



Public Safety Building Project Questions

Wendel Five Bugles Questions

1. According to the 2012 space needs assessment by AES, the police needed 6,067 square feet (about two and a half times as much as existing), and EMS and fire together needed 17,493 square feet (about 15% more than existing). According to your assessment, the police need 16,333 square feet (about 7 times existing) and EMS and fire together need 49,905 square feet (over 3 times existing). How do you account for your assessment differing from another consultant's by almost a factor of 3?
2. The report calls for a 90' x 18' bay for truck 144, which (assuming 122 is a typo on section 1 - 2), is 46.8' x 8.7'. Why does the bay need to be four times the size of the vehicle?
3. How much of the space called for in the space needs analysis is truly needed? How much is a want, a wish, or an anticipation of a future need which may or may not materialize?
4. The report claims that various deficiencies of the existing Broadway property prevent creating a combined fire/EMS facility at this site. Among these is the lack of ADA compliance of the existing facilities. Why is it important for them to be ADA compliant? These are facilities for people who have to be able bodied. What would be wrong with spending the minimum on accessibility required by law?
5. Several of the noted deficiencies would present constraints and challenges for the design of an expanded facility: the sloping topography, the site's irregular shape, the need to manage stormwater and provide parking within a limited space. A creative design can work within constraints and overcome challenges. Are any of these challenges insurmountable?
6. The report cited the historic status of the firehouse among the deficiencies. How would the historic status of the firehouse impede achieving the project goals for a renovated and expanded facility?
7. There is room for a small building on the north end of the Rescue Squad's property where the driveway intersects Depot Street. Have you considered placing an annex garage/storage facility there for articles which do not need to be accessed quickly (such as the parade trucks?)
8. In the context of historic Saranac Lake Village importance and the ongoing downtown revitalization climate, why exactly is the historic red brick traditional firehouse building

at 100 Broadway not a more seriously supported viable option to expand, update and improve upon?

9. Has there been an emergency response time trial, using data, historic info, study, and best management practices comparing central 100 Broadway v. the outer Petrova site (distances, drive, traffic, weather, and the benefits of proximity v. dangers of a delayed response travel/ distances) example; time for all the volunteers and required fire apparatus to a on scene - active fire - for the entire Village fire jurisdiction?
10. If the expected level of funding from the federal and state (?) levels does not come through, how would the size and design of the project change?
11. Building on wetlands can present unforeseen problems. What is the plan for the Pius X structure? Will it be completely be razed? Could part of it be used and part be demolished? What is the plan to manage water under the existing Pius X structure?
12. What is the status of oil spill contamination on and under the property?
13. What is the timeline for construction? When is the project expected to begin, and what is its expected duration?
14. Factoring wetlands, slopes, streams, and power and sanitary easements, what is the actual buildable area of this parcel? Is the total buildable area contiguous or in separate sections?
15. Could you clarify how the sanitary easement “impedes the expansion and will have to be addressed”? The report states: “Sanitary Easement – As depicted in Orange, there is an easement for sanitary and sanitary piping that currently interferes with conceptual additions. In the next phase of design, care will be taken to remove additions from the easement and to provide proper clearances.”
16. Neither the survey nor site concept show elevation contours for the wooded area in the southwest corner of the property, where police access is indicated on the site concept. There is a steep slope: the height of land under the gray “police access” area is a 20+-foot climb from the parking lot over a short distance.
17. If the designer is aware of this, is the plan to excavate the hillside to flat grade and build a retaining wall?
18. Or, is the plan for police vehicles to drive ~20 feet up and down the hill?
19. Why does the report state that a retaining wall of 2 to 3 feet would suffice when the driveway would cut into an elevation of about 20 feet?
20. If the designer did not know about the significant slope, does this information alter the plan and/or cost?

21. Is Petrova Ave. the only egress option for police? If so, what is the default route for police response?
22. The report states, "Safety and minimization of response times are significant considerations when designing a public safety facility." How would the 33 Petrova Ave. location affect police response time to different neighborhoods?
23. Is a traffic study part of determining feasibility? Will there be a traffic study of the 33 Petrova proposal?
24. Is egress to Route 3 really off the table forever? The report states: "As with most projects, the overall intent when moving forward with additional design will be to adjust the conceptual plans to eliminate the need to use wetlands and to explore all options to eliminate the need for permit or JIF from the APA." The syntax implies that "most projects" do not submit jurisdictional inquiries to the Adirondack Park Agency. What is the basis for this statement?
25. In your opinion, is this location feasible for emergency services if access to Route 3 is not possible?
26. Is Bay Blvd. contemplated for fire and ambulance egress? If so does it require permission to cross Citizen Advocates or other private land? Is permission secured?
27. If Bay Blvd is contemplated for fire and ambulance egress, what is the plan to widen the road?
28. Will the village have to take land from homeowners on Bay Blvd?
29. Will the village have to submit a JIF to the APA to address wet areas along Bay Blvd?
30. If Bay Blvd is contemplated for fire and ambulance egress, will the village require a town permit?
31. How would 33 Petrova location affect fire response times to different neighborhoods?
32. How would 33 Petrova location affect rescue response times to different neighborhoods?
33. If a Route 3 driveway were possible, please clarify what the plan is for returning fire vehicles. The report states that they would have to return from the "south" through neighborhood streets because of pass-through bays. If that is the case, do you mean via Canaras and Petrova? Have you considered turning radiuses and school/game traffic in the flow plan? Again, would a traffic analysis help determine feasibility?
34. Does the cost estimate in the feasibility study factor bringing the entire facility (including renovation) up to NYS Type IV code requirements?

35. What is the plan to manage flowing and standing water under the existing Pius X structure? The feasibility study mentions “further investigation of a sub drainage system.” What would that add to project cost?
36. What is the status of oil spill contamination below the Pius X building and on the property? Will you share the environmental due diligence report on the village website?
37. Have all Pius X replacement/renovation costs been estimated for this study?
38. Are there minimum exterior lighting requirements for police sally ports and holding centers?
39. Are there minimum exterior lighting requirements for fire and ambulance facilities?
40. (Overall, it possible for these types of facilities to have low-impact lighting, i.e., lighting that doesn’t trespass onto neighboring properties, as required by village code?)
41. How do you expect noise to impact residential areas? In your response, please consider that the surrounding topography essentially forms an amphitheater. The noise of fans at the SL Hot House and the Pius X building are amplified.
42. In your experience, is it commonplace to build these type of facilities in such close proximity (in some cases up to minimum setback) of residential neighborhoods?
43. Is there a rule of thumb or formula for diminution of property value of residences in close proximity to a police/fire/ambulance facility?
44. In its cost estimate, has the feasibility study factored just compensation to homeowners whose property value is affected by a zoning change and construction of a 70,000 SF police/fire/ambulance facility?
45. What steps could be taken to buffer impacts on residences and the neighborhood?
46. At 33 Petrova, have you looked at siting a new, smaller facility (not a renovation project) closer to Route 3 to buffer residential neighborhoods?
47. The feasibility study acknowledges there is not much information about site drainage, and the next Phase of design would have to address storm water and drainage considerations. How do engineers protect streams and wetlands from chemicals used in firefighting? Have all of these costs been factored?
48. The feasibility study mentions flowing water under the existing building, but neither the feasibility study nor the survey show streams. Should they?

49. W5B's recommendation to retrofit Saranac Lake's emergency services complex into an existing structure appears to make it bigger than we need and does not optimizing areas that could be shared. Presumably, one advantage of joining forces is to maximize shared space. Why do we need multiple dorms (one for police and another for fire)? Are there ways to make the design more efficient (combined dispatch, dorms, and parking) to economize on building costs, heating costs, and maintenance costs? Has W5B projected the costs of heating a @70,000 sq. ft. structure in Saranac Lake's climate?
50. Is it W5B's recommendation that the egress of emergency vehicles funnel into school zones where young pedestrians, school buses, and after school game parking exist? What is the liability to the village and residents if a collision should occur?
51. The W5B proposal of March, gives examples of their work but does not provide the size of the community for which those projects were built. Please provide examples for a community the size of Saranac Lake. In other words, what is the ideal size of an emergency services complex for a village of 5,500 people?
52. Since W5B is proposing a location adjacent to Saranac Lake's public schools, are there environmental impact studies that look at the impact of repeated sirens during the course of a school day on the psyche of young students?
53. The W5B study states that one of the advantages of the site at 33 Petrova is the size (@15 acres). However, not all of that acreage is usable/buildable due to wetlands. What is the usable acreage?
54. Can the proposed egress support the weight of the heaviest fire trucks since it is also subject to wetlands jurisdiction? It seems an egregious oversight not to include wetlands review for numerous reasons. The proposal states that water is under the building and deterioration of steel and cement is evident from running water. What portion of the \$27million estimated costs address water issues on the site? What can we learn from the fact that the new Tupper Lake fire department bays, built on wetlands, are sinking?
55. The W5B proposal states that further design modifications to the site are required due to a grading conflict that requires the elimination of woodlands between the build out of the facility and the residential neighborhood. Can anything be done to maintain that buffer between residential and industrial?
56. The W5B proposal states how many parking bays are required for a facility that will be adaptive for 20 years. How does this projection correlate with the number of vehicles Saranac Lake currently owns? Does this projection assume the acquisition costs of additional vehicles? Are those included in the \$27million costs?
57. On the plans of the W5B proposal, there is 12,500 sq. ft. of "staff support." What is that?

Building & Grounds Assessment

58. Has the St. Pius school building been assessed for the presence of lead (such as in pipes or paint)?

- a. If no, when will the assessment be completed?
- b. If yes, what were the findings and what are the costs of any needed mitigation?

59. Has the St. Pius school building been assessed for the presence of asbestos?

- a. If no, when will the assessment be completed?
- b. If yes, what were the findings and what are the costs of any needed mitigation?

60. Has the St. Pius school building been assessed for the presence of mold?

- a. If no, when will the assessment be completed?
- b. If yes, what were the findings and what are the costs of any needed mitigation?

61. Has the creek on the St. Pius school property been assessed to determine the source of the “blue/green” substance in the water?

- a. If no, when will the assessment be completed?
- b. If yes, what were the findings and what are the costs of any needed mitigation?

Design

62. What is the projected square footage of the impervious surface (roofs, parking, and other non-porous surfaces) of the proposed design?

63. How will storm water from these impervious surfaces be managed?

64. How many cubic yards of soil will be removed to expand the building and parking?

65. Where will any excess soil be moved to?

66. Will there be any areas filled with soil from onsite or offsite?

67. How many trees will be removed to accommodate the proposed design?

68. Is there a landscaping plan that illustrates how the visual and environmental impacts of tree removal will be mitigated?

69. How has and/or will the proposed design be modified now that the wetlands have been delineated?

70. How will carcinogens, such as PFAS in fire retardant, from the showers, laundry, and other sources be managed?
71. Will any of the wastewater be sent to the Village of Saranac Lake's sewage treatment plant?

Cost and Alternative Assessment

72. Has the Village Board disclosed what its budget is to build the facility and to maintain it?
73. Have you determined the annual maintenance costs of the proposed facility?
74. If the Village of Saranac Lake could only afford to build a 30,000 square foot facility (twice the size of Tupper Lake), how would you answer the following questions?
75. Can you design one "living unit" (kitchen/lounge/dorms) to serve all of the emergency services instead of duplicating them?
76. Which equipment is used seasonally and/or only for special services? Can this equipment be stored offsite?
77. Can the proposed training tower be built at a different site as a free-standing unit (such as in an industrial park, gravel pit, or other site unsuitable for housing or educational services)?
78. Have you investigated options for the various emergency services departments to utilize gym/athletic facilities at existing facilities that are already maintained in the community?

Process

79. What is the next step in your proposed design process?
80. Have you developed a community engagement plan?
81. Will there be a public referendum on the expenditure of the capital construction costs?
82. How much more space would be needed for the Broadway site to accommodate all three services?
83. Is the existing space adequate for just fire and rescue? Adequate for just police station?
84. Does the Pius building meet the space needs of all three emergency services?
85. What is the cost of repurposing this facility to meet the needs of emergency services?
86. Would it be more cost effective to tear down the existing building and build an energy efficient state of the art building?

87. How important is it for emergency services to have direct access to Route 3?
88. How important is it for the neighborhood to support these services in the neighborhood?
89. It appears that the proposed egress to Route 3 through wetlands will not be pursued. Has a safe plan been developed for the egress of emergency vehicles onto village streets which have an elementary school and athletic fields within a couple of blocks?
90. The Village’s RFQ under section IV requests examples of three similar facilities successfully completed within the past five years. Your Design Qualifications shows no completed joint police, fire and rescue facilities. Has Five Bugles successfully completed any 3-service projects similar to the one proposed for Saranac Lake?
91. In the village’s RFQ, section III (a): “Scope of Services Requested from the Architect” lists “Bond vote preliminary tax impact calculations.” In your Design qualifications under Task E of the scope of services for phase one, your team promised “estimates of probable cost and tax impact.”
92. Did Five Bugles deliver an estimate of the project’s tax impact—either for construction or operations and maintenance—at any point during the feasibility study? Were calculations ever made by your team on bonding for all or part of the total cost of the project?
93. 3. On the broader issue of budget, did Five Bugles at any point discuss an over-all budget for the project, or consider a limit to the community’s ability to afford a multi-million dollar project? If so, what spending limit was determined between you and your client?

Feasibility Study

94. In rationalizing the \$27 million price tag of the Saranac Lake Public Safety Building, Five Bugles’ feasibility study calculates the cost of building individual service buildings as follows:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost/Area</u>
Fire	34,322 sq. ft.	\$20,560,799	\$599.06/sq. ft.
EMT	19,586 sq. ft.	\$12,172,331	\$621.48/sq. ft.
Police	16,333 sq. ft.	\$10,320,560	\$631.88/sq. ft.

By contrast, thirteen of Five Bugles’ recent projects listed in your Design Qualifications and on your website range in price from \$173 to \$378 per square foot, with the median around \$200/sq. ft.

96. Why do you calculate it is over twice as expensive to build a police, fire or EMT facility in Saranac Lake than in Wisconsin or Minnesota?
97. On the matter of scale, what is the largest (square footage) public safety project Five Bugles' team has ever completed? What is the most expensive?
98. What is the largest public safety project Five Bugles' team has ever completed for a community of less than 7,000 population? What is the most expensive for a community of less than 7,000?
99. Finally, the feasibility notes the significant challenges of parking and traffic flow at the 33 Petrova site. The conceptual design shows a main access to the site for fire and rescue apparatus on a new road that crosses a wetlands to LaPan highway.
100. If the access road to LaPan highway is not permitted by the regional planning agency, and all emergency traffic must be rerouted along Bay Boulevard or Petrova Ave. (both within separate school zones), Is the project still feasible? And at what extra cost in terms of upgrading the roads and sidewalks to insure safety?

Comment: The limitations of the 33 Petrova site are not as visible as the constraints of some other potential sites. All potential emergency services sites in our community pose challenges, and all sites should be evaluated and compared in equal detail. My sense is that people glance at the 33 Petrova property and assume all of it is usable when in fact only a fraction of the site may be suitable for construction and this type of use given wetlands, slopes, easements, egress, safety and neighborhood character. The site's limitations seem to be forcing impacts toward residential areas rather than away. The impacts would be compounded by proposing a renovation and expansion of enormous size and refusal to seek Route 3 egress. A clean-slate approach of an expandable, need-based fire/ambulance concept closer to Route 3 and with egress only to Route 3 might avert the most significant neighborhood, pedestrian, student, traffic, sports-field conflicts, but a local business would be dislocated (it may be dislocated under any scenario; the feasibility does not make that clear). Engineers may be able to find less-problematic solutions elsewhere in the village including consideration of multiple sites. The October 2023 feasibility study underscores the importance of having engineers look thoroughly at all potential sites. This is a statement not a question, but if you had objective thoughts please share them.

Village Board Questions

1. As a Village taxpayer, what will be the annual cost to maintain and operate the proposed 69,000 square foot facility? In other words, how much can I expect my tax liability to increase?
2. Is the size of the proposed facility a want or a need for a village the size of Saranac Lake? What are the known projections for population growth in our community for the next decade, 50 years, or 100 years?
3. Has a needs-based assessment of the present service facilities been considered, with a cost comparison between the proposed facility and existing facilities with their renovations and expansion? Could parts of Broadway structures be used with new facilities added on?
4. How did the Board determine that 33 Petrova was the best site for the project?
- especially because it is further from downtown where such services would be centrally located, and because the character of a neighborhood would be significantly altered, because it is on a wetlands, but most importantly because the Village presently owns property contiguous to the present locations of each facility, where renovation and expansion could take place.
5. *As a community member,* I want our first responders to have modern, efficient spaces. Can we have a community-based process for solving this shared problem?
6. Can we have a Village resident/homeowner in the Petrova neighborhood and a community member concerned with the fiscal impact of this expensive capital project participate in a local advisory group to define the current proposal?
7. What are the factors that led the Board to decide against applying for a wetlands permit from the APA?
8. Will the Village post on its website all relevant documents* and answers to resident questions before the proposed January public forum? *cost comparisons, environmental and other due diligence reports.
9. Has the Village considered hiring a local firm to critique the work conducted by Five Bugles Design, and propose alternative approaches, if necessary?
10. As a neighborhood resident, what is the average diminution of property values of residences in close proximity to a combined emergency services building? How common

is it to site these facilities in residential neighborhoods? Will the Village make just compensation to the homeowners for such a fundamental change in their neighborhood?

11. Will there be a traffic study to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the neighborhood?
12. What is the plan for access for each service to and from the site?
13. How will lighting for police and rescue facilities be minimized?
14. What will be the policy on siren usage in a residential neighborhood?
15. When will the SEQR impact assessment on neighborhood quality, human health, and other factors be conducted? How will residents and homeowners in the Petrova neighborhood be able to participate in the process?
16. Do engineers think that constraints mentioned by Village officials of the Broadway properties are insurmountable?
17. Has the \$40,000 fee for W5B's proposal been exhausted?
18. Can Saranac Lake engage a regional professional organization, like AEP Northeast, to review the findings of W5B?
19. If the scale of the W5B proposal is bloated due to using the existing footprint of Pious (which was always expensive to run), then the comparison between the cost of retrofitting and building new at the same size is irrelevant. Who can make a more apt comparison of the cost of retrofitting Pious versus building a new facility that efficiently meets the needs of Saranac Lake's emergency services?
20. How can this project be LEED certified, so it is in keeping with the values of our community?
21. Can we step back and look holistically at the village's pressing needs that include short term housing and make a comprehensive long-range plan that looks at other potential sites for the emergency services complex? The 2012 AEP Northeast study looked at the Public Works site on Van Buren Street next to Kinney's. There are other sites...
22. What is going to happen to the mental health services which will be displaced in the existing police building on 1-3 Main?
23. Maintenance: What are the estimated costs for maintaining the facility for the next 20 years? What other hidden costs have yet to be factored into this project considering wetlands and potential remediation issues of the site? What will be the cost to taxpayers for this additional scope of work?

24. If the W5B proposal is accepted, and they are guaranteed the contract to build it, what outside professional checks and balances will be in place? Is W5B's work guaranteed for the 20-year scope of the project that they defined?
25. State troopers currently have a canine unit. Why does SLPD need one now that marijuana is now legal in New York? Can we share a K-9 unit? Can we afford one?
26. Would the emergency services chiefs please outline for us: What improvements do you absolutely need?
27. Will the Village revisit its RFQ for a feasibility study that is based on needs, not wants, for emergency services to scale with other communities of its size?
28. When analyzing available property within the village - for emergency services or otherwise - will the Village seriously analyze all possibilities for the property as it relates to the needs and best use of the property based on size, scope and location - before deciding to commission a study for a singular specific purpose?
29. When possibilities for emergency services improvement are identified - as a singular complex, expansion of existing, or new properties for separate services - will the Village involve other stakeholders in the decision process in addition to emergency services representatives and elected officials.
30. Have Village officials discussed with the town of Harrietstown the reuse of the NYS Armory on route 3 for fire and rescue services. The armory was surplus in 2016 by NY State. My understanding is that the site was dismissed as a possible site by the village because the access for fire trucks was too steep. (There are several steeper hills within the community than the Armory access road. And because of the size of the parcel, 19 or 30 acres? There may be alternative access routes.)
31. The armory, itself, is more than 20,000 square ft. The Tupper Lake Emergency Services Building is 14,900 SF and houses Fire and Police. Why was this building dismissed? A vote by 2 legislatures could result in the building being given to the community.
32. Why not consider the armory for fire and rescue and repurpose the fire house on Broadway for police? Isn't it important for police to be more visible?
33. Has there been a serious discussion of the cost of improving emergency services? Tupper Lakes Emergency Building cost \$3.7million 8 years ago. How do you plan to meet the needs of emergency service personnel and the community? Do you have a process that will provide a result that the community can afford?
34. Based on the Village's fiscal planning and its tentative commitments of funding from federal (and State?) officials, what is the expected maximum local share of capital investment in an Emergency Services Facility (ESF)? How is this local share expected to

be financed (general fund, spending down of reserves, bonds, etc.), and in what proportions?

35. How could the scale/design of this project change if the expected level of federal (and State?) funding fails to materialize?
36. What guidance on facility scale, function and design has the Village requested from other northern NY communities and from the NYS Department of State?
37. What was the logic behind the decision to select Wendel's Five Bugles Design as the consultant for this project?
38. Before selecting Wendel's Five Bugles Design, did the Village consult with the NYS Department of State and did the Village request a list of other qualified design firms which had conducted similar projects in rural areas of New York?
39. Has the Village considered hiring a local or regional design/build firm to evaluate and critique the work conducted by Wendel's Five Bugles Design and to possibly propose an alternative program?
40. It seems that it would be wise to consider demolishing the entire St. Pius XII school structure as it is too big and inefficient. Should the Village consider building an entirely new "right-sized" structure on the site more in line with the real needs of our emergency services, with or without the Police Department and consistent with the Village's commitment to being climate smart? This alternative capital investment could significantly reduce the Village's life-cycle costs for the structure including heating and maintenance.
41. With the Mayor's stated goal of having a facility which can serve local needs long into the future, is it the wisest course to over-build now rather than ensuring that the building's design and placement can accommodate a significant expansion when needed?
42. Was a full alternatives analysis conducted before determining that the Petrova site is the best location in the Village for development of the proposed Emergency Services Facility? If so, please provide details of all alternatives that were evaluated. Are any aspects of an alternatives analysis still underway?
43. Will the Village make a firm commitment to not sign a lease with the State of New York for 1-3 Main Street until: 1) a full evaluation of all alternatives for housing Saranac Lake's emergency services (Fire, Rescue, Police) is completed; and 2) the Village's conclusions regarding the location(s), scale and scope of the building program are fully discussed with the Saranac Lake community?

44. Please fully explain what analyses were conducted which resulted in the decision to eliminate direct access for emergency vehicles to Route 3 on a new service road crossing the Class 1 wetland. Fully explain the logic behind avoiding an application for a wetlands permit from the Adirondack Park Agency since this new direct service road has been considered an important way to protect homeowners and property values in the Petrova neighborhood.
45. Please explain the composition of the local advisory group which has been working with the Village Board and the Consultant to define the current proposal for the Emergency Service Facility. What representation is there on the advisory group for residents/homeowners in the Petrova neighborhood and for those in the community concerned about the fiscal impact of what in any configuration is an expensive capital project?
46. What is the target date for the completion of the Village's purchase of the Petrova Avenue site? What is the expected date of adoption of a development plan by the Village Board? What is the timetable for arranging financing for the proposed project? What is the timetable for construction and completion of the facility?
47. Please detail what legal advice has been given to the Village to ensure full compliance with the State's Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for all aspects of this project, including the purchase of the Petrova Avenue site?
48. When is the SEQR impact assessment for the proposed facility scheduled to be conducted?
49. Has the annual cost to Village taxpayers to maintain and operate such a huge facility been estimated as of yet?
50. It appears that the proposed egress to Route 3 through wetlands will not be pursued. Has a safe plan been developed for the egress of emergency vehicles onto village streets which have an elementary school and athletic fields within a couple of blocks?
51. What are the shared goals and objectives the Village has established for evaluating options for new facilities? If there are none, will the board go through a process of establishing them?
52. When did the Village Board decide to locate all emergency services departments in a shared facility?

53. In addition to renovation of the existing building at 33 Petrova, will you fully consider demolition and new construction at 33 Petrova Ave., 100 Broadway, and the Armory as options for one or more departments?
54. Will you conduct a full location analysis for several sites, including but not limited to 33 Petrova Ave., 100 Broadway, and the Armory, using standard criteria such as topography, access, traffic, noise, response times, cost and surrounding land uses?
55. How much can the Village afford for new facilities?
56. How will the Village determine what is affordable?
57. What is the preliminary financing plan for the project?
58. What funding sources have been identified that will make the renovation of 33 Petrova Ave., compared to new construction, an attractive option? If there is indeed funding available for renovation, wouldn't it also be available for the existing fire station at 100 Broadway?
59. What is the preliminary timeline for the project?
60. Will you provide a list of laws, regulations, rules, standards and best practices that are applicable to the design and operation of emergency service facilities and that were used by Wendels Five Bugles to determine the space needs analysis?
61. Will you provide a list of needs and requirements for new facilities versus wants or best practices?
62. What is the status of the redesign of the 33 Petrova Ave. site to avoid wetlands?
63. Does the Village plan to build a road through or over the wetlands to NYS Route 3 to access 33 Petrova Ave?
64. Do all vehicles need to be stored in climate-controlled bays? What vehicles could be stored outside or in unheated space? What is the cost savings of not storing all vehicles indoors?
65. Are there any other uses planned for the proposed public safety building at 33 Petrova besides the village fire department, police department and rescue squad?
66. What specific aspects of the project will the rescue squad, being a not-for-profit entity separate from the village, be responsible for funding?

67. Will any of the revenue from billing for ambulance transportation, donations to the rescued squad, or contracts with surrounding townships be used to cover the cost of the project and/or the monthly operating costs for the facility?
68. Are the services that will be located in this facility planning on hosting training sessions for visiting teams of responders?
69. How will these facilities mitigate an increase in noise pollution from sirens in the neighborhood, especially during quiet hours?
70. Is it possible to reinforce the floor so that vehicles can be parked in bays within the current footprint of the structure?
71. Would you consider putting together a comparison of different evaluations, both of facility needs as well as assessment of previous sites?
72. Has an assessment of the armory building located on route 3 been performed to a similar level as 33 Petrova?
73. Will there be neighborhood and community representation on the Emergency Services Board? If so, how will you choose the representatives?
74. What, exactly, is the final proposal for the Petrova/Pius site, especially as regards ingress and egress for police, rescue and fire vehicles?
75. What assumption is the Village Board making in regard to financing the Petrova/Pius site construction by means of state and/or Federal grants? What is the basis for this assumption? Is the Board willing to make available to the public all communications to date with state and Federal officials regarding this project? What is the projected timeline for grant award(s), final construction/site plans and start of construction?
76. If the Village fails to obtain Federal and/or state grants sufficient to cover the costs of project assessments and construction (\$40 million), does the Village Board intend to pursue the project described in the March 2023 presentation and the October 2023 Feasibility Report? If so, what are the property tax implications for Village property owners? If not, what design option is the Board intending to pursue? Has that contingency been addressed in any alternative design prepared by Wendel Five Bugles? Please provide that alternative.

77. In March 2022, the Village Board established a "Public Safety Facilities Reserve Fund" of \$2.5 million, citing the need for "upgraded and secure facilities for our volunteer firefighters and police force " The stated purpose of this Fund "is to accumulate moneys to build and retrofit the existing police, fire, and/or public safety buildings, perhaps combining the services into one Public Safety Building." Notwithstanding the language of the resolution, at its February 13, 2023 meeting, the Village Board authorizing the expenditure of \$350,000 from the Reserve Fund to purchase the 15-acre parcel at 33 Petrova Avenue. A week later the Board appeared to correct the legal error by approving a "budget adjustment" to the General Fund to cover the cost of the land purchase. But, the local newspaper has recently described the expenditure as being made from the Reserve Fund. And, the Village Board appears to have approved expenditures from the Fund to cover the cost of preparing the conceptual plan for a public safety building on the Petrova site. Please provide an exact accounting of all expenditures made from the Reserve Fund since its creation.

78. In 2016 New York State closed the Armory on Route 3, a building situated on 30 acres of land within the Town of Harrietstown with a portion within the Village limits. For several years prior to the closing Village officials lobbied the State to transfer ownership so the building (20,000 square feet) could be used a facility for the fire department (then including the rescue squad) and the police department. The Town, which had originally purchased the parcel and donated it to the State (in about 1958) for construction of a new armory, was interested re-acquiring a portion of the parcel to expand the Dewey Mountain recreational area. Legal questions (similar to the closed prisons issue) were raised in 2016 about such proposals, with legal research described as on-going among State officials. It is unclear (there are no further Enterprise articles could be found on-line) what happened to these proposals.

When questioned about the potential use of the armory, Village officials have recently been vague and even dismissive of the idea. The mayor stated (Village Board meeting - 2/27 /23) that the "armory could not be used", in part, because of the "slope of the driveway". Who, exactly, determined this purported slope obstacle? When did that occur? Please make available to the public the report/communication establishing this fact. Has the possibility of re-grading the driveway (something far less complicated than re-engineering the Pius building situated within wetlands above a flowing stream) even been considered? Within a 30-acre parcel, this would seem, at the least, to be plausible. We suggest the legal question regarding possible Forest Preserve status might be solved, especially by legislative votes and constitutional amendment, especially since there is the unique history of Harrietstown having donated the land in the first place.

The Mayor also cited "traffic speed" on route 3 as an obstacle to re-use of the Armory building as a public safety building. Again, who made this determination? When was it made? Is the conclusion/observation in writing such that the public can review it? Whatever the traffic speed, we note that the site line from the Armory property, elevated

as it is, is excellent. In fact, posted speed limit at the Armory entrance is 45 mph, exactly the same as it is at the possible entrance/exit from the Petrova site only a very short distance along the very same highway. We cannot find any mention of "traffic speed" as an obstacle for accessing the Petrova/Pius from Route 3 (focus has been on wetlands disturbance)

Village residents have repeatedly asked about analysis of potential impacts under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. To date the Village has avoided SEQR requirements, in the first instance by voting to purchase the Petrova Pius parcel with absolutely no mention of such requirements. The mayor said that time was of the essence. The Village has also avoided SEQR requirements by segmenting different phases of the project to make them appear unrelated, e.g., the re-zoning, the property purchase, the 2-lot subdivision (treated as if there were no particular plans). Now it is critical to know whether a particular construction/site plan development proposal will "involve wetlands", in which case it would be a class A regional project under the APA Act and exempt from SEQR review. If not, it would appear, SEQR provisions apply. Has the Village Board submitted a jurisdictional inquiry to the APA? If not, why not? And when will this be accomplished? If SEQR applies, does the Village Board intend to assert lead agency status?

101. What, exactly, is the final proposal for the Petrova/Pius site, especially as regards ingress and egress for police, rescue and fire vehicles?
102. What assumption is the Village Board making in regard to financing the Petrova/Pius site construction by means of state and/or Federal grants? What is the basis for this assumption? Is the Board willing to make available to the public all communications to date with state and Federal officials regarding this project? What is the projected time-line for grant award(s), final construction/site plans and start of construction?
103. If the Village fails to obtain Federal and/or state grants sufficient to cover the costs of project assessments and construction (\$40 million), does the Village Board intend to pursue the project described in the March 2023 presentation and the October 2023 Feasibility Report? If so, what are the property tax implications for Village property owners? If not, what design option is the Board intending to pursue? Has that contingency been addressed in any alternative design prepared by Wendel Five Bugles? Please provide that alternative.