

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

Q1. Who made the decision to design and evaluate the community survey on the basis of "net neutrality"? Was there any data to support that decision?

A1. Interim ACM Thomure was responsible for all aspects of the Community Conversation. During survey design, the five-point Likert scale was selected as it gave each respondent the opportunity to consider each of the eight options on its own merit. Neutrality as an outcome reflects the stark polarity of opinion on this specific topic and reflects the goal of a "win-win." The calculation of net neutrality is the same as calculating net favorability, whereby "oppose" responses are subtracted from "favor" responses. For this survey, the outcome was the same. Concept D was both the most "net neutral" and the most "net favorable."

Q2. Can you provide us the data 3 days before the close of the survey? So, the results before you saw [potential] evidence of tampering.

A2. We do not claim that the final results were materially affected by tampering, although we saw evidence of people sharing information in the final days of the survey on how to "cheat the system" and record multiple responses in support of Concept G and against Concepts B and C. This did not result in Concept G closing the gap on the higher-rated responses (B, C, and D), but it did move Concepts B, C, and D from net positive to net negative. See below results from three days before the survey ended ("Trend") versus "Final." Concepts D, C, and B were the top results and "net positive" throughout the timeframe, until they shifted to "net negative" at the very end – with Concept D still the top result and essentially "net neutral."



Q3. What is your analysis of option "G Minor"?

A3. [Note: This information was also provided in response to questions from Ward 5] 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

Q4. If the Council delays again, what are the costs?

A4. The cost of the 45-day delay was about \$75,000 for the Community Conversation and the monthly contractor delay cost is about \$65,000 per month. Additional costs would depend on the purpose of an additional delay and what work would be requested by Mayor and Council.