

# Village of Scotia Municipal Facilities Project - Public Process

## Running List of Summarized comments in order from Meeting # One

- Concerns about location: was there/could there be a study of where most fires are?
- The project was simply too big at estimated \$7.1 million for a community where taxes are already too high.
- The location on such a small street was a concern
- Sirens at night impact the neighborhood
- Should pick a location closer to the schools and other facilities of high fire risk/demand
- Should consider splitting the vote into two parts: 1) location and 2) money
- Other communities are building fire stations for a lot less
- How seriously was consolidation considered? Especially combining fire with the City of Schenectady and/or the Town of Glenville?
- Do we really want a new facility? Do we really need more space? Are we really ok just as is?
- Is it cheaper to build a new police station rather than rehab?
- What was the purpose of hiring a New York City firm?
- What was the selection process for the architect
- Were there other proposals for architectural services
- How were the dollars in the architects fees spent?
- Did we look at other facilities built recently in the region and discuss their experience and the contractors/consultants they used?
- The process for selecting the professionals should be transparent
- The project was larger than the village could manage
- We spent too much ( architectural fees) on a project that was soundly defeated
- Village services are important
- The services must be scaled to the community both in terms of cost and personnel
- We need the Fire Protection District Four commitment and long term contract as revenue stream to support this project.
- Sites should not displace existing businesses.
- Keeping businesses on the tax rolls should be a priority
- When considering location we should consider the tax implications
- Property adjacent to the Corporate Park is available and for sale and should be considered
- What sites were on the short list and why weren't they chosen? Are they still available? Are there others that are now available?

- What will happen to the existing building?
- Will all of the facilities be in the same building or will there be multiple buildings? And what is the impact on the cost of the single site/multiple site decision? (Was this issue publicized enough)
- We need to do something. The facility is out moded. But what we do needs to be more cost effective
- Information about the project was not given early enough
- Too much money was spent on pre-development costs
- It is good to have a comprehensive plan and vision for these issues
- The village is built-out and can't be compared to communities with lots of green space
- Answers to questions should have been made available earlier
- Need to ensure that everyone understands that this plan was not just for the fire house
- Some pre development money was spent to get the answers to these questions
- Sense that architects tried to shove things down our throats. They had a big city attitude and did not respect the intelligence of locals.
- The plan should stick to the simple approach and Avoid unnecessary expensive aesthetic or cosmetic elements
- Make sure police and village office needs are considered as much as fire
- Initial planning money was NOT lost especially the site selection process and the space/design/needs identification
- Renovation is expensive, but it's not appropriate to abandon the building
- Using existing building contributes to the village character
- We need to make sure that the building is used
- Information was available, and after the study it became clear that logical decisions had been made. Process needs to be more readily available
- Process of education and vote seemed rushed
- Cost and the location ( from NYC) of Architects is a concern
- Need to have more than one polling place. People should vote in the places they are used to voting like the schools.
- Reason the bond was defeated is not just voter ignorance - cost and location really mattered
- We must keep historic character of existing building. We don't have a lot of historic buildings left.
- The Village Master Plan called for preserving historic structures
- Use an addition to the building to expand, expand the existing building onto adjacent property even if it means buying/condemning Village Paint
- Elimination of local businesses will leave us with nothing but big boxes
- The avenue needs parking to support businesses. Thinking of removing the new parking facility is ridiculous

- Businesses have synergy. Eliminating village paint will impact other businesses
- Village paint is a large tax contributor and business in general is important to the community.
- Master plan identified village paint as an institution
- Didn't like the location of the planned firehouse on a one way street
- The building (fire house) could be located anywhere. District is only a three minute drive time for fire department. No location will impact response time. Need to revisit the site matrix with that in mind
- The current location is difficult due to cars parking on the street
- Considering the existing building, private money not public money should be used for rehabilitation
- Fire Protection District Four needs to be considered in terms of financing
- Make sure the full cost is understood - including bonding fees and interest - with interest this was a \$15 million dollar project
- Consider equipment needs - how many fire trucks do we really need?
- What are the consequences of doing nothing?
- Consolidation should have been considered more thoroughly. What about combining police or clerk function with Town of Glenville?
- Maybe consider combining non-emergency functions only?
- Should include the county in consolidation discussions
- Village can't continue to have all municipal services that we have had.
- Taxes are too high and rising and driving people out
- Shared facilities - e.g. using school as a location for village meetings should be considered
- Can village offices be sited at an open or vacant site?