final Report of the entire design process and documenting the outcomes and input from the stakeholders
SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

By cutting courtyards into the first, second and third floor of the Chet Holifield Federal Building, this scheme brings light and life into existing office spaces. The parking lot is improved by planting a new tree canopy and adding shade and greenery around the building. Pedestrian pathways line the perimeter of the site, newly landscaped with trails and gardens.
NEW COURTYARDS IN FLOORS 1, 2 & 3 FOR CREATIVE OFFICE SPACE

REHABILITATED OFFICE SPACE 772,100 SF.

PERIMETER GARDEN LOOP WITH PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS

PARKING 3,090 SPACES

TREE CANOPY AT PARKING LOT

ADDITIONAL PARK/RECREATION AREAS

WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT AXON
NEW COURTYARDS IN FLOORS 1, 2 & 3 FOR CREATIVE OFFICE SPACE
WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 5

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 6

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 7

ZOOM IN AXON OVERALL
Maintaining the tree canopy and perimeter garden loop of the previous scheme, this rehabilitation focuses on the interior of the Chet Holifield Federal Building. Floors one, two and three are repurposed to accommodate entertainment programs including new restaurants, entertainment and retail. The tall ceiling heights of the existing building easily fit basketball courts, a movie theater, rock climbing gym, bowling alley and more.
WORKSHOP #4 SCHEME 2 THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

TREE CANOPY AT PARKING LOT
PERIMETER GARDEN LOOP WITH PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS
PARKING 3,215 SPACES
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ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 1

WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 2 THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 2

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 3

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 4

CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

- HEALTH CLUB
  43,200 SF
- BASKETBALL COURT
- LASER TAG
  27,000 SF
- MOVIE THEATRE
  82,000 SF
- RETAIL
  27,000 SF
- ROCK CLIMBING
  34,200 SF
- BOWLING
  82,000 SF

- ART GALLERIES
  90,000 SF
- BASKETBALL COURTS
- RETAIL
  15,000 SF ea.
- TWO RESTAURANTS
  @ 9,000 SF ea.
- ROCK CLIMBING
- SKYLIGHT
- PHOTOVOLTAIC SOLAR PANELS

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 2 THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 5

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 6

ZOOM IN AXON FLOOR 7

ZOOM IN AXON OVERALL

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

A hybrid scheme, this proposal combines the adaptive re-use of the Chet Holifield Federal Building with new construction. New mixed-use buildings are on the south and east sides of the site. The new buildings have restaurants and retail spaces on the ground floor. A pedestrian pathway passes between these new shops and eateries. The pathway passes between the new construction and extends around the site, forming a continuous loop. Above the ground floor, the new buildings become housing, topped with solar panels and rooftop gardens. Additionally, a 150 room boutique hotel sits on the southwest corner of the site.
WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

CHARRETTE WORKSHOPS

SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY GROUND PLAN

- Residential
- Retail
- Hotel

Hotel
Residential
Retail

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
OFFICE SPACE
296,000 SF

WAREHOUSE
634,500 SF

APARTMENT
1,640 UNITS

PHOTOVOLTAIC SOLAR PANELS

ROOF GARDENS

GROUND FLOOR
RESTAURANTS & RETAIL
286,600 SF

SUBTERRANEAN PARKING

TREE CANOPY
AT PARKING LOT

HOTEL
150 ROOMS

WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
By cutting the Chet Holifield Federal Building, this scheme effectively reduces the land use of this historic property while retaining the character of the ziggurat. The first and second floors are cut back to the edge of the ziggurat, leaving an empty footprint where the building was demolished. Newly landscaped trees, paths and open grass fields transform the footprint into a public quad garden. A paved plaza extends out to connect the garden to Chet, providing outdoor seating for the restaurants which occupy the remaining area at this level. Paved entrances at the east and west side of the building lead to an indoor parking lot on the second floor. Both the restaurant and parking levels feature a new glass facade, bringing light into Chet where it was cut. At the south end of the site, courtyard town homes are nestled in between the quad gardens and recreational areas. Again, pedestrian pathways loop around the site and a tree canopy covers the parking lot.
WORKSHOP #4 - SCHEME 4 REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWN HOMES

RESIDENTIAL TOWN HOMES WITH COURTYARDS
265 UNITS

RESTAURANTS

LANDSCAPE QUAD

CANOPY TREES AT PARKING

OFFICE
296,000 SF

PERIMETER RESIDENTIAL ONLY PARKING

PARK AREA
In this demolition scheme, Chet is completely removed from the site. An outdoor amphitheater serving the local community nestles itself into the blank hillside. In addition to the amphitheater, a new community center creates a local destination for public gatherings. Mixed use buildings trace across the site, topped with lush rooftop gardens to mitigate the impact of new construction. These mixed-use buildings accommodate housing, retail and offices, with public plazas and walking trails crossing around and between them. At the west edge of the site, office buildings with ground floor parking act as a buffer between the mixed-use community and La Paz Parkway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>EXISTING BUILDING</th>
<th>SCHEME 1</th>
<th>SCHEME 2</th>
<th>SCHEME 3</th>
<th>SCHEME 4</th>
<th>SCHEME 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE</td>
<td>930,500 SF</td>
<td>4,777 SF</td>
<td>772,100</td>
<td>SF 3,090</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>SF 1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>1,478,490 SF</td>
<td>2,870 SF</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td></td>
<td>516,750</td>
<td>SF 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL</td>
<td>27,000 SF</td>
<td>216 SF</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td></td>
<td>335,770</td>
<td>SF 1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>18,000 SF</td>
<td>206 SF</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>SF 48,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERTAINMENT</td>
<td>358,400 SF</td>
<td>1,675 SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>634,500</td>
<td>SF 634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>27,940 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,940</td>
<td>SF 27,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPITHEATER</td>
<td>23,650 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY CENTER</td>
<td>181,945 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOR PARKING</td>
<td>23,650 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>930,500 SF</td>
<td>4,777 SF</td>
<td>772,100</td>
<td>SF 3,090</td>
<td>699,400</td>
<td>SF 3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO</td>
<td>0.24 FAR</td>
<td>0.20 FAR</td>
<td>0.18 FAR</td>
<td>0.72 FAR</td>
<td>0.28 FAR</td>
<td>0.33 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 ACRES / 3,876,840</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING PARKING</td>
<td>1,852,854 SF</td>
<td>1,309,107</td>
<td>SF 1,309,107</td>
<td>SF 878,783</td>
<td>605,743</td>
<td>SF 105,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SURFACE PARKING</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTERRANEAN PARKING</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>554,400</td>
<td>SF 554,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>543,100</td>
<td>SF 581,100</td>
<td>SF 535,700</td>
<td>970,900</td>
<td>SF 970,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKSHOP #4 - HISTORIC FEATURES

EXISTING BUILDING
As defined in GSA's 2019 Historic Structures Report for the Chet Holifield Federal Building, the building retains multiple character-defining features dating to its original construction. A character-defining feature, also referred to as a historic feature, is a physical aspect of a building's design, construction, or detail that is representative of its historically significant function, type, or architectural style. Historic features may include the overall shape of a building, its materials, craftsmanship, and decorative details and features, as well as the various aspects of the building's site and environment.

Historic exterior and interior features of the Chet Holifield Federal Building include (but are not limited to) large-scale elements like its monumental scale; stepped ziggurat form and massing; integral designed topography and landscape; flat roofs with broad, deep, mansard eaves; textured precast concrete panel cladding; horizontal bands of fixed aluminum windows; smooth concrete angled entry volumes; open roof decks; and the guard station and maintenance building ancillary structures. Smaller elements also express the building's original character, and include (but are not limited to) historic features like the configuration and finishes of the fourth floor main entry lobby; fully glazed aluminum double doors at secondary entries; the wood slat ceilings at the south entry and at escalator/elevator lobbies; and corridor configurations.

SCHEME 1
Scheme 1 retains all of the building's exterior and interior historic features and most of the overall site's historic features. It removes the maintenance building and converts some surface parking to recreation and park areas. Adding interior courtyards with fenestration to the building's formerly windowless first floor does not impact the character-defining flat roof lines or original windowless façades.

SCHEME 3
Scheme 3 retains all of the building's exterior and interior historic features, and most of the overall site's historic features. It converts some surface parking to new residential, retail, restaurant, and hotel construction, and some to recreation and park areas.

SCHEME 4
Scheme 4 partially retains the building's exterior and interior historic features, and most of the overall site's historic features. It removes the maintenance building and converts some surface parking to new residential construction and recreation/park areas. At both the exterior and the interior of the building, all changes are related to the removal of the southern portion of the first floor. This removal alters the building's stepped massing, removes the south concrete angled entry volume with wood slat ceiling, and incorporates extensive fenestration at the new south façade at the first floor. At the building's interior, the wood slat ceiling at one first floor escalator bank is removed, and the configuration of main corridors and elevator banks are altered.

As Scheme 4 involves partial demolition of the building and loss of the above historic features, substantial measures to mitigate the loss would be necessary.

SCHEME 5
Scheme 5 demolishes the building and converts the site for new mixed-use construction, recreation areas, and park areas. As a result, no historic features are retained.

As Scheme 5 involves full demolition of the building and loss of all historic features, substantial measures to mitigate the loss would be necessary.
WORKSHOP #4 - FINANCIAL VIABILITY

GENERAL
While a detailed cost estimation was not part of the scope of work for the Chet Holifield Federal Building Community Design Charrette, some general assumptions regarding financial viability can be assumed based on the varying aspects of each scheme. It is understood that any future development would require developers working with the City of Laguna Niguel and the community to form new zoning and use guidelines. It is also understood that market research would need to be performed to assess the financial viability of the various uses represented in these schemes and that this study does not include that level of detail.

The prospective and new owners of the building are responsible for doing their own due diligence, for developing their own designs, and for formulating their own opinions about the financial viability, market conditions, and suitability of this property as an investment. This report contains statements about costs and financial viability, however these statements do not guarantee future costs, profitability, nor any lack thereof.

SCHEME 1
This scheme proposes the complete rehabilitation of the existing building while maintaining its current use as an office building. Seismic, asbestos and lead based paint abatement are assumed to be part of the rehabilitation, and would also include partial demolition (-158,400 SF) of the structure to create light filled courtyards to improve the quality of the large floor plates on floors one through three. The gross office area is then reduced from 930,500 SF to 772,100 SF. This scheme also includes reducing the surface parking to 3,090 spaces and replacing with new landscaped area of 543,100 SF.

It is expected that the existing office building is greatly improved in terms of its rentable areas by the introduction of the light filled courtyards, improved accessibility, and general improved quality of the office areas. The ability to divide the building into varying areas is expected to be able to cater to a wider variety of office tenants, from small businesses, to larger companies. A rehabilitation of the building of this type would have to consider land costs combined with possible remediation of any hazardous material and structural upgrades in the financial analysis of possible rental income. This scheme reduces the total building area of the current site, from an FAR of 0.24 to 0.20, or a 20% area reduction.

SCHEME 2
This scheme proposes the complete rehabilitation of the existing building while introducing new uses of entertainment, retail, and restaurant spaces on the 1st and 2nd floors of the existing building. Upper floors are maintained as the current use as offices. Seismic and asbestos abatement are assumed to be part of the rehabilitation, and would also include partial demolition (-231,100 SF) of the structure to create skylights to improve the quality of the large floor plates. The gross office area is then reduced from 930,500 SF to 296,000 SF. Areas of new use include Retail (27,000 SF), Restaurants (18,000 SF), and Entertainment (358,400 SF). This scheme also includes reducing the surface parking to 3,281 spaces and replacing with new landscaped area of 581,100 SF.

It is expected that the existing office building is greatly improved in terms of its rentable areas by the introduction of the skylights, improved accessibility, and general improved quality of the building areas. The introduction of entertainment type uses offers an alternative to the single use of the project as an office building. It is expected that this scheme would offer a more diverse set of uses that could create a varied set of rentable spaces. The ability to divide the building into varying areas is expected to be able to cater to a wider variety of office tenants, from small businesses, to larger companies. A rehabilitation of the building of this type would have to consider land costs combined with possible remediation of any hazardous material and structural upgrades in the financial analysis of possible rental income. This scheme reduces the total building area of the current site, from an FAR of 0.24 to 0.18, or a 25% area reduction.
**SCHEME 3**
This scheme proposes the complete rehabilitation of the existing building while introducing new construction of multi-use buildings along the perimeter of the site. The upper floors of the existing building are maintained as their current use as offices (296,000 SF). Seismic and asbestos abatement are assumed to be part of the rehabilitation and would also include the change of use of the lower floors to warehouse space (634,500 SF). The gross office area is then reduced from 930,500 SF to 296,000 SF. Areas of new construction include Residential (1,478,490 SF), Retail & Restaurants (335,770 SF), and Hotel (48,880 SF). This scheme also includes reducing the surface parking dedicated to the existing building to 1,818 spaces and replacing with new landscaped area of 535,700 SF. The new construction also includes 4,749 spaces of subterranean parking.

One advantage of this scheme is that the perimeter development of new construction could be developed separately from the existing building. The project could be phased depending on different timelines of rehabilitation of the current building vs. new construction. Of all of the schemes, this offers the most total building area on the site, combining a complete rehabilitation of the existing building with new construction. A rehabilitation of the building of this type would have to consider land costs combined with possible remediation of any hazardous material and structural upgrades in the financial analysis of possible rental income. The new buildings also include subterranean parking in order to meet the denser FAR of .72, which is a 300% increase in building area on the site.

**SCHEME 4**
This scheme proposes the partial rehabilitation of the existing building while demolishing a significant amount of the 1st and 2nd floors (-374,555 SF). Upper floors are maintained as the current use as offices (296,000 SF) and a portion of the remaining lowest floor is rehabilitated to restaurant uses (78,500 SF), while the second floor is converted to covered parking (181,945 SF). Seismic and asbestos abatement are assumed to be part of the rehabilitation. New construction includes 296 units (516,750 SF) of residential town homes and 600 surface dedicated residential parking spaces.

**SCHEME 5**
This scheme proposes to demolish the entire 930,500 SF of the existing building and create a new mixed use development on the site. This includes 837,030 SF of residential apartment style (1,785 housing units), 91,370 SF of retail, 229,430 SF of office and 65,000 of hotel. A public community center is also included at 23,650 SF. New landscaped park areas of 1,484,100 SF, and surface parking areas 718,215 SF are also included.

At a total of 1,274,420 SF of new construction, this scheme results in an FAR of 0.33, which is a 37% increase from the current building. The significant amount of demolition would also include the retaining walls that the building currently contains as there is a series of stepped floor plates that navigate the total site grade differential of approximately 65 feet. This area would be completely regraded to form the central landscaped park area where the building currently resides. This scheme offers the greatest flexibility of any future development as it essentially creates a clean slate for differing masterplan strategies. Any future development, however, would have to consider site costs and demolition of the existing building vis-à-vis possible revenue from new construction.
WORKSHOP #4 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Which scheme is the most responsive to community needs?

What one design element do you like the best?

How has your vision for the use of the building / site changed during this process?

What future do you want to see for the building / site?

CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING | 24000 AVILA ROAD | CHARRETTE
WORKSHOP #4 - SURVEY FINDINGS

ARE YOU A RESIDENT OF LAGUNA NIGUEL?
16 NO
14 YES

WHAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR INTEREST IN THE CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING?
15 COMMUNITY MEMBER
8 HISTORIC PRESERVATIONIST
6 OTHER
5 DEVELOPER
4 BUSINESS OWNER
2 GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEE

WHICH SCHEME IS THE MOST RESPONSIVE TO COMMUNITY NEEDS?
10 SCHEME 5 A NEW MIXED COMMUNITY
9 SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY
8 SCHEME 4 REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWN HOMES
7 SCHEME 2 THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED
4 SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

WHICH SCHEME IS THE MOST FINANCIALLY VIABLE IN YOUR OPINION?
13 SCHEME 3 THE PEDESTRIAN BELTWAY
10 SCHEME 5 A NEW MIXED COMMUNITY
4 SCHEME 4 REDUCE CHET + PARK + TOWN HOMES
3 SCHEME 2 THE ZIGGURAT REPURPOSED
0 SCHEME 1 AN IMPROVED ZIGGURAT

WHAT ONE DESIGN ELEMENT DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?
3 WALKING TRAILS
6 REUSE OF EXISTING BUILDING
5 HEAVY TREE CANOPY
2 COMMUNITY GARDEN/FARMER’S MARKET SPACE
2 SPORTS COURTS
1 AMPHITHEATER
0 UNDERGROUND PARKING

HOW HAS YOUR VISION FOR THE USE OF THE BUILDING/SITE CHANGED DURING THIS PROCESS?
10 OPENED MY MIND TO NEW OPTIONS I HAD NOT CONSIDERED
5 DID NOT CHANGE MY MIND
4 APPRECIATED PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY
3 FELT LIKE AN OPEN PLATFORM TO SHARE
3 HAD NOT CONSIDERED A HYBRID APPROACH
2 CHANGED MY MIND
2 OPPORTUNITY TO CREATE A DESTINATION
1 PROCESS & RESULT MET MY EXPECTATIONS

WHAT FUTURE DO YOU WANT TO SEE FOR THE BUILDING/SITE?
9 HYBRID
7 DEMOLITION/REDEVELOPMENT
5 FULL PRESERVATION

DO YOU FEEL YOU WERE ABLE TO MEANINGFULLY PARTICIPATE IN THIS COMMUNITYENGAGEMENT PROCESS?
3 YES, GREAT PROCESS
3 YES, ENJOYED SEEING THE DESIGN PROCESS
1 YES, WANT MORE INFORMATION/STATISTICS
1 YES, WOULD PREFER A DIFFERENT TIME OF DAY
1 YES, WISH THERE WERE MORE COMMUNITY MEMBERS PRESENT

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
**WORKSHOP #4 - SURVEY FINDINGS**

**DEVELOPERS**

**ARE YOU A RESIDENT OF LAGUNA NIGUEL?**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**WHAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR INTEREST IN THE CHET HOLIFIELD FEDERAL BUILDING?**
- [ ] Developer
- [ ] Historic Preservationist
- [ ] Other

**WHICH SCHEME IS THE MOST RESPONSIVE TO COMMUNITY NEEDS?**
- [ ] Scheme 1: An Improved Ziggurat
- [ ] Scheme 2: The Ziggurat Repurposed
- [ ] Scheme 3: The Pedestrian Beltway
- [ ] Scheme 4: Reduce CHET + Park + Town Homes
- [ ] Scheme 5: A New Mixed Community

**WHICH SCHEME IS THE MOST FINANCIALLY Viable IN YOUR OPINION?**
- [ ] Scheme 3: The Pedestrian Beltway
- [ ] Scheme 5: A New Mixed Community
- [ ] Scheme 4: Reduce CHET + Park + Town Homes
- [ ] Scheme 2: The Ziggurat Repurposed
- [ ] Scheme 1: An Improved Ziggurat

**WHICH SCHEME IS THE LEAST FINANCIALLY Viable IN YOUR OPINION?**
- [ ] Scheme 1: An Improved Ziggurat
- [ ] Scheme 5: A New Mixed Community
- [ ] Scheme 2: The Ziggurat Repurposed
- [ ] Scheme 3: The Pedestrian Beltway
- [ ] Scheme 4: Reduce CHET + Park + Town Homes

**WHAT ONE PROGRAM DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?**
- [ ] Residential
- [ ] Office (Including Medical or Tech)
- [ ] Retail
- [ ] Entertainment
- [ ] Performing Arts Center/Art Galleries
- [ ] Restaurant
- [ ] Hotel
- [ ] Warehouse

**WHAT ONE DESIGN ELEMENT DO YOU LIKE THE BEST?**
- [ ] Heavy Tree Canopy
- [ ] Walking Trails
- [ ] Sports Courts
- [ ] Reuse of Existing Building
- [ ] Community Garden/Farmer's Market Space
- [ ] Amphitheater
- [ ] Underground Parking

**HOW HAS YOUR VISION FOR THE USE OF THE BUILDING/SITE CHANGED DURING THIS PROCESS?**
- [ ] Did not change my mind
- [ ] Appreciated participating in this study
- [ ] Opportunity to create a destination

**WHAT FUTURE DO YOU WANT TO SEE FOR THE BUILDING/SITE?**
- [ ] Demolition/Redevelopment
- [ ] Hybrid
- [ ] Full Preservation

**DO YOU FEEL YOU WERE ABLE TO MEANINGFULLY PARTICIPATE IN THIS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS?**
- [ ] Yes, great process
- [ ] Yes, enjoyed seeing the design process
- [ ] Yes, want more information/statistics

---

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
### Workshop #4 - Survey Findings

#### Historic Preservationists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a resident of Laguna Niguel?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What best describes your interest in the Chet Holifield Federal Building?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which scheme is the most responsive to community needs?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which scheme is the most financially viable in your opinion?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which scheme is the least financially viable in your opinion?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What one program do you like the best?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What one design element do you like the best?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has your vision for the use of the building/site changed during this process?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What future do you want to see for the building/site?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel you were able to meaningfully participate in this community engagement process?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical values above represent the approximate number of responses from active participants.
So much more appreciative that we have this valuable space in our community. The possibilities are endless.

I appreciated some of the interesting ideas that emerged - e.g. using the space for entertainment or arts. I had not considered a hybrid approach.

I initially thought that a complete demolition of the building was the only viable option and was pleasantly surprised by the options presented that included modification of the building as an entertainment venue.

It being virtual allowed me to attend. Mr. Enright’s presentation was very clear. Presenters and moderators were excellent. I just helped me imagine more clearly what is possible at this site.

The comments above represent a small snapshot of the closing remarks from workshop attendees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY:</th>
<th>WORKSHOP #0</th>
<th>WORKSHOP #1</th>
<th>WORKSHOP #2</th>
<th>WORKSHOP #3</th>
<th>WORKSHOP #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/20/2021</td>
<td>10/26/2021</td>
<td>11/04/2021</td>
<td>11/16/2021</td>
<td>12/02/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEA (DESIGN TEAM)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARUP (WORKSHOP TEAM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG (HISTORIC ARCHITECTS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ATTENDEES</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>