

Point Pinos Lighthouse Preservation Plan

A. Project Nature and Scope

Lighthouse Overview: The Point Pinos Lighthouse is the oldest continuously operating lighthouse on the west coast. Since February 1, 1855, its beacon has flashed nightly as a guide and warning to shipping off the rocky California Coast. Historical structures such as the lighthouse are non-renewable cultural resources that we need to preserve and cherish as an asset to the City of Pacific Grove. This report will give a synopsis for the preservation and restoration of the lighthouse. A preservation plan has already been developed in August 2009, and volunteers have worked countless hours to keep the lighthouse maintained and to aid in the development of the preservation plan. We as a city, staff, and volunteers need to follow through with this preservation plan to ensure the longevity and functionality of the lighthouse for years to come.

Reasons for Attention Now: A single phrase for why the lighthouse needs attention now would be “To stop immediate deterioration” as quoted by Dennis Tarmina of the lighthouse preservation committee. The overall condition of the lighthouse does not pose an immediate safety issue to the staff and patrons that visit the lighthouse, but if specific items stated within the preservation plan are not addressed within a timely manner these items may fester into the possibility of safety issues. The structure itself is in need of weather proofing now. It has gone years with the weather beating it in the harsh coastal climate and if action is not taken then more costly repairs will have to be done in the future. At this point I do not see us facing any liabilities due to neglect of the structure. I think with this plan we are making progress to ensure that appropriate actions are taken.

Objectives and Criteria for Success: There are multiple issues that need to be addressed within the Point Pinos Lighthouse property as stated within the preservation plan. In order for us to be successful in the completion of this plan we need to address problems that are critical for the continued success of the lighthouse. We need to keep in mind that the lighthouse is a great asset for the city and has potential to be even more of an attraction for tourism, and for the use of our residents of Pacific Grove.

What we are trying to accomplish with the preservation of the lighthouse is to keep it functioning as it was first intended, but to also share the beauty, its surroundings and its history with all who visit it. In order for us to be successful with this preservation we are going to have to work diligently with the lighthouse preservation committee and all the volunteers that have already put in many hours at the lighthouse. We are going to have to assist them with support of the city and resources that they may need to accomplish the preservation plan.

B. Project Execution

Technical Approach: A preservation plan was developed by Lighthouse Preservationist, LLC in August 2009 and was paid for by the lighthouse improvement funds. The plan outlines what work needs to be done both on the exterior and the interior of the lighthouse building. It is quite detailed and rates each item depending upon the severity of the problem. Each part of the structure is rated by category. The first being the Qualitative condition ratings. This varies from GOOD, FAIR, and POOR depending upon the condition of the described object. The second being the Maintenance Deficiency Priority ratings. This ranges from MINOR, SERIOUS, and CRITICAL. Many of the described items within the preservation plan fall within the FAIR to POOR rating, and lean toward SERIOUS to CRITICAL. Many of the objects that are detailed within the plan have to do with the age of the structure and are consistent with the lack of maintenance that has occurred on the structure for many years. The most pressing issue is to get the building weather proofed and then proceed with the other projects outlined within the plan.

A landscaping plan is also being developed to restore the landscaping around the lighthouse back to its historical look. This is not included within the preservation plan, but is a key component to the restoration of the lighthouse.

Constraints: There are a few key constraints that are going to inhibit the work at the lighthouse from being done quickly and efficiently. The first being that all work needs to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standard for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This means that all materials, fabrics, paint, roofing, etc., need to be consistent with what was originally there. However given the large amount of historic fabrics still in existence at the lighthouse most of the treatment will be protection, preservation, stabilization, and rehabilitation. All of these components take time and many hours to complete. A restoration is much more detailed and cost much more than a remodel or new construction of a similar fashion would.

The obvious second constraint of the preservation plan is financial. This will be discussed in a later portion of this document.

There shall be no issues completing the work as long as the work deemed is completed with specific tools, materials and practices that are stated within the preservation plan.

Target and Stakeholder Groups Affected: At this point no groups shall be adversely affected by the work deemed to be done at the lighthouse. This should be a benefit only to the city, the employees of the lighthouse, and the patrons that visit the lighthouse and its surroundings.

Work Breakdown Structure, Schedule and Milestones: Since the preservation plan has already been done and is ready to be implemented we are ready to start with the restoration of the lighthouse.

Phase 1: Years 1-3

- The first phase would be to prioritize the plan to ensure that all tasks are completed to ensure the safety of staff and patrons. Any items with a critical

or poor rating. Example: metal flashings around lantern room, leaking pipes within interior, windows

- To ensure the building is weather proofed and able to withstand daily use. Example: cocking exposed areas, flashing reconstruction.
- Implementing the landscaping plan.
- Make building and grounds ADA compliant. Example: making all walkways wheelchair accessible.

This may consist of a larger portion of the time frame to ensure that these tasks are completed properly and to the historic value of the building.

Phase 2: Year 4-5

- This would consist of prioritizing the items within the plan that have a rating with fair to good and minor to serious.
- Continuing with the restoration of building. Example: roofing, painting, stucco repair

Phase 3: Year 6-10

- Implement a maintenance plan to keep building from reaching further degradation.
- Finish all other cosmetic needs
- Rebuild historic buildings

This is only a tentative guideline and completion of this plan may take from 5 to 10 years. There are multiple tasks that need to be completed beyond the examples described.

Resources / Budget / Cost: The lighthouse has an improvement fund that has been used in the past to do work needed. This is derived from donations from the lighthouse. A grant has already been received for the work to be completed on the landscaping. The preservation plan will be a costly plan to complete, but the persons who currently are on the Lighthouse Preservation Committee or adamant about finding resources to do the work at no to little cost from the city's general fund.

Most of the projects listed within the plan can be completed from volunteers, using the lighthouse funds to buy materials. There are some projects that will need to be done by a qualified contractor, but grants, fundraisers and donations, hopefully can offset these tasks as long as they are properly managed. In the long run the Lighthouse Preservation Committee would like to see the lighthouse as a self-sufficient asset.

Monetary values have been discussed in a Historic Preservation Report that was completed by the National Parks Services back in 2004. This report is out of date and includes a large amount of funds devoted to travel time and equipment needed since all work would have been done by the parks service.

A representative sample of key tasks and their costs are provided below. The cost figures do not include travel time, housing, and excessive vehicle charges, only cost of labor and materials. These are rough estimates, and are provided only to be used to get an idea of the cost of some of the projects that are necessary.

Window Restoration:

- Cost of Labor: \$43,300
- Cost of Materials: \$6,550

Much of the money for this project is in labor due to the fact that the window fabric is historic and will need to be reused. Extensive amounts of time will be spent restoring and preserving instead of just rebuilding or new installations.

Reroofing:

- Cost of Labor: \$21,500
- Cost of Materials: \$6,500

Repainting:

- Cost of Labor: \$43,300
- Cost of Materials: \$9,250

These three projects are not necessarily the most important but are some examples of tasks that need to be completed. They do have the potential to be the most costly since they will have to be performed by a professional contractor experienced in Historic Preservation. These figures are very rough totals only designed to give a ballpark value. When it comes time to complete such task projects of this magnitude would have to go to bid and be awarded to the persons who best fit our needs.

Cost Needed For the Project: The estimated total cost of this project could be between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 according to the members of the lighthouse preservation committee. These numbers could vary depending on how much work would be able to be done by volunteers or by a contractor. Further examination of all jobs would have to be done and contractors would have to give bids to fully understand the scope of work needed. The preservation plan is only a guideline to all that needs to be done. Currently in the Lighthouse improvement fund there is \$60,414.08.

The lighthouse preservation committee has examined multiple ways to raise funds for the lighthouse beside the donation collection within the lighthouse. Application for grants is one key way to raise funds. There are grants available for lighthouse restoration from many agencies such as, Department of Transportation, National Parks Service, State Grants, Historic Museum Grants, County Grants, and City Grants. Future information can be received regarding grants as the project progresses.

Fundraising would also have to take place to accomplish all tasks within the lighthouse. Within the Preservation Plan it discusses ways other lighthouses have raised funds to complete restorations. For example special events at the lighthouse where entertainment and food is donated and fees are collected. Art contests of the lighthouse where artists are offered prizes donated from local businesses and then the artist work is sold and proceeds go to the lighthouse. On a local level we could host a golf tournament where some of the proceeds go to the lighthouse funds. There are ways to generate funds, we would need to be creative but we think the community, as a whole, would support us. The Lighthouse Restoration could

be completed in a timely manner with no cost to the cities general fund, if it is thought out and executed over a period of time. We would like the lighthouse to be self-sufficient and pay for its own repairs.

C. Structure, Staffing and Support

Project Structure and Responsibilities: The Lighthouse Preservation Committee would like to be one of the leads within this project with the support of City staff. This project is grand in scale and multiple facets will need to be involved, depending upon the work that is scheduled to be completed. As a City we would need to dedicate either a committee to the project who could over see the project as a whole or we could assign staff to do this. This is a big project and taking staff time to compile and complete may not be feasible but staff should be able to aid in the project.

Involved Commissions/ Committees/Boards: The committee that would be most involved would be the Lighthouse Preservation Committee. It is already comprised of multiple volunteers who are willing and have already done an extensive amount of work with and at the lighthouse.

The ARB would need to be involved, along with the Heritage Society to ensure that all aspects of the project are staying within the historic manner.

The Team: At this point the team consists of

Daniel Gho	Pacific Grove Golf Course Superintendent/City Staff
Jeff Becon	Lighthouse Preservation Committee/ARB/HRC
Dennis Tarmina	Lighthouse Preservation Committee
Ken Hinshaw	Lighthouse Preservation Committee
Lowell Northrop	Lighthouse Preservation Committee
Steve Honegger	Lighthouse Preservation Committee

Other City Staff:

Celia Martinez	Public Works
Karen Vaughn	CDD

Developed By:

Daniel Gho, Pacific Grove Golf Course Superintendent, with the assistance of the Lighthouse Preservation Committee

References:

Point Pinos Lighthouse Preservation Plan: Developed August 2009, Lighthouse Preservation, LLC.

Point Pinos Lighthouse Historic Preservation Report, Documentation and Treatment Planning; Developed 2004, National Parks Service, U.S Department of the Interior