

Study Session Item 4 (M/C Mtg 5/4) - Follow Up Questions from CM Fimbres

Q1. Did the Core Stakeholder Group formed by Mayor and Council direction reach a consensus on the 8 proposed concepts?

A1. No. There was no consensus on which concept to recommend.

Q2. Did any of the 8 concepts receive a net positive result in the survey conducted?

A2. No. Concept D was the closest to positive at 0.2% below neutral. Concept D also had the least “strongly opposed” responses (28.6%). Concept C was a close second at -1.9% overall with 37.7% strongly opposed. In contrast, Concept G was -31.4% overall with 45.1% strongly opposed.

Q3. What was the survey response by Ward?

A3. The table below presents the aggregated results by Ward, with the top result, measured as **net favorability**, per Ward highlighted in Green. (Note that the top results for **net neutrality** are quite similar, though Ward 2 would shift to Concept C over Concept B and in Ward 4 Concept B would tie with Concept D).

| Concept | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Ward 1 | -13.4 | -24.6 | -20.1 | -4.3 | -42.2 | -15.5 | -18.0 | -58.6 |
| Ward 2 | -33.9 | +1.6 | 0.0 | +0.9 | -48.3 | -36.8 | -37.1 | -75.1 |
| Ward 3 | -15.9 | -19.0 | -14.5 | -3.0 | -48.3 | -25.5 | -22.8 | -67.1 |
| Ward 4 | -30.4 | -2.7 | -2.9 | +2.7 | -45.4 | -31.4 | -33.3 | -69.6 |
| Ward 5 | -8.7 | -29.3 | -24.3 | -5.1 | -44.0 | -20.3 | -19.3 | -63.8 |
| Ward 6 | -11.9 | -25.3 | -21.7 | -4.0 | -45.2 | -23.6 | -22.5 | -66.6 |

Concept D was the top result in every Ward except for Ward 2, where it was second. Concept G was -18.0% to -37.1% in every Ward.

Q4. How did the survey address the question of green space in Reid Park?

A4. Each Concept was described across a variety of features including green space; open space; impacts (or not) to Barnum Hill, South Duck Pond, and mature trees; and Reid Park operations. Other factors presented included Zoo operation, project risks, costs, etc.

Q5. Can the Mayor and Council be reminded of the original size, in terms of acreage, of the Zoological Society's proposed expansion of the Zoo?

A5. The area of the current design is 5.3 acres, including approximately 3.5 acres of habitat space. Non-habitat areas include walking paths, service road, maintenance areas, etc.

Q6. What is the acreage for Option D and Option G?

A6. Neither Concept D nor Concept G are designed yet, therefore, their acreages could vary. Concept D as originally presented is about 6.6 acres including 2.1 acres of hardscape and 4.5 acres of green space (32% hardscape and 68% green space). Note that the total acreage is conservatively high to preserve design flexibility and that the mix of green space versus hardscape is adjustable based on the final footprint (see Hybrid D-G Option). Concept G is about 4.2 acres and has little design flexibility. However, it is about 90% hardscape and 10% green space consisting of a small grass area, hedges, and trees.

Q7. What is the acreage of the proposed Hybrid D-G option?

A7. The Hybrid D-G option would be about 5.5 acres (+/-) including about 4 acres of hardscape and 1.5 acres of green space (73% hardscape and 27% green space). Again, as this is not yet designed, the total area and percentages of hardscape and green space can vary.

Q8. Can the Mayor and Council be reminded of the presentation by staff of a potential variant that was brought forward by the Julia Keen Neighborhood Association (JKNA) and the original acreage total for this proposal?

A8. [Note: This information was also provided in response to questions from Ward 6] Staff have reviewed the concept forwarded by JKNA, which was recently updated and is referred to as “Concept G-Minor.” A map of Concept G-Minor (prepared by Vint & Associates Architects, Inc. dated April 29, 2021) is attached. The map is included in its original form. Note that the expansion footprint would require some adjustments from what is shown on the map to address some constructability issues – but that is true of every other concept as well.

In short, Concept G-Minor is a feasible alternative with some minor modifications. It is also likely to be able to be constructed in a similar timeframe to Concept D or the Hybrid D-G Concept (one-year delay). Notably, all three concepts include solutions to address circulation of park users between the Edith Ball Adaptive Recreation Center and the main park. The three concepts vary in the relative percentages of hardscape versus open space required.

Concept G-Minor would have a higher total cost than either Concept D or the Hybrid D-G Concept. The staff cost opinion for Concept G-Minor is about \$7M versus Hybrid D-G’s cost of \$5.5M and Concept D’s cost of \$3.6M. All three concepts assume a redesign cost of \$2.6M and inflation cost on the base project of \$345k. Any savings on the redesign or materials escalation / inflation would apply to all three concepts equally. (Note that the lengthy delay to implement Concept G carries a much higher inflation cost and it has imbedded additional design costs to resolve impacts to parking and Therapeutic Recreation). Concept G-Minor, the Hybrid D-G Concept, and Concept D differ in the amount of additional construction cost to move the expansion into this northwest footprint.

Focusing solely on construction costs, the additional construction cost of Concept G-Minor is estimated at about \$4M, while the additional construction costs of the Hybrid D-G Concept and Concept D are estimated at \$2.5M and \$700k, respectively. (All of these concepts are over \$10M less than Concept G.) The cost driver between these concepts is primarily due to the cost and risk of converting hardscape to buildable space and the degree to which each concept disrupts the Parks and Recreation Maintenance Compound (Compound). Concept D does not affect the Compound and its costs are related to addressing utility conflicts and park/zoo circulation issues.

Hybrid Concept D-G shifts the expansion footprint to the east and north into the Compound to reduce the amount of green space used. This concept focuses on the more open areas of the Compound to avoid impacting any fixed structures or hard buildings and leaves sufficient space in the remaining compound to consolidate on-site operations. Only storage needs would be relocated, avoiding the need to develop a new Compound at a separate location.

Concept G-Minor has a larger impact on the Compound and affects fixed facilities. While some Compound uses could remain on-site, a new Compound would need to be developed and/or the SAMMS warehouse operation would need to be relocated to a new site (location unknown). As drawn, Concept G-Minor also impacts a portion of the Edith Ball Adaptive Recreation Center, although that is assumed to be unintentional and that the footprint would be modified as needed. Concept G-Minor would need to be modified to address large vehicle traffic within the Zoo for maintenance and animal care needs. Finally, the more of the Compound that is redeveloped, the greater the project risk due to unknown conditions from past site uses (e.g., chemical storage, abandoned utilities, etc.).

| Concept "G-Minor": Northwest Zoo Expansion [Updated 05/02/2021] | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------|
| Variation of Hybrid D-G with Max Hard Space | | | |
| Redesign of Zoo Expansion | | | \$ 2,600,000 |
| Inflation on \$23M project for 1 year (1.5%) | | | \$ 345,000 |
| Resolve park circulation (pedestrian bridge - Zoo side) | | | \$ 500,000 |
| Resolve utility conflicts, larger area of Maintenance Compound | | | \$ 350,000 |
| Relocate Maintenance Compound storage needs | | | \$ 400,000 |
| Relocate SAMMS operation to accommodate loss of two buildings | | | \$ 750,000 |
| Consolidate remaining Maintenance operations within the site | | | \$ 400,000 |
| Reclaim hardscape areas | | | \$ 400,000 |
| Provide vehicle and emergency access to zoo expansion | | | \$ 150,000 |
| Replace parking (50 spots) | | | \$ 150,000 |
| Contingency (30% of new elements) | | | \$ 930,000 |
| Estimated Total | | | \$ 6,975,000 |

Q9. Costs notwithstanding, what were the other factors staff looked at for these proposals?

A9. Mayor and Council direction, input from the Community Survey, project feasibility, future park and zoo operations, project risks (schedule, legal, unknown conditions), impacts to other user groups and stakeholders, taxpayer obligations, contractual obligations, and seeking a win-win for all parties.