PERRY POINT VAMC

Local Advisory Panel Meeting – Public Meeting September 27, 2005 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM

I. Participants

Local Advisory Panel (LAP) Members: Sanford Garfunkel, Director, Washington DC VA Medical Center, Chairman; Archna Sharma, MD, Quality Management Office, VISN 5; Roy Albert, Vice President of Business Development Office of Aberdeen Proving Ground; James Eberhardt, Mayor of Perryville; Colonel Kevin Smith, Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff for the Ordinance Center and School Aberdeen Proving Ground; Absent: Phillip Medlin, Department Service Officer, Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars; Anthony Lehman, MD, Professor & Chair, Department of Psychiatry, University of Maryland

<u>VA Support Team</u>: Ken Backer, VISN 5, HSS; Abdul Razak, VISN 5, Capital Asset Manager; William England, Perry Point VAMC, Facility Engineer; Michael McElroy, VSSC, Asst. COTR; Alan Hackman, OAEM, Portfolio Manager; Ken Sliker, VISN 5, Network Marketing Coordinator; Mike Stout, VISN 5, Deputy Network Director; Nancy Quailey, VA Maryland HCS, Executive Assistant to Director

<u>Team PwC</u>: Janet Hinchcliff (PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Melissa Stevens (PwC), Chad Eppley (PwC), Brent Hussong (Perkins & Will)

<u>The Metis Group</u>: Terrilyn McCormick <u>Public</u>: Approximately 60 attendees

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Ray Astor, VAVS Representative, Catholic War Veterans

III. Opening Remarks: Sanford Garfunkel

- Welcome
- Introduction of the LAP Members. Philip Medlin and Anthony Lehman are not present.
- Description of the purpose of the LAP
- Stakeholder input will be collected and considered by the LAP during the option evaluation process
- · Ground rules/instructions on how to provide input
- Perry Point is not a healthcare study. The mission of Perry Point will not change, and healthcare services will not be changed due to the CARES process.
- · Introduction of Janet Hinchcliff and CARES Perry Point study team

IV. Old Business: Sanford Garfunkel

In response to a request from the first LAP, a Veterans Service Organization Member has been added to the LAP membership. Philip Medlin, Department

- Service Officer, Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars is now on the LAP. He will not be able to attend this meeting.
- During the first LAP, there was confusion over the status of the construction of the new nursing home at Perry Point. Many of the veterans thought that the construction of the new nursing home was already decided. An excerpt from Secretary Nicholson's letter to Senator Mikulski concerning the construction and funding of construction for a new nursing home at Perry Point was read to clarify the status of the possible construction of a new nursing home.

V. <u>CARES Study Introduction and Stakeholder Input</u>: Janet Hinchcliff

- Recap of first LAP
- Purpose of the second LAP public meeting and an overview of the CARES project
 - Three to six options will be selected by the Secretary, LAP 3 is scheduled for November/December timeframe, and LAP 4 is scheduled for the February/March timeframe
- Encourage stakeholder input
- Perry Point is not a healthcare study, and the mission and services provided at Perry Point will not change
- Review of the public input
 - Limited amount of input
 - Input can be through e-mail, CARES website, mail, and public testimony

VI. Option Development and Presentation of Business Plan Options (BPOs): Janet Hinchcliff

- Description of how the BPOs were developed
- Review of inputs for BPO development (stakeholder, capital, and re-use)
- · Initial screening criteria of access, cost, and quality
- · Introduction of Brent Hussong, Perkins + Will, Capital Planner
- Brent Hussong provided an overview of the current state of the Perry Point campus. A second projector displayed the site maps.
- Option 1 (BPO 1) Baseline: Brent Hussong
 - Describes baseline option which includes no new construction and doing the enough to the existing campus to bring the Perry Point facility up to a modern, safe, and secure environment. Renovated nursing home does not provide enough space to meet forecasted nursing home demand.
 - 480,000 square feet to be renovated throughout the campus
 - Reviews site map of Perry Point campus
- Option 2 (BPO 2) Construct new nursing home east of Building 364; create master plan; and re-use: Brent Hussong
 - BPO 2 includes a newly constructed nursing home sized to meet 2023 forecasted demand and necessary renovation of the existing buildings on the campus

- Describes the site map on display and the changes that will occur in BPO
 2
- Describes the parcels available for re-use

Option 3 (BPO 3) – Construct new nursing home near Building 20H; create master plan; and re-use: Brent Hussong

- BPO 3 includes a newly constructed nursing home sized to meet 2023 forecasted demand and necessary renovation of the existing buildings on the campus
- Describes the site map on display and the changes that will occur in BPO 3
- Identical to BPO 2 except for the location of the nursing home

Option 4 (BPO 4) – Construct new nursing home near Building 80; create master plan; and re-use: Brent Hussong

- BPO 4 includes a newly constructed nursing home sized to meet 2023 forecasted demand and necessary renovation of the existing buildings on the campus
- Describes the site map on display and the changes that will occur in BPO
 4
- Identical to BPOs 2 and 3 except for the location of the nursing home

Option 5 (BPO 5) – Reduced campus; new nursing home north of Building 20H and behavioral health building; and master plan: Brent Hussong

- BPO 5 includes a newly constructed nursing home sized to meet 2023 forecasted demand and necessary renovation of the existing buildings on the campus. Construct new behavioral health building near Building 80. Adopt master plan to reduce overall size of campus through phased consolidation of clinical services including new construction and enhanced use lease programs for vacated existing buildings.
- Describes the site map on display and the proposed changes
- Notes that BPO 5 is significantly different from BPOs 2, 3 and 4
- Describes the Parcels A through E available for re-use

Option 6 (BPO 6) – Consolidated campus; new nursing home; master plan; and re-use: Brent Hussong

BPO 6 includes a newly constructed nursing home sized to meet 2023 forecasted demand and necessary renovation of the existing buildings on the campus. Adopt master plan to consolidate services including phased relocation, renovation, and demolition of aged buildings and logistical functions. This will reduce campus into minimal area required while maintaining sufficient property for future campus flexibility. Minimize central energy requirements by decentralizing energy plants in all new construction. Aggressive new construction and new campus footprint

- Describes the site map on display and the changes that will occur in BPO
 6
- Describes the Parcels A through F available for re-use

Re-use Options: Terrilyn McCormick

- Enhanced use leases (EULs) will be the only re-use options studied
- EULs are generally long-term leases where the VA maintains ownership of the property
- EULs allow any proceeds to remain at Perry Point
- The high level analysis in Stage I identified four potential uses: hospitality, light industry, institutional and residential
- Re-use options will be refined further in Stage II

Closing Comments: Janet Hinchcliff

- Description of options not selected
- Review of next steps
- Recap of how stakeholders can provide input

VII. Public Comments: Facilitated by Bill England

- Question from Audience Member: Who maintains the facility in terms of roads, sewage, snow removal, etc.? Any consideration to lease this land to other Federal agencies?
 - o **Response from Sanford Garfunkel:** Those issues will be worked out later when choosing a re-use option is closer. Nothing precludes Perry Point from leasing land to another Federal Agency.
- Comment from Audience Member: We would like to see the re-use parcels turned into senior villas. The senior villas would make a nice bridge between the community and the VA. They would also add to the safety of the VA and could be a great opportunity for volunteerism.
 - Response from Bill England: Thank you for your comments; they will be recorded
- Prepared Statement Read by Staff Member of Senator Mikulski (copies available):
 - Summary of Senator Mikulski's statement: The purpose of the VA is to deliver the best possible care to veterans while providing the best value for taxpayers. CARES should not mean fewer services. Veterans need open access and timely care. CARES should not move forward until lessons have been learned from Ft. Howard. The Perry Point campus needs a new nursing home as soon as possible. The focus of CARES should be on healthcare for veterans and not the re-use of land.
 - o Response from Colonel Smith: As a military leader I was initially skeptical about CARES. I assure you, we have not ignored what was just read. Jobs will not be outsourced and the mission of Perry Point will not change due to CARES. You, the veterans, need to make your voice heard in the next ten days to help direct this decision. EULs allow like and in-

- kind services at Perry Point and provide money that might not be here otherwise. EULs can provide the money needed to benefit Perry Point.
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran): Has been attending VBA and VHA meetings since 1996. Has heard over and over about the declining number of veterans and does not believe it. Should forget those numbers. Do not use the projections. Just because veterans are dying does not mean the number of services are declining. We just received a supplement of \$1.5 billion because the numbers were wrong. Secretary Nicholson said we did not need anymore money in May 2005, and a few months later they needed \$1.5 billion.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: The projections have no impact on the Perry Point study. There will be no reduction in services at Perry Point.
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran): Was on the committee for the Fort Howard mission change. Nothing that was promised has come about. CARES is the same as BRAC. This is another experiment. Closing the VA hospitals does not keep our promise to veterans.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: No one on this panel volunteered with the thought that there was intent to close the facility. We have no hidden agenda. The CARES decision said services will remain the same.
 - Response from Dennis Smith (Director): Fort Howard involved a mission change. We did not close one program at Fort Howard. The Fort Howard facility was not needed. We did not need the beds. Financially it was a drain. In addition, we probably could not pass JCAHO at Fort Howard anymore. I share your concern about the EUL at Fort Howard. It is moving very slowly. It has not fallen through, but it has been drawn out. Do not compare Fort Howard to what is occurring at Perry Point. This is completely different.
- Comment from Economic Development Director for Cecil County (Veteran): There is much to be said for EULs. We should set our sights higher for EULs. Walter Reed and their mission shift should be considered (for using the Perry Point campus). We should look at technology firms. A warehouse on the site would be a waste and should not be an option. Opportunities with the historic sites should be considered.
- Comment from an Audience Member (Perryville Resident): The roads and infrastructure need to be improved if the mission changes and more traffic is brought into the site.
 - Response from Bill England: The railroad is a limiting factor for accessing the site.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: Thank you for your comments. At this time we are not yet in a position to comment on that, but we will have your comments on the record and they are very valuable as we move forward
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran): The projection numbers did not include Priority 7 and 8 veterans. There are many more of these veterans.
 I am a patient here; at this time of war we should not cut any space. There will be more demand for services. I waited a year for an appointment. We ca

not handle the veterans that we have today. There is a waiting list for nursing home beds.

- Response from Dennis Smith: We do not have a waiting list for our nursing homes in this VISN.
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran and volunteer at Perry Point): We transport at least four veterans into Perry Point to catch a bus to Baltimore for chemotherapy. They often get too sick to come back on the shuttle and they have to stay. I would like to see them get better care here, expand chemo services, etc. Also, we do not have enough nursing home beds. (applause)
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran): The map showing all of the re-use parcels is the only one on the Internet. Why is that? The waterfront property is very soothing for the nursing home patients. The nursing home needs to be facing the water. We do not have enough nursing home beds either.
 - Response from Janet Hinchcliff: We will be putting all of the site maps on the website.
 - Response from Colonel Smith: The person in charge of the nursing home is who you need to speak with concerning the bed demand. Our mission here today is different. Get in touch with him after the meeting.
- Comment from Audience Member (VA Employee): Although you say we are not cutting services, I know of three services that have been cut.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: Services are always changing, everywhere. However, nothing in this CARES process will diminish services here.
- Comment from Audience Member (Veteran): I was a patient here and had to stay in a locked psych ward for two months before being moved. Was in worse shape by the time I got out. I think a multi-family transitional housing option is a great option, and would love to rent a property on Perry Point. While I was here the roof fell in, and I think we need to improve our facilities.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: Renovations will be occurring throughout the Perry Point campus.
- Comment from an Audience Member (Spouse of a Veteran): Husband suffers from PTSD. How many vets suffer from this? A 155 bed nursing home is not nearly enough. You need to get your numbers straight.
- Comment from an Audience Member (Veteran): A lot of veterans are Priority 7 and 8. They will be enrolling. If the EUL money comes here, will it decrease the funding from VACO for Perry Point?
 - o **Response from Sanford Garfunkel:** EUL money would be used to help carry out the construction, renovation, etc. recommended by the option.
 - o **Response from Colonel Smith:** The re-use options will enhance the buildings. No one told Mr. Garfunkel that EUL money will cut back funding. EULs provide an opportunity that the current state does not offer. Money in the VA budget is tight. Based on the VA budget, you are not going to get to where you want without the EUL money.

- o **Response from Sanford Garfunkel:** There is no plan for EUL money to replace appropriation money.
- Response from Colonel Smith: There is no such thing as an absolute when dealing with budgets, but we were not told that EUL money will replace appropriation money.

<Break from 11:00 – 11:30>

- Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: Thanks again for all of the comments.
 Please keep comments to issues concerning the scope of what today's meeting is for.
- Comment from Staff Member of Senator Sarbanes: Senator Sarbanes
 hopes that throughout the CARES process the veterans' interests are put
 first. Incorporate the stakeholders' views for re-use. Perry Point should be
 driven by the needs of the local veterans.
- Comment from an Audience Member (Veteran): VA healthcare appropriation is discretionary spending. Congress can pass whatever they want, advocate for funding.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: We appreciate your comments, but please keep the comments to what we are trying to discuss today.
- Comment from an Audience Member (VA employee): Asked LAP to look at some unpopular things. Look at moving VISN headquarters, which is currently in leased space, to Perry Point. Any renovations should consider the infrastructure, water, sewage, etc.
- Comment from an Audience Member (VA employee): The infrastructure is falling apart. The current management has allowed this to happen. Switch the parcels. Keep everything that is green on the map. If you build houses on the re-use parcels, you are going to have issues with families interacting with patients.
- Comment from Mayor Eberhardt: Perry Point needs to bring state of the art facilities here. EULs can bring the needed income to the facility. A correctly managed EUL could bring about a great campus for the Perry Point veterans. I also suggest that the firehouse and post office become more centrally located in the master plan. Secondly, the two historical buildings take a lot of money to maintain. We should look at the leasing of these buildings or turning them over to the National Park Service. Industrial uses should be struck from any re-use plan.
 - Response from Sanford Garfunkel: We are months or years from deciding re-use. It probably is not a good use of time to talk about that right now.

Conclusion of stakeholder input.

VIII. LAP Deliberation

Option 1 (BPO 1)

LAP concern about BPO 1

- Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: I have a great deal of concern about this option. By definition, this option does not consider new construction; this violates the Secretary's Decision. This really is not a viable option.
- Comment from Colonel Smith: This option displaces 40 beds in the end state.

Recommendation

- Sanford Garfunkel made motion to not recommend, seconded
- LAP votes 5-0 not to recommend

Option 2 (BPO 2)

LAP support for BPO 2

 Comment from Roy Albert: Likes this option. It is near the water, quiet, and very peaceful. Thinks it would be soothing for the veterans. It would help preserve the land.

Recommendation

- Roy Albert made motion to recommend, seconded
- LAP votes 5-0 to recommend BPO 2 for further study

Option 3 (BPO 3)

General comments

- Comment from Brent Hussong: BPO 3 is similar to BPO 2 except for the different location of the nursing home. There are no significant infrastructure differences.
- Comment from Colonel Smith: Was it considered to place the nursing home east of parcel D, and create larger parcels of E and F?
- Response from Brent Hussong: No, but this could be done.

Recommendation

- Sanford Garfunkel made motion to recommend, seconded
- LAP votes 5-0 to recommend BPO 3 for further study

Option 4 (BPO 4)

General comments

- Comment from Brent Hussong: BPO 4 is similar to BPOs 2 and 3 except for the different location of the nursing home. There are no significant infrastructure differences.
- LAP concern over BPO 4
 - Question from Dr. Sharma: Is this option drawn to scale for a single floor building?
 - Response from Brent Hussong: If the plan is for a single story building, this build space will be very tight
 - Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: I see no advantages of this option

Recommendation

Colonel Smith made motion not to recommend, seconded

LAP votes 5-0 not to recommend BPO 4 for further study

Option 5 (BPO 5)

- General comments
 - Brent Hussong recaps BPO 5
- LAP concern over BPO 5
 - Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: This option seems to chop up the campus. It does not seem to get much bang for the buck.
 - Comment from Dr. Sharma: Parcel E could create more traffic through the campus. This creates an urban environment more than the current campus atmosphere.
 - Comment from Colonel Smith: I like what it does, but I do not like where it does it on the campus.
- Recommendation
 - Dr. Sharma made motion not to recommend, seconded
 - LAP votes 5-0 not to recommend BPO 5 for further study

Option 6 (BPO 6)

- General Comments
 - Brent Hussong recaps BPO 6
- LAP Support for BPO 6
 - Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: There are new buildings for providing healthcare.
 - Comment from Mayor Eberhardt: The compact campus makes it easier for veterans to get around.
 - Comment from Sanford Garfunkel: Based on past experiences veterans prefer a compact campus
- LAP concern about BPO 6
 - Comment from Colonel Smith: I like the option other than where the nursing home is facing. I think the nursing home should face the water. I plan on recommending an option that does this.
- Recommendation
 - Mayor Eberhardt made motion not to recommend, seconded
 - LAP votes 5-0 not to recommend BPO 6 for further study

IX. LAP Proposed Options

- Option 7
 - An iteration of BPO 6
 - Place a nursing home facing the water on re-use Parcel E, reducing parcel E (and changing the title of this new, reduced parcel)
 - o Link re-use parcels A and D, re-name this new re-use parcel
 - Recommendation
 - Mayor Eberhardt motioned to recommend BPO 7, seconded
 - LAP votes 5-0 to recommend BPO 7
- Option 8

- o An iteration of BPO 5
- Place a nursing home facing the water on re-use Parcel E, reducing Parcel E (and changing the title of this new, reduced parcel)
- Construct a new behavioral health building near Building 364
- o Link re-use Parcels A and D, and re-name this new re-use parcel
- Recommendation
 - Sanford Garfunkel motioned to recommend BPO 8, seconded
 - LAP votes 5-0 to recommend BPO 8

<Break for Lunch 1:00 PM- 1:30 PM>

(During break site maps for BPOs 7 and 8 were developed to allow LAP members to review and confirm the maps accurately reflected the LAP's intent.)

X. Ranking of Options:

Options the LAP recommends to the Secretary for further study are therefore:
 BPOs 2, 3, 7 and 8 as seen in the following table:

BPO	Yes	No
1	0	5
2	5	0
3	5	0
4	0	5
5	0	5
6	0	5
*7	5	0
*8	5	0

- Roy Albert motions that the options are ranked:
 7, 8, 2, 3
- LAP votes 5-0 to rank the options in this manner

XI. Closing Statements:

- Next meeting will report the Secretary's Decision that will determine the three to six options that will move forward to Stage II
- · Stage II analysis will then occur
- The additional site plans, including the new options proposed by the LAP, will be posted on the CARES website

2:10PM Meeting Adjourned