

Questions Directed to the Village of Saranac Lake

These responses are based on the best information to which we have access at this time and are subject to change/modification as the project moves forward.

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?

ANSWER: Unknown at this time – there will be more information once all funding opportunities have been explored.

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, 100 years?

ANSWER: Programming is the very first step of design and our team has completed the process of programming more than 300 public safety projects. We ask our clients to forecast future needs for the next 20 years and then go through the exercise of paring back the project in future phases if the client desires. This process allows us to document what was adjusted/eliminated and ensures that the facility is not missing key components, both now and in the future.

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?

ANSWER: Each agency was asked to complete a needs assessment for a facility with a projected 20-year lifetime. Renovation/expansion of existing facilities is not practical, given the age and condition of the structures, the needs identified by each service, current building codes, and NFPA standards.

4. Could parts of Broadway structures be used with new facilities added on?

ANSWER: This is not a viable option for our emergency services, per the completed feasibility study.

5. 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 wetlands, but most importantly because the Village owns property contiguous to the present locations of each facility, where renovation and expansion could take place.

ANSWER: Many challenges with the existing site present when considering expansion to the existing facilities or even demolition and new construction on the existing site. As mentioned, the topography, irregular shape, stormwater, and parking are all going to be problematic. Other things to consider are making the existing facilities compliant with envelope and current code requirements, where emergency services will operate during construction, storm sewer that runs behind the facility, appropriate exiting for apparatus while responding to emergencies, age of the current facilities, scale of such additions to the current facilities, required/requested/programmed square footage, etc. Taking all items into account led the building committee to the conclusion that building on the existing site was not feasible.

6. 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?

ANSWER: We invite all members of the community to be involved with this project. Community members are always invited to come to informational meetings, and public members will soon be added to the Public Safety Building Committee.

7. Can we have a Village resident/homeowner in the Petrova neighborhood and a community member concerned with the fiscal impact of the expensive capital project participate in a local advisory group to define the current proposal?

ANSWER: We invite all members of the community to be involved with this project. Community members are always invited to come to informational meetings, and public members will soon be added to the Public Safety Building Committee.

7. What are the factors that led the Board to decide against applying for a wetlands permit from the APA?

ANSWER: Members of the public raised concerns that it would present a potential conflict of interest for the Village to do so.

8. Will the Village post on its website all relevant documents (cost comparisons, environmental and other due diligence reports) and answers to resident questions before the proposed January public forum?

ANSWER: The village is working to answer questions and post all relevant documents, which will be updated as necessary.

9. Has the Village considered hiring a local firm to critique the work conducted by Five Bugles Design, and propose alternative approaches, if necessary?

ANSWER: The Public Safety Building Committee and Village Board does not believe this is a fiscally responsible way to spend funds towards this project.

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?

ANSWER: There is no data to suggest that property values will decrease, however some insurance agencies do value proximity to emergency services and individual rates may decrease.

11. Will there be a traffic study to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the neighborhood?

ANSWER: Yes.

12. What is the plan for access for each service to and from the site?

ANSWER: Bay Blvd. will be used as much as possible for all services.

13. How will lighting for police and rescue facilities be minimized?

ANSWER: There are no minimum requirements for exterior lighting, other than normal Village code. Cut-off fixtures are applicable to mitigate light pollution at the site, per the municipality's requirements.

14. What will be the policy on siren usage in a residential neighborhood?

ANSWER: Siren usage will be left to the discretion of each service's leadership.

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?

ANSWER: SEQR impact assessment will be completed during the first phase of design. The Village will hold a public hearing where all residents will have the opportunity to participate.

16. Do engineers think that constraints mentioned by Village officials of the Broadway properties are insurmountable?

ANSWER: Yes.

17. Has the \$40,000 fee for WFB's proposal been exhausted?

ANSWER: Yes

18. Can Saranac Lake engage a regional professional organization, like AEP Northeast, to review the findings of W5B?

ANSWER: The Public Safety Building Committee and Village Board does not believe this is a fiscally responsible way to spend funds towards this project.

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?

ANSWER: Please refer to the feasibility study to cross reference the cost of retrofitting versus building new.

20. How can this project be LEED certified so it is in keeping with the values of our community?

ANSWER: LEED certification will be explored in the first phase of design.

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....

ANSWER: A search for potential sites has been ongoing for forty years, without success. The Village has been, and will remain, committed to identifying housing solutions and has already taken multiple significant steps toward this goal, including the development and passage of a Village short-term rental law, ongoing work to update the Village's master land use table, support for the Lofts housing project, and identification of the sandpit behind Aldi as a promising site for future housing development. Van Buren Street is not a viable option, as the Village garage and Department of Public works are already located there, with no extra space for another building.

22. What is going to happen to the mental health services which will be displaced in the existing police building on 1-3 Main?

ANSWER: Some of these staff members will be relocated within Saranac Lake to a new location and some staff will be stationed in Tupper Lake.

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 the project considering wetlands and potential remediation issues of the site? What will be the cost to taxpayers for this additional work?

ANSWER: More data will become available as the design process moves forward.

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?

ANSWER: W5B is not contracted to build the structure but will be involved in all phases of design/construction to ensure the building stays true to the initial design process.

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?

ANSWER: Currently, the SLPD does not have a working K-9 unit. However, there is desire to keep our future options open.

26. Would the emergency services chiefs please outline for us: What improvements do you absolutely need?

ANSWER: Please refer to the programming in the feasibility study.

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?

ANSWER: The Village, in conjunction with emergency service professionals, believes that these are, in fact, needs – not wants – to ensure that as our village grows, we can continue to provide high-quality emergency services to residents and visitors.

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 singular specific purpose?

ANSWER: Yes. However, we will not conduct a formal feasibility study for every conceivable use.

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?

ANSWER: Yes.

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 surplused 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.)

ANSWER: The Armory is unavailable for long-term use.

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.

ANSWER: The Armory is unavailable for long-term use.

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?

ANSWER: The Armory is unavailable for long-term use.

33. Has there been serious discussion of the cost of improving emergency services?
Tupper Lake's Emergency Building cost \$3.7 million 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?

ANSWER: We are exploring all funding opportunities to offset the overall cost to village taxpayers.

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 reserves, bonds, etc.), and in what proportions?

ANSWER: We do not yet have enough data to answer this question, but will provide the public with additional information as soon as possible.

35. How could the scale/design of this project change if the expected level of federal (and State?) funding fails to materialize?

ANSWER: We will not cut required square footage based on funding. Instead, we will exhaust every option for outside funding, to maintain the integrity of the requisite design to sufficiently support our emergency services departments.

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?

ANSWER: Emergency services department heads, along with W5B, have contacted numerous emergency service departments in the area and believe the proposed scale is appropriate.

37. What was the logic behind the decision to select Wendel's (sic) Five Bugles Design as the consultant for this project?

ANSWER: Representatives from Saranac Lake emergency services entities were sent to an emergency services building conference in Chicago. There was then a

request for proposals issued for a feasibility study. The top three proposals were selected, and then in-person interviews held. Wendel Five Bugles Design was ultimately selected.

38. Before selecting Wendel's (sic) 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?

ANSWER: Through our RFP process, many qualified design firms submitted proposals, all of which were thoroughly reviewed.

39. Has the Village considered hiring a local or regional design/build firm to evaluate and critique the work conducted by Wendel's (sic) Five Bugles and to possibly propose an alternative program?

ANSWER: The Public Safety Building Committee and Village Board do not consider this to be a fiscally responsible way to spend funds for this project.

40. It seems that it would be wise to consider demolishing the entire St. Pious 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.

ANSWER: The cost of a complete rebuild is \$13 million more than the cost of adaptive reuse/renovation, without considering removal costs of the old building. The carbon footprint of a complete demo/rebuild is also substantially greater.

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?

ANSWER: The size of the building is appropriate for current operations and can be designated as an emergency operations center (EOC) for the Village of Saranac Lake and surrounding areas, as we have the largest district in NYS for combined service coverage.

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?

ANSWER: All other areas, including 400 Broadway, The Armory, Van Buren Street, and 1-3 Main Street were considered. These options were not viable for appropriate accommodation of emergency services.

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?

ANSWER: This project is not connected with 1-3 Main Street.

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 I 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.

ANSWER: Members of the public stated they felt this was unethical. Therefore, we are working to explore all other options.

45. a. 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.

ANSWER: The committee currently consists of the mayor (ex officio), a village trustee (ex officio), and representatives of police, fire, and EMS services.

- b. 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?

ANSWER: Members of the public will soon be added to this committee.

46. a. What is the target date for the completion of the Village's purchase of the Petrova Avenue site?

ANSWER: The site was purchased last year.

- b. What is the expected date of adoption of a development plan by the Village Board?

ANSWER: Unknown at this time.

- c. What is the timetable for arranging financing for the proposed project?

ANSWER: Financing is an ongoing effort and will continue as long as necessary.

- d. What is the timetable for construction and completion of the facility?

ANSWER: We will not have an answer to this question until the design phase and exploration of all funding options are further along.

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?

ANSWER: In consultation with W5B and the village attorney, SEQR will be a part of the first phase of design.

48. When is the SEQRA impact assessment for the proposed facility scheduled to be conducted?

ANSWER: SEQRA will be completed in the first phase of design.

49. Has the annual cost to Village taxpayers to maintain and operate such a huge facility been estimated as of yet?

ANSWER: Annual maintenance costs cannot be determined until building design and materials are finalized.

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?

ANSWER: Emergency service vehicles will ingress/egress via Bay Blvd. whenever possible.

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?

ANSWER: The committee created by the village has evaluated, and will continue to evaluate, options for the new facilities. These options will be communicated to the Village Board.

52. When did the Village Board decide to locate all emergency services departments in a shared facility?

ANSWER: The previous administration set aside \$2.5 million to start a shared facility effort. The previous village board voted unanimously to purchase 33 Petrova

for this purpose.

53. In addition to renovation of the existing building at 33 Petrova, will you consider demolition and new construction at 33 Petrova Ave., 100 Broadway, and the Armory as options for one or more departments?

ANSWER: The Armory is unavailable for long-term use and demolition/new construction would increase the project's overall cost by approximately \$13 million.

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?

ANSWER: This analysis was undertaken by the planning committee. The results established that: 1) the Armory is unavailable for long-term use (per NY State); 2) 100 Broadway is inadequate with regard to physical space, traffic patterns, and optimized land use.

55. How much can the Village afford for new facilities?

ANSWER: Efforts are ongoing to secure outside funding, which will determine how much the Village can afford to spend on this initiative.

56. How will the Village determine what is affordable?

ANSWER: The Village will continue to evaluate competing infrastructure projects, priorities, and costs to determine overall affordability.

57. What is the preliminary financing plan for the project?

ANSWER: Financing options are under evaluation and outside funding efforts are ongoing.

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?

ANSWER: The cost of new construction is approximately 40% greater than renovation of an existing building. New additions to 100 Broadway are not feasible, due to building's structural integrity/age of plant. Engineers have communicated to the Village that 100 Broadway is not suitable, regardless of cost, due to site challenges highlighted previously in this document.

59. What is the preliminary timeline for the project?

ANSWER: The preliminary project timeline is still to be determined.

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 Wendel Five Bugles to determine the space needs analysis?

ANSWER: Space needs analysis is ongoing, and all laws, regulations, and rules are being followed throughout this process. Standards and best practices inform decision making and are heeded to the greatest degree possible, in consultation with project engineers and emergency services department heads.

61. Will you provide a list of needs and requirements for new facilities versus wants or best practices?

ANSWER: Emergency services leadership feels that the size and scope of the project are appropriate.

62. What is the status of the redesign of the 33 Petrova Ave. site to avoid wetlands?

ANSWER: This process is ongoing and will continue during the first phase of design.

63. Does the Village plan to build a road through or over the wetlands to NYS Route 3 to access 33 Petrova Ave?

ANSWER: Not currently.

64. Do all vehicles need to be stored in climate-controlled bays?

ANSWER: Yes.

- b. What vehicles could be stored outside or in unheated space?

ANSWER: Fire Department watercraft could be stored outside or in unheated space.

- c. What is the cost savings of not storing all vehicles indoors?

ANSWER: There is no tangible cost savings, as most all vehicles must be stored inside.

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?

ANSWER: An emergency operations center (EOC) will be programmed in the gymnasium and potentially available to the community when not in use. Additionally, regional emergency services trainings will be possible at this facility, which is a change from the past.

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?

ANSWER: Discussions with SLVRS are ongoing. They are willing to contribute to the building in any way they can.

67. Will any of the revenue from billing for ambulance transportation, donations to the rescue squad, or contracts with surrounding townships be used to cover the cost of the project and/or the monthly operating costs for the facility?

ANSWER: Revenue derived from billing, charitable contributions, and service contracts is used to cover operating expenses of the rescue squad.

68. Are the services that will be located in the facility planning on hosting training sessions for visiting teams of responders?

ANSWER: Yes.

69. How will these facilities mitigate an increase in noise pollution from sirens in the neighborhood, especially during quiet hours?

ANSWER: Sirens will be utilized at the discretion of emergency services leadership, who are well aware of – and sympathetic to – the concerns of nearby property owners.

70. Is it possible to reinforce the floor so that vehicles can be parked in bays within the current footprint of the structure?

ANSWER: No, as the building is constructed on piers. In any event, there are insufficient clearances within the existing building to accommodate emergency service vehicles.

71. Would you consider putting together a comparison of different evaluations, both of facility needs as well as assessment of previous sites?

ANSWER: Much of this information is available on the Village website.

72. Has an assessment of the armory building located on route 3 been performed to a similar level as 33 Petrova?

ANSWER: The armory is unavailable for long-term use.

73. Will there be neighborhood and community representation on the Emergency Services Board? If so, how will you choose the representatives?

ANSWER: Yes. Letters of interest will be solicited and representatives will be selected.

74. What exactly, is the final proposal for the Petrova/Pious site, especially as regards ingress and egress for police, rescue, and fire?

ANSWER: Bay Blvd. will be utilized as much as possible.

75. What assumption is the Village Board making in regard to financing the Petrova/Pious 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?

ANSWER: The Village is making no assumptions – we will seek funding through every available source. Project-related information is posted on the village website. The projected timeline is unknown at this time, while financing and design efforts continue.

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.

ANSWER: The feasibility report outlines an estimated project cost at 33 Petrova of \$27.5 million. It would cost more than \$40 million to create a new facility from the ground up. Tax implications cannot be determined until all funding options have been exhausted.

77. Please provide an exact accounting of all expenditures made from the Reserve Fund since its creation (original question was abridged to remove background commentary).

ANSWER: All resolutions pertaining to reserve fund expenditures can be accessed on the village website.

78. The mayor stated that the “armory could not be used”, in part, because of the “slope of the driveway.” Who, exactly, determined this obstacle? When did it occur? Please make available to the public the report/communication establishing this fact. Has the possibility of re-grading the driveway...even been considered? (original question was abridged to remove commentary).

ANSWER: The Armory is unavailable for long-term utilization, per NYS.

79. 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? [original question was abridged to remove irrelevant commentary].

ANSWER: Traffic speed along with the grade of the driveway was a concern. Per NYS, the Armory is unavailable for long-term utilization and emergency services operations are not considered acceptable long-term uses for the site.

80. ...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 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?

ANSWER: The Village is making every effort to stay out of wetlands. Lead agency status has not been determined for the purposes of SEQR, at this time.

81. What, exactly, is the final proposal for the Petrova/Pious site, especially as regards ingress and egress for police, rescue, and fire vehicles?

ANSWER: Emergency service vehicles will utilize Bay Blvd.

82. What was the logic behind the decision to select Wendel's Five Bugles Design as the consultant for this project?

ANSWER: Representatives from Saranac Lake emergency services entities were sent to an emergency services building conference in Chicago. There was then a request for proposals issued for a feasibility study. The top three proposals were selected, and then in-person interviews held. Wendel Five Bugles Design was ultimately selected.

83. Has the annual cost to Village taxpayers to maintain and operate such a huge facility been estimated as of yet?

ANSWER: Unknown at this time – there will be more information once all funding opportunities have been explored and the design process is further along.

Questions directed to Wendel/ Five Bugles

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: Wendel/Five Bugles Design cannot comment on the report done by AES 12 years ago, as many factors could have changed within that time frame. Programming is the very first step of design and our team has completed the programming process on

more than 300 public safety projects. We ask our clients to forecast future needs for the next 20 years and then go through the exercise of paring back the project in future phases. For instance, the program did ask for 16,33 square feet for Police, 19,586 square feet for Rescue and 34,322 square feet for Fire. On the current conceptual plans though, we currently sit at 11,922 square feet for Police, 14,628 square feet for Rescue and 25,469 square feet for fire, with the rest available being circulation, mechanical, and community-driven spaces. So reductions in square footage have occurred and will continue to occur in the future phases of design.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: The intent in programming was for the ladder truck to be a drive-through bay. Placement of the ladder truck will be determined in future phases of design, which could result in shortening up the bay. The 18'-0" width is considered a programming standard to allow for all side doors/compartments to open appropriately. Reduction of the 18'-0" width could occur in the future phases of design if the Village wishes to adjust.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: Programming is the very first step of design and our team has completed the process of programming more than 300 public safety projects. We ask our clients to forecast future needs for the next 20 years and then go through the exercise of pairing back the project in future phases if the client desires. This process allows us to document what was adjusted/eliminated and ensures that the facility is not missing key components, both now and in the future.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law in 1990. The law scopes a series of standards for accessibility for the disabled (e.g., 2010 ADA Standards). Requirements for fire stations as public buildings are scoped under Title 2 of the Act, and public facilities are subject to higher accessibility standards than commercial and

residential developments. Convincing a local building official of an interpretation of an accessibility requirement is no guarantee the DOJ wouldn't find an issue during an audit conducted years after project completion. Also, the community is often touring these types of facilities and that includes disabled individuals who legally cannot be excluded from touring with non-disabled individuals.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: Many challenges with the existing site present when considering expansion to the existing facilities or even demolition and new construction on the existing site. As mentioned, the topography, irregular shape, stormwater, and parking are all going to be problematic. Other things to consider are making the existing facilities compliant with envelope and current code requirements, where emergency services will reside during construction, storm sewer that runs behind the facility, appropriate exiting for apparatus while responding in an emergency, age of the current facilities, scale of such additions to the current facilities, requested square footage, etc. Taking all items into account led the building committee to the conclusion that building on the existing site was not feasible.

QUESTIONS 6, 8: 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?

ANSWER: If remodel and additions were to have been the ultimate solution, keeping the historic status of the fire station intact would be the biggest impediment in a new design, but anything can be accomplished with the appropriate funding. As mentioned above, if remodeling a historic building, it still needs to be brought up to the current code and any additions would be required to match the scale and same design characteristics of the existing building. This could be done, but compounded with the items mentioned above in question 5, economics come into play.

QUESTION 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?)

ANSWER: The Rescue squad no longer owns the property referenced in this question.

QUESTION 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 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?

ANSWER: Rescue squad response distances and times within the Village of Saranac Lake (3 sq miles) for 61 calls thus far during July 2024 were estimated using data from Google maps for responses from either 110 Broadway or 33 Petrova (avoiding response routes that directly pass Petrova elementary school). Average response times (SD) were 3.83 (2.49) for 110 Broadway and 4.67 (2.08) for 33 Petrova. Average response times are both within the national standard of nine minutes. The national average response time is 7 minutes (see Table 1).

Average EMS response time for calls outside the Village, but within our 600 sq mile response area, for this period were 9.54 (9.32) for 110 Broadway and 11.45 (10.21) for 33 Petrova Average response times are both within the national average of 14 minutes (see Table 1).

NOTE: Ambulance fire drivers are in residence at HQ as are day crews and night crews (typically until midnight).

Fire truck drivers are in residence at HQ and respond directly to the fire scene while volunteers respond directly to the scene in personal vehicles.

Table 1. National EMS Response times ¹		
Category	Number	Mean (SD) ²
Suburban	1,538,203	7.7 (5.4)
Rural	68,283	14.5 (9.5)

QUESTIONS 10, 72-73: Concern budget for building maintenance, state and Federal funding: 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?

ANSWER: We will not cut required square footage based on funding, we will exhaust every option for funding in order to maintain the integrity of the needed design to sufficiently support our emergency services departments.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: The current conceptual plan does not have any part of the structure in the wetlands and, as indicated in the report, recommends keeping the structure and remodeling it. Future design options may include selective demolition of some of the facility, depending on what is found in the next phase of design. Any issues with the existing facility's repair will be addressed in future phases.

QUESTION 12: What is the status of oil spill contamination on and under the property?

ANSWER: Remediation was completed by Citizens Advocates in cooperation with the DEC, and clean samples have been collected.

QUESTION 13: What is the timeline for construction? When is the project expected to begin and what is its expected duration?

Answer: Unknown at this time.

Question 14: Factoring wetlands, slopes, streams, and the power and sanitary easements, what is the actual buildable area of this parcel? Is the total buildable are contiguous or in separate sections?

Answer: This will be determined in the first phase of design.

Question 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 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."

ANSWER: This will be addressed in the next design phase; once we move from conceptual planning to actual planning.

QUESTIONS 16-20: Concern the slope contours for the wooded area in the southwest corner of the property, where police access is indicated on the site concept.

ANSWER: This will be addressed in the next design phase; once we move from conceptual planning to actual planning.

QUESTIONS 21-22: Concern police response egress and response times

ANSWER: Please see question 9 for response time, Bay Blvd. will be the main egress.

QUESTION 23: Is a traffic study part of determining feasibility? Will there be a traffic study?

ANSWER: A traffic study will be completed in the first phase of design.

QUESTION 24: Is egress to Route 3 really off the table forever?

ANSWER: We do not currently have plans to egress via Route 3.

QUESTION 25: In your opinion, is this location feasible for emergency services if access to Route 3 is not possible?

ANSWER: Yes

QUESTIONS 26-30: Concern egress via Bay Blvd.

ANSWER: Bay Blvd. presents far less congestion than Canaras Ave., Lake St. or Petrova Ave.

QUESTIONS 31-32: Concern response times for fire and rescue.

ANSWER: See answer to question 9.

QUESTION 33: Clarify plan for returning fire vehicles with vs without Rte 3 direct access.

ANSWER: All vehicles will use Bay Blvd. for ingress and egress, to the greatest extent possible.

QUESTION 34: Does the cost estimate factor bringing the facility up to NYS Type IV code requirements?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION 35 and 48: Concern plans to manage flowing and standing water under the building? What would that add to the project cost?

ANSWER: This will be determined in the first phase of design.

QUESTION 36: RE Status of oil spill under the building

ANSWER: See response to question 12.

QUESTION 37: Have all Pius X replacement /renovation costs been estimated for this study?

ANSWER: Yes. A more detailed and accurate estimate will be available after the design phase.

QUESTIONS 38-40: Concern minimum exterior lighting requirements for police, fire and ambulance facilities?

ANSWER: There are no minimum requirements for exterior lighting, other than normal Village code. Cut-off fixtures are applicable to mitigate light pollution at the site, per the municipality's requirements.

QUESTIONS 41-46: concern noise, property set-backs, impact on property values and compensation to property owners for any adverse impacts on value.

ANSWER: There is no data to suggest that property values will decrease, however some insurance agencies do value proximity to emergency services and individual rates may decrease.

QUESTION 47: Concerns site drainage and protection of wetlands from firefighting chemicals.

ANSWER: No firefighting chemicals will enter the wetlands.

QUESTION 48: See response to question 35

QUESTIONS 49 and 75: concern shared "living unit" for all emergency services:

ANSWER: Emergency services leadership feels that the current shared living unit design is appropriate. The alternative would be to further separate living units for each emergency services department, increasing overall square footage.

Are there ways to make the design more efficient (combined dispatch, dorms, and parking) to economize on building costs, heating costs, and maintenance costs?

ANSWER: Fire and EMS dispatch are combined. Police are separate. See above regarding shared dorms. Parking is shared.

Has W5B projected the costs of heating a @70,000 sq. ft. structure in Saranac Lake's climate?

ANSWER: To be completed during the design phase.

QUESTION 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?

ANSWER: There are many emergency services facilities that are located near school zones across the country. Apparatus are operated by trained professional drivers and properly identified, with situational lights and sirens. Consideration should be given to the existing facilities and current traffic volumes at those locations, versus what will occur in the future. Additionally, most all ingress/egress will be routed through Bay Blvd.

QUESTION 51: What is the ideal size of an emergency services complex for a village of 5,500 people?

ANSWER: Fire and EMS serve a much larger area and population than the village of Saranac Lake. Rescue has a 600-square-mile response area and serves seven communities with a combined population of approximately 22,000 (larger than the population of Plattsburgh, per 2023 census). All agencies were asked to project space needs for a 20-year time horizon in anticipation of increases in both regional and aging populations.

QUESTION 52: What is the impact of repeated sirens during the course of the school day on the psyche of young students?

ANSWER: We will make every attempt to include a response to this hypothetical question in the future traffic study.

QUESTIONS 53-54: Concern usable acreage and impact of the wetlands.

ANSWER: Design is progressing with an internal commitment to stay a minimum of 100 feet away from the wetland boundaries.

QUESTION 55: Can anything be done to maintain that buffer between residential and industrial?

ANSWER: The Village will strive to maintain that buffer in design, construction, and landscaping plans.

QUESTION 56: The W5B proposal states how many parking bays are required for a facility that will be adaptive (sic) for 20 years.

How does this projection correlate with the number of vehicles Saranac Lake currently owns?

ANSWER: Each service was asked to project garage space and vehicles over the 20-year life of the building; the current plan accommodates all existing/anticipated vehicles and allows for expansion of the fleet(s) as regional growth occurs.

Does this projection assume the acquisition costs of additional vehicles? Are those included in the \$27 million costs?

ANSWER: No. Rescue purchases their own vehicles. Fire and Police vehicles are items in the village budget.

QUESTION 57: On the plans of the W5B proposal, there is 12,500 sq. ft. of “staff support.” What is that?

ANSWER: Sleeping quarters, showers, bathrooms, kitchen/dining areas, day rooms, housekeeping supplies, locker rooms, and existing gym (to be used for training and an emergency community shelter, as needed).

QUESTIONS 58-61: Concerning assessment and mitigation for lead, asbestos, mold, “blue/green water”

ANSWER: A hazardous materials study has been conducted and is available on the Village website.

QUESTIONS 62-69: Concern Impervious surfaces, soil removal/addition, tree removal, wetlands accommodation, and landscaping to reduce visual impact of building.

ANSWER: See answers to question 47 and 55.

QUESTION 70: How will carcinogens, such as PFAS in fire retardant, from showers, laundry, and other sources be managed?

ANSWER: This will be determined during the design phase of the building.

QUESTION 71: Will any of the wastewater be sent to the Village of Saranac Lake's sewage treatment plant?

ANSWER: Most all wastewater from the facility will be connected into the municipality's sanitary system, per their existing requirements.

QUESTIONS 72-73: Concern annual maintenance costs

ANSWER: We will not be able to calculate this figure until we are further along in the process and the design phase is completed.

QUESTIONS 74-78: Concern space issues:

ANSWERS:

Re: Question 75 (shared space), see response to Question 49.

Re: Question 76 (seasonal equipment): The agencies do not have "seasonal equipment" – all equipment should be available year-round.

Re: Question 77 (training tower location): A hose tower (from which to hang/dry out fire hoses after use) is an essential component of this project. While the viability of a training tower will be determined in the design phase, the Village will seek to maximize efficiencies wherever possible and potentially combine the two functions in one such tower.

Re: Question 78 (offsite gyms): Offsite gym space would adversely impact response times, minimally but necessarily.

QUESTION 79: What is the next step in your design process?

ANSWER: Detailed schematic drawings and site plans, to include SEQR process.

QUESTION 80: Have you developed a community engagement plan?

ANSWER: There will be multiple informational meetings for the public to attend and public representation on the building committee in the future.

QUESTION 81: Will there be a public referendum on the expenditure of the capital construction costs?

ANSWER: We cannot know the answer to this until project design and funding are further along.

QUESTIONS 82-84: Concern space needs

82: How much more space would be needed for the Broadway site to accommodate all three services?

ANSWER: Even if more space were available (which it is not) there are too many site complications that cannot be economically remedied.

83: Is the existing space adequate for just fire and rescue? Adequate for just police station?

ANSWER: No.

QUESTION 85: What is the cost of repurposing this facility to meet the needs of emergency services?

ANSWER: Repurposing 100 Broadway is not practical. The existing buildings would need be demolished and a new structure built at an estimated cost of more than \$40 million.

QUESTION 86: Would it be more cost effective to tear down the existing building and build an energy efficient state-of-the-art building?

ANSWER: No. Demolishing current buildings and building a new structure (or structures) has an estimated cost of more than \$40 million.

QUESTION 87: How important is it for emergency services to have direct access to Route 3?

ANSWER: See answers to Questions 21-33.

QUESTION 88: How important is it for the neighborhood to support these services in the neighborhood?

ANSWER: It is very important, and we look forward to continuing to engage with project site neighbors whenever possible and/or helpful.

QUESTIONS 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?

ANSWER: Egress from emergency services will go through Bay Blvd.

QUESTIONS 90-93 concern the RFQ and cost/tax issues:

Has Five Bugles successfully completed any 3-service projects similar to the one proposed for Saranac Lake?

ANSWER:

...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.” 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?

ANSWER: Estimates were generated. However, project cost and tax impact will not be firm numbers until the design phase is further along.

...did Five Bugles at any point discuss an over-all budget for the project....If so, what spending limit was determined between you and your client?

ANSWER: The initial estimated project cost is \$27.5 million. Spending limits/expenses requiring village board authorization are subject to the Village's purchasing policy and approved contractual terms.

QUESTIONS 94-96: Review estimated cost/sq ft for each service...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?

ANSWER: Recent data show 2024 estimated costs average \$705/sq ft³

QUESTIONS 97-98 Concern size and cost of comparable Five Bugles projects:

QUESTION: 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?

ANSWER:

QUESTIONS 99-100 Concern alternative to direct access to Rte 3.

QUESTION 99: (not a question; predicate to question 100)

QUESTION 100: If access to LaPan highway is not permitted by the regional planning agency.....Is the project still feasible? And at what extra cost in terms of upgrading the roads and sidewalks to insure safety?

ANSWER: Yes, the project is still feasible without access to LaPan Highway. Road/sidewalk upgrades will be explored during the design phase and with data from the traffic study.