YMCA
Of Snohomish County
EVERETT FAMILY BRANCH

Facilities Assessment

Executive Summary
May 27, 2004

INTRODUCTION

The YMCA Everett Family Branch serves its members and constituents from an interconnected group of three buildings built over a 60 year time period.

- The original building was built in 1920 and occupies the southeast corner of the site. This is a five story wood frame and brick veneer building. Only the bottom three floors of the building are currently used for programs. The upper two floors were previously used for overnight rooms and are in a severe case of disrepair. Programs housed in this building are childcare, child-watch, some athletic programs in the second floor gym/track and association offices.
- In 1960 a small building was built adjacent to the 1920 building. This building houses a small pool, family locker rooms and gymnasium and related mechanical spaces as well as the main entry for the athletic facilities.
- The northern building is the largest and was built in 1980. It houses the large pool, large gymnasium and racket ball courts as well as the locker rooms and a roof top running track.

The YMCA also leases property across the street with the option to purchase. At the direction of the YMCA, this property was not included in this study.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The YMCA Board recognized that each of these three facilities has ongoing maintenance problems and associated costs. Some of these were identified in previous reports. The facilities also have accessibility issues and are not as functional as a new facility would be. At the same time the YMCA Board recognized that these facilities provide them more square footage for program delivery than a "standard" new Y would as well as a second pool, additional gymnasium, racquet ball courts and locker rooms.

The YMCA Board retained Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership, an architectural firm, along with structural, mechanical and electrical engineering consultants and GLY Construction to study the three structures to:

- Evaluate the condition of the existing buildings and their structural, mechanical and electrical support systems.
- Evaluate how to relocate certain social and athletic facilities to better accommodate social and athletic programs based on ideal program outlined by the Board.
- Determine the construction cost of upgrading the buildings and building systems and remodeling the buildings to accommodate the above. Costs to include:
    - Seismic upgrade
    - Accessibility
    - Mechanical and electrical system upgrades and replacements
    - Remodeling to accommodate program relocations

FINDINGS

1920 Building:

- Requires major structural upgrade to address lack of seismic bracing including addition of braced frames and tying floors and exterior walls together.
- Mechanical equipment is beyond its expected lifespan and maintenance is costly. Some systems would not be appropriate to serve relocated program areas. The low floor to floor heights in this building will make the installation of new HVAC systems difficult, especially finding space for distribution ductwork and restricted ceiling heights of less than 8'-0' will result in some areas.
- Electrical systems, including wiring, panels and switchgear, are beyond their expected lifespan. Maintenance is problematic as replacement parts are not available.
- The forest of existing columns is an obstacle to planning for the large open spaces usually found in today's athletic facilities including new YMCAs. Removal of some columns may be possible but would be costly.
- The unused upper two floors present a maintenance problem (source of water intrusion) and a potential liability (fire or vandalism). These floors would be costly to repair and upgrade and there does not appear to be a program need for this space.

1960 Building

- Some structural modifications are required to meet seismic requirements but these are much less extensive than in the 1920 Building.
- Mechanical systems are at the end of or beyond their expected lifespan. Controls are not integrated with the other buildings.
- The existing pool is an amenity that members appreciate as it provides a separate venue for therapy and exercise. However the underground pool piping is leaking (see 1980 Building)
- Problems with the waste piping system have been reported.
- Electrical switchgear is at end if its expected lifespan
- Floor levels do not match the 1920 and 1960 building, making accessibility difficult.
- Upper levels are not served by an elevator and therefore do not meet accessibility requirements.

1980 Building

- Building only requires minor structural changes to accommodate seismic criteria.
- Mechanical equipment is nearing the end of its expected lifespan.
- Underground water piping associated with the pool appears to be leaking based on water usage. This piping also serves the pool in the 1960 building.
- Problems with the waste piping system have been reported.
- Electrical switchgear is in good condition and has excess capacity which could be used to serve the 1920 and 1960 buildings if a remodel takes place.
- The vapor barrier between the main pool room and the main gym above has been compromised and the pool vapors are causing warping and deterioration of the gym floor.
- Exterior concrete masonry unit walls should be cleaned, repainted and sealed.

OPTIONS

The existing buildings provide more area than would be available if a new "standard" Y were built. The facilities also provide a second pool and roof top track which would not be part of a new Y. Thus the focus of this study was on the reuse of the existing facilities.

Upon completing the study of the remodel of the existing facilities to address building system, code and functional deficiencies, the design team and Board identified several other options. These have not been studied in detail but based on the study of the existing buildings and familiarity with new Y construction, GLY has been able to extrapolate some estimated costs for these options. The study of the existing buildings along with other options is briefly described below along with construction costs and a synopsis of the pros and cons.

Costs included in this report are estimates of construction costs only and do not include soft costs such as: land costs, cost to locate programs off site during phased construction, potential loss of membership during phased construction, athletic and office equipment and furnishings, administrative and legal costs, permit and design fees, and sales taxes. The YMCA is in the best position to determine most of these costs which need to be added to the construction cost to provide a total project costs. Also, the construction costs below represent today's costs and need to be escalated to the time of construction. Development of the soft costs mentioned above also needs to take into account the cost at the time they will be incurred.

- Option 1 – Retain existing buildings, remodel to upgrade systems and relocate programs. Remove top two floors of 1920 Building.
    - Gross Area: 94,830 gsf:
    - Estimated Construction Cost: $9,836,000
    - Estimated Construction Time: 16 months in three phases
        - Phase 1 - the 1920 Building
        - Phase 2 - the lower level of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
        - Phase 3 - the upper levels of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
    - Pros
        - Retains existing area (more area than a new YMCA)
        - Retains second pool
        - Retains rooftop track
    - Cons
        - 1920 Building is not suited for athletic facilities do to columns and low floor to floor height.
        - Requires phasing of construction.
        - Requires shutdown or offsite location of existing programs during construction
        - Floor levels will still not align.

- Option 2 – Use same planning for program location as in Option 1 but demolish 1920 Building and replace with new three story building with same area
    - Gross Area: 94,830 gsf
    - Estimated Construction Cost:
    - Estimated Construction Time: 16 months in three phases
        - Phase 1 – the lower level of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
        - Phase 2 – the upper levels of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
        - Phase 3 – demolish 1920 Building and build new building
    - Pros
        - Retains same amount of area as Option 1 (more than a new YMCA)
        - New building can be built to contemporary standards with fewer columns and adequate floor to floor heights.
        - Will fully meet seismic standards (seismic upgrade of existing building will improve seismic performance but will never be able to fully meet current codes at a reasonable cost)

- Cons
  - Do to intervening 1960 Building; floors are still unlikely to align with existing buildings if new building is built to ideal floor to floor height.
  - Still requires phasing which would be similar to that required for Option 1 and thus will require shutdown or offsite relocation of existing programs during construction.

- Option 3 – Demolish 1920 Building and do not replace. Do system upgrades in 1960 and 1980 Buildings but do minimum program relocations.
  - Gross Area: 51,000 gsf
  - Estimated Construction Cost: $5,800,000
  - Estimated Construction Time: 12 months in three phases
    - Phase 1 – the lower level of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
    - Phase 2 – the upper levels of the 1960 and 1980 Buildings
    - Phase 3 – demolish 1920 Building
  - Pros
    - Doesn't put money into the 1920 building that even after remodel would still be less than an ideal facility.
    - Less construction cost.
  - Cons
    - Reduces program area and thus some programs will need to be located offsite or eliminated. Note program area is just slightly less than the 55,000 gsf size of a new suburban YMCA.
    - Programs that remain are compromised functionally due to lack of space or use of space by a facility that is duplicated (small pool).

- Option 4 – Build new facility
  - Gross Area: 55,000 gsf (Average size of a new suburban YMCA)
  - Estimated construction Costs: $8,800,000
  - Estimated Construction Time: 12 months
  - Pros
    - Provides facility designed specifically for today's program needs.
    - All facilities are new
    - No phasing is required and thus no shut down or offsite location of programs is required.
  - Cons
    - Need to find a site that would serve downtown membership
    - Need to find buyer for existing site/buildings
    - Building area is significantly less than area of existing building. Some programs would have to be eliminated or would need to be located in a different facility.
    - There would be no second pool or second gym..

RECOMMENDATIONS

Without considering the ability to raise funding or the timetable for doing so ZGF's observations are as follows:

- Do not put money into remodeling or upgrading the 1920 Building. Either replace it with a new building or demolish it without replacing - Option 2 or 3:
  - Replacing the 1920 Building costs more than remodeling it but will provide a much superior facility.

- Demolishing and not replacing the building results in having to delete or offsite some programs and the cost of doing so needs to be factored in by the YMCA. The remaining facilities will be less than ideal for programs and the Y should determine if this will be satisfactory to its members.

- Consider building a new YMCA - Option 4:
  - The construction cost of a new YMCA is less than the cost to remodel and upgrade the existing facilities primarily because a smaller facility is being constructed.
  - A new facility similar to a new suburban YMCA will require eliminating or locating certain programs offsite. An option would be to build a larger new facility. Assuming the same square foot cost for new construction as in Option 4:
    - Another 6500 gsf could be built for the construction cost difference between Option 1 and Option 4.
    - Another 17,650 gsf could be built for the construction cost difference between Option 2 and Option 4.
  - Would not require shutdown or offsite relocation of programs during construction so this is presumably a cost savings to the Y.
  - Since existing facilities would continue to operate, their presumably would not be a drop in membership due to construction phasing - a potential cost savings.
  - Biggest obstacle is finding suitable land and paying for it:
    - Is a land swap possible?
    - Would a site be convenient to present users?

Any of the above options will require fundraising which will require time. In the meantime, the existing facilities will continue to operate and will need to be maintained. The question has been asked about what interim measures should be undertaken during this timeframe. This is really a question that the Board needs to address. The existing facilities have operated in their present state for many years. From discussions with YMCA personnel, we believe the deficiencies noted in this study are similar to those identified to the YMCA in previous studies. Thus it seems the YMCA's risk position has not changed but the Board is in the best position to address this.
As to any recommended interim steps:

- Exiting
  - Exit corridors should be kept clear.
  - A second exit path in the 1920 Building could be provided but would require some construction work including a new door in the west exterior wall at the alley.
  - Addressing the exiting from the 1980 pool may be desirable but is more problematic.
  - If any work regarding exiting is undertaken a meeting should be held with the Everett Building Department and Fire Marshal to determine if they agree with proposed solutions as none would be likely to achieve a fully code compliant exit way.

- Building Systems
  - Structural - No interim measures are recommended as the main issue is seismic which cannot be addressed by less than a full effort.
  - Mechanical and Electrical
    - Since systems are at or have exceeded expected lifetimes, short of replacing systems the only option is continued maintenance. If the YMCA decided it would undertake a remodel, then the YMCA may find it useful to discuss which system components may want to be replaced

while fundraising is undertaken. The idea being to stop spending money on maintenance of systems that are going to be replaced and use this money to fund replacement. This of course depends on the magnitude of funds being spent for maintenance.

- A separate investigation is underway to study extent of problem with underground plumbing in pool area. Depending on result of that study certain repairs may be needed to assure continued operation of the pools.