

October 31, 2022

59 Low St Frequently Asked Question

1. In Option B, are the modular gym and addition net zero?

No. Option A shows a fully net zero development of both the existing building and the new gym/addition, utilizing a solar array and battery storage, as well as intensive insulation and heat pumps. The cost of these items totaled between \$750,000-1,000,000. During the value engineering exercise, which resulted in Option B, the net zero component was greatly reduced: the solar array was eliminated, as was battery storage. The building will be well insulated and have an air barrier, but will not be considered net zero. The mechanical system will be entirely electric, but there is currently no means of energy generation included in the estimate. The building can be made solar-ready, should the City decide to include this at a later date. There are likely grant opportunities for solar.

2. Could the toilets be gender neutral and, if so, would that reduce the cost?

This is not realistic due to the sheer volume of kids that could be utilizing the building at one time. Each restroom will need to have multiple stalls. However, the single restroom that is currently used as a staff/preschool restroom is gender-neutral.

3. How much storage is shown in the eaves?

There is 1,132 sf included for storage on the upper level, which includes the eave on the west side of the building. On the east side, the corridor below is open to the roof so there is no eave storage in that location.

4. Can the Brown School gym be value engineered to reduce the cost? What would, for example, \$1M do for the Brown School?

We can discuss further, but there is a million dollars of work just in mechanical and electrical work at the Brown School gym.

5. How could we mitigate the potential for flooding?

This location is nowhere near the FEMA floodplain, with the nearest floodplain being at a stream on Parker street. The elevation of that flood is 10, 88NAVD and the elevation of the 59 Low Street lot is typically above 20, so there is no floodplain risk. The only water issues would relate to stormwater and drainage and there is no existing stormwater management on site. We would be adding stormwater management with the overall site design, which should both mitigate any localized stormwater-based flooding which generally would occur behind the fence away from the building. It is not

realistic it is to regrade around building and put in a subsurface storm drainage system due to the existing clay soils and cost/effort vs reward.

6. What would be the rough cost for traffic calming and/or sidewalks near this site on Low St?

Crossing lights and a painted crosswalk could be installed in-house by DPS for a cost between \$12,000- 15,000. A raised crosswalk is not recommended due to the fact that Low Street is a main route and not a secondary street. A sidewalk on the 59 Low St side is not feasible because there are currently no connecting sidewalks on that side of the street. Rather, a crosswalk across Low St toward the school, connecting to an existing sidewalk on the school side of Low Street, makes the most sense.

7. What do we anticipate for 'carrying costs' on this building (heating/cooling and electric)?

Based on the usage per square foot at the Senior/Community Center (\$1.68/sf per year for 15.5K sf), the proposed NYS Facility (+/-11K sf) would cost approximately \$18K/year for heating, cooling and electricity.

8. What about plowing and janitorial service? Can these services be folded into current manpower at DPS?

The building size and parking area of this new project are roughly equivalent to the portions of the Brown School that were utilized for NYS. As such, it is reasonable to assume the current manpower at DPS could handle this new project under their current staffing capacities.

9. How does the size of the new project, as proposed, match the needs of the Department in terms of enrollment and utilization of the space?

NYS's capacity in the former Brown School (not including the gym) was about 110-120 young people, depending on age and type of activity. The goal for this project was to design a space that provided, at a minimum, the same amount of programming space. The new designs vary: Option C would allow between 80-90 participants at one time, or a 30% decrease. Option B would allow between 105-110 in classrooms with the biggest difference being more space in the "art room". Option A provides the most capacity at 110-120, with the additional space primarily in the teen hangout. Options A and B also have the most flexibility, by utilizing room dividers, in a variety of ways both for NYS programs but also for community organizations and rentals.