

**ST. ALBANS VA MEDICAL CENTER**

**Local Advisory Panel Meeting – Public Meeting  
Pratt Auditorium  
September 29, 2005, 11:00 AM – 6:50 PM**

**I. Participants**

**Local Advisory Panel (LAP) Members:** Robert Schuster, LAP Chair; Andrew Adler, MD, Deputy Chief of Staff, NYHHS; Ralph DeMarco, Executive Director; VSO; Seth Bornstein; Ben Weisbroth; Olivia Coleman Banks, Community Representative

**LAP Member Absent:** Mark McMillan

**VA:** Stephen Gonzenbach, CARES Support Team Leader; Stephen Bergen, Interim CARES Support Team Leader; Christine Crockett, Data Manager; Mike McElroy, Assistant COTR; Jay Halpern, Special Assistant to the Secretary and Designated Federal Official, Office of Strategic Initiatives; John Mazzulla, Public Affairs Officer; Joy Andrew; Martin Sobel

**Team PwC:** Ryder Smith (PricewaterhouseCoopers), Garey M. Fuqua (PwC), Ryan Ewalt (PwC), Susan Niculescu (Perkins + Will), Sally Hinderegger (Perkins + Will)

**Pruitt Group:** Roger Kormendi, John Watts

**Public:** 90 attendees

**11:00 AM - 11:15 AM**

**II. Opening Remarks:** Mr. Schuster

- Welcome
- Introduction of LAP members
- Introduction of VA Team members: Stephen Gonzenbach
- Introduction of Team PwC and Pruitt Group: Ryder Smith
- Approved minutes from first LAP meeting
- Change of written comments being submitted within 10 days of the public meeting
- Roberts Rules of Order
- Overview of agenda
- Procedures for collecting public questions
- Purpose of meeting and next steps

**III. CARES Study and Business Plan Options (BPOs) Presentation:** Ryder Smith (PwC) assisted by Susan Niculescu (Perkins+Will) and Roger Kormendi (Pruitt Group)

- The presentation and a supporting narrative are posted to the public website: [www.va.gov/CARES](http://www.va.gov/CARES). A summary of the BPOs is available for reference at this meeting.

- Recap of the first LAP meeting
- Project overview timeline
- Reiteration of the 2004 Secretary's Decision
- Mr. Schuster: Are these options all going to be replacements of facilities?
- Mr. Smith: Two options were developed specifically emphasizing renovation rather than replacement facilities due to stakeholder input from the first public meeting.
- Overview of the Capital Planning Study and Re-Use/ Redevelopment Studies
- Purpose of this meeting
- Public input through June 30, 2005
- Mr. Bornstein: Would like to make sure women's health and hospice care are noted as important areas of concern from stakeholders.
- Mr. Schuster: Would like to also add that enhancement of services are noted as important areas of concern from stakeholders.
- Stakeholder input taken into account during option development

**IV. Report on Administrative Meeting:** Stephen Gonzenbach

- Reviewed materials to be presented today
- Reviewed options and asked clarifying questions of Team PwC
- Reviewed change from 14 days of public comment to 10 days
- Noted exception for financial disclosure requirements of LAP Members
- Discussed today's meeting processes and procedures
- Reminded audience to please turn off cell phones and pagers
- Mr. Schuster: Please use note cards to ask questions about options

**V. CARES Study and Business Plan Options (BPOs) Presentation**

**continued:** Ryder Smith (PwC) assisted by Susan Niculescu (Perkins+Will) and Roger Kormendi (Pruitt Group)

- Overview of St. Albans campus
  - a. Site plan
  - b. Enrollment projections
- Options development process
- Overview of nine options developed
- BPO 1: Baseline
  - a. Reflects current conditions projected into the future without any changes in services and programs in order to obtain and modern, safe, and secure environment
  - b. Ms. Niculescu: Site plan
    - i. Nursing units need more area per patient
    - ii. Only one building would be vacant
  - c. Access is measured by drive time. Evaluation is the same for each option since no services are leaving the campus.

- d. Quality and security are achieved. Number of outpatients projected to increase significantly.
  - e. Significant capital investment required.
  - f. Mr. Schuster: Since outpatient is projected to grow significantly, what about thoughts about expanding the Outpatient Clinic (OPC)?
  - g. Ms. Niculescu: Would need to analyze that information in more depth in Stage II. Now there are two buildings not occupied, and in the future there would only be one building not occupied.
  - h. Dr. Adler: Question about data source and accuracy
  - i. Mr. Smith: That is the data we have been provided by VA.
  - j. Mr. Bornstein: Question on duration of swing space renovation.
  - k. Ms. Niculescu: Renovation would take a long time, which would add cost.
  - l. Mr. Smith: Likely a four to five year renovation plan. Any plan must make sure that services are continuously available to veterans.
- BPO 2: Replacement – Near to State Veterans' Home
    - a. Mr. Bornstein: Entrance would be on 115<sup>th</sup> Street?
    - b. Ms. Niculescu: That is correct.
    - c. Mr. Schuster: Was there any consideration on the traffic flow impact by this option?
    - d. Ms. Niculescu: Should take that into consideration. If it is a concern, should state it as such in this meeting.
    - e. Ms. Niculescu: Advantage of this option is that it is close to the Stage Veterans' Home. Could leave existing nursing units in place while the new units are built, which would allow easy transition to the new facility.
    - f. Mr. DeMarco: Would parking be available in the 150 ft setback?
    - g. Ms. Niculescu: Can consider that.
    - h. Ms. Banks: Have you taken bus transportation into consideration?
    - i. Ms. Niculescu: This option would have about the same walk time from the bus stop.
    - j. Mr. Kormendi: Any empty space could be used for re-use. Almost any building or land that is left available would be very valuable. Re-use dollars are funneled back into veteran services.
    - k. Mr. Schuster: The square building is really the outpatient facility, and the rectangular building is the nursing home facility. If we recommend that this

should be one story, this footprint would change significantly.

- l. Ms. Niculescu: That is correct. Laundry would be relocated. All other services stay.
  - m. Mr. Schuster: To renovate an old building is usually more costly than building new, right?
  - n. Ms. Niculescu: Renovating lets you preserve some of the building. You might have as much as 90% of the cost of the building to put into it. Depends on the height of the ceilings, etc. Costs are very close and depends very much on the condition of the existing building. Will do a more detailed analysis in Stage II.
  - o. Mr. Smith: This has long-term implications that will need to be studied further in Stage II.
  - p. Ms. Niculescu: More phases brings about higher costs, and costs can add up with renovations very quickly.
- BPO 3: Replacement near 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Outpatient Clinic near Linden Boulevard
    - a. Dr. Adler: Advantages of BPO 2 vs. BPO 3?
    - b. Mr. Smith: Biggest difference is that in BPO 3, everything would be closer to Linden Boulevard
    - c. Mr. Kormendi: Not much difference between the two in terms of re-use. Closer buildings get to central campus; lose a little bit of re-use potential.
    - d. Ms. Niculescu: In BPO 2, do not need to demolish.
  - BPO 4: Replacement near Linden Boulevard
    - a. Nursing home closer to center of campus than BPO 3
    - b. Main services would be focused in center of campus, causing property/buildings in upper left and lower right portions of campus to be disconnected and of lesser re-use value
    - c. In all replacement options, would demolish chapel and auditorium.
    - d. Ms. Niculescu: Could not demolish and would not interfere with option.
    - e. Dr. Adler: Question about recommending to preserve auditorium through the enhanced-use process.
    - f. Mr. Kormendi: Would recommend those desires, but LAP would not be involved in the enhanced-use process.
    - g. Mr. Schuster: The overriding considerations that impact every option will change re-use potential. The LAP must consider re-use, but first and foremost we need to consider how to provide for veterans.
  - BPO 5: Replacement near Long Island Railroad

- a. Mr. DeMarco and Mr. Schuster: Would the noise from the railroad be a problem?
  - b. Ms. Niculescu: That is a disadvantage to this option.
  - c. Ms. Banks: Could the two be switched around?
  - d. Ms. Niculescu: If the 150 ft guideline is not met, could switch the two buildings.
  - e. Ms. Banks: Is this the only option that keeps all buildings on campus intact?
  - f. Mr. Smith: BPOs 2 and 5 keep the entire campus available.
  - g. Farther walk from the bus.
  - h. Fractured space for re-use, but not fundamental change.
  - i. Mr. Kormendi: Fundamental change would only take place if there is a change in height/ space requirements recommended by the LAP.
- BPO 6: Replacement near Baisley Boulevard
    - a. Mr. Kormendi: Fractured space for re-use, but not fundamental change.
    - b. Dr. Adler: Is a separate building possible for domiciliary?
    - c. Ms. Niculescu: Yes, could have a separate building or wing for domiciliary.
    - d. Mr. Schuster: In all options, the treatment facility will remain.
    - e. Mr. Smith: Correct.
  - BPO 7: Replacement near NY Stage Drug Treatment building
    - a. Disadvantage is remote access from Linden Avenue.
    - b. Preserves current nursing home.
    - c. Dr. Adler: Does this have a unique advantage over other options?
    - d. Ms. Niculescu: Space all around nursing home, so re-use around buildings would be more pleasant and less of a reason to demolish. More space around buildings.
    - e. Mr. Kormendi: Allows more land to be available for re-use.
    - f. Mr. Smith: Would require outsourcing of laundry.
    - g. Would probably require demolishing Drug Treatment building for additional parking, and could add new entrance off Baisley.
  - BPO 8: Combination, new Outpatient Clinic and renovated Nursing Home
    - a. Closer to main entrance on Linden Boulevard.
    - b. Renovate inpatient and nursing home.
    - c. Dr. Adler: Would have to build and renovate. Seems to be very disruptive.

## 10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- d. Ms. Niculescu: Could move nursing home residents to other wings of hospitals during renovations.
  - e. May be more expensive.
- BPO 9: Combination, renovated Outpatient and new Nursing Home
  - a. Ms. Niculescu: Makes more sense because it is easier to provide modern nursing home services in a new building than in an old building. Easier to turn an old building into a modern clinic than a modern nursing home.
  - b. More attractive re-use opportunity than BPO 8.
  - c. This would be easier to phase than BPO 8.
- Mr. Smith: Discussed options not selected for assessment
- Mr. Smith: Discussed next steps
  - a. LAP will review BPOs and recommend
    - i. Options to study further
    - ii. Additional options
    - iii. Specific concerns to be addressed
  - b. Will collect stakeholder input for 10 days after the public meeting
  - c. Provide feedback through website, on paper here, or by mail
- Questions from the public: moderated by Mr. Schuster
  - a. Will services be enhanced?
  - b. Mr. Smith: Will keep all services currently offered.
  - c. Why replace buildings?
  - d. Ms. Niculescu: The buildings are aging and in need of replacement.
  - e. Mr. Smith: To achieve larger patient rooms and to change sizes of rooms, will need to weigh upgrading buildings versus rebuilding.
  - f. Mr. Kormendi: May keep some of those buildings as previously discussed.
  - g. Is Queens considered to be a part of Metro NY?
  - h. Mr. Smith: Yes, and the data takes into consideration other patients that come into St. Albans.
  - i. Will services be moved elsewhere?
  - j. Mr. Smith: No
  - k. Outsourcing of laundry why? Cost?
  - l. Mr. Smith: Do not currently know cost of contracting out versus keeping in house. Not part of our authorized scope of study. However, hospitals are generally getting out of laundry services.
  - m. Ms. Niculescu: Hospitals find that it is more cost effective to contract those services out.
  - n. Mr. Schuster: Not a done deal regarding laundry services.

- o. Is the state nursing home on federal property?
- p. Mr. Schuster: No, the state nursing home is on state property.
- q. Does a lower number of floors void current options?
- r. Ms. Niculescu: Need feedback on height and space for buildings from LAP and stakeholders.
- s. What if enrollment projections are inaccurate?
- t. Mr. Smith: We have used assumptions that have been provided by the VA. The VA will adjust plans as new data becomes available.
- u. How do we handle expansion issues after construction has begun?
- v. Mr. Smith: Will do a sensitivity analysis in Stage II that will provide consideration to new demand.
- w. Will this nursing home be designed to be able to add floors onto it later if needed?
- x. Ms. Niculescu: That is a very good thing for the LAP to recommend. Designing a building strong enough to build extra floors onto it does not require that much of a capital investment.
- y. Why has there not been a new site in Queens that would provide better access?
- z. Mr. Smith: Secretary's Decision does not allow Team PwC that latitude.
- aa. Are there re-use opportunities for BPOs 2 and 3?
- bb. Mr. Smith: Those two probably make the most land available of all nine.
- cc. What is the time associated with putting up new buildings or renovating?
- dd. Mr. Smith: Team PwC must ensure that services provided here must stay here at all times, so there will be no disruption in service.
- ee. Will budget allocation be available for funding?
- ff. Mr. Smith: Re-use is a potential source of funds for VA.
- gg. If parking is allowed in the security zone, how is that secure?
- hh. Mr. Smith: This is just a guideline set by DHS.
- ii. For BPO 7, what happens to the Drug Treatment Facility?
- jj. Mr. Smith: Would answer that question in Stage II if that option gets selected for moving forward. Drug Treatment Facility could remain.
- kk. How expensive would this be?
- ll. Mr. Smith: Do not have cost studies yet.
- mm. Considerations of Cherry Blossom trees?

- nn. Mr. Smith: Have not considered it yet.
- oo. Would BPO 7 need to demolish facilities?
- pp. Ms. Niculescu: Would not necessarily have to demolish.
- qq. How were calculations made? And are those numbers available to the public?
- rr. Mr. Smith: Utilization calculations made by the VA, and demand presentation is available on the public website.

<Break 1:10 PM – 2:20 PM>

**VI. Public Comments**

- Stephen Gonzenbach: Operating Procedures
- Mr. Smith: Brief recap of options
- Mr. Schuster: Please keep comments to inside three minutes
- Public Comment #1
  - a. Comments do not apply to St. Albans, but rather Manhattan-Brooklyn study he attended a hearing on the previous week.
  - b. Go outside the box
  - c. Never move forward without bloodshed
  - d. Learn from history or repeat the mistakes of the past
  - e. Does not want to close Manhattan VAMC
  - f. Report has no footnotes, no references, and a lack of substance
  - g. Violence is the last refuge of the inarticulate
- Public Comment #2: Assemblyman Scarborough, 29<sup>th</sup> District
  - a. Neighbor and representative
  - b. Most impressed by BPO 4, which would move the facility closer to Linden Boulevard
  - c. First concern has to be the care and maintenance of the veterans and facilities
  - d. Concerned about the 75% of the property that is not included in that plan
  - e. Does not want to see the property sold to developers
  - f. Would like to see community use re-use (e.g. assisted living, nursing home, community center, etc)
- Public Comment #3
  - a. Should expect that the VA will have to eventually expand these facilities due to longer life expectancy
  - b. City should not construct a school when St. Albans will have to expand later
  - c. Should not shrink VA campus
  - d. LAP: you can develop your own options



## 10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- e. Be careful of community center addition with Drug Treatment Facility
- Public Comment #4
  - a. Has been volunteering here for 18 years
  - b. Supports BPO #1
  - c. What bothers him the most is that on the other eight options focus too much on re-use
  - d. What do we need to re-use it for?
  - e. What's wrong with a Central Park-type situation here?
  - f. Will need extra land in the future for increased demand
  - g. Will incur high costs to demolish, and should be cheaper to renovate
  - h. E and F wings could be renovated and people could be put in there
  - i. Saw Babe Ruth play on the golf course on these grounds
  - j. Forget about re-use. Use it for the veterans who deserve every ounce and penny of it
- Public Comment #5
  - a. Has lived in this area for 40 some years now, and is a retired marine
  - b. Would like to see an emergency facility here
  - c. Would like to see some of the community to use some of the land
- Public Comment #6
  - a. A veteran who has used the hospital
  - b. Cost overruns and waste of money
  - c. Who will eventually succeed? Not the veterans.
- Public Comment #7
  - a. Jewish war veteran
  - b. Vietnam veteran
  - c. Options poorly defined
  - d. BPO 1 acceptable
  - e. Need 240 – 400 beds
  - f. Beds should be available in case of emergency
  - g. Opposes any option that would reduce the size of the campus
  - h. Have sufficient space for VSOs
  - i. Various improvements including security
  - j. Will impact Manhattan veterans
  - k. Should only serve the VA
  - l. Should be a federally owned facility only
  - m. Build schools outside campus walls
- Public Comment #8

## 10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- a. Need extra bed space that would be available on a moment's notice due to potential emergency situations
  - b. Doubts data due to policy decisions which exclude some veterans
  - c. Money from leases will not be used to improve healthcare here
  - d. Will we be able to comment on LAP-recommended options?
- Public Comment #9
    - a. Thomas White, Jr. – CEO of JCAMH
    - b. Will respond on website to options
    - c. As a veteran, is in full support of all these services
    - d. History of JCAP
    - e. Would like to have original intentions of property honored by deeding that property to JCAP
    - f. JCAP stands ready to serve veterans
    - g. Vote down BPO 7
  - Public Comment #10
    - a. William Nelson
    - b. President of Neighborhood Association
    - c. Park provides services to everyone in the community
    - d. Would like to talk about working with any re-use property
  - Public Comment #11
    - a. Treasurer of St. Albans Hospital volunteers
    - b. Has not heard any talk of creating an assisted living facility here, which is needed
    - c. Need to address what we will do with the veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan
  - Public Comment #12
    - a. Was in Vietnam and Korean conflicts
    - b. This hospital has to stay
    - c. Hospital here for the benefit of all American people
  - Public Comment #13
    - a. Dr. Elgin Watkins, represents St. Albans Congregational Church
    - b. Re-use for senior facilities, senior assisted living, child development center, renovation of the rehabilitation facility
    - c. Proposes to design and manage senior living village
    - d. LAP Chair Question: Seniors from across the spectrum for age, or specific ages?
    - e. Probably against the law to set aside certain ages. Veterans, families, and widows would get priority.
  - Public Comment #14

## 10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- a. Been in this facility for 20 plus years
  - b. The new building will not be a full service hospital or an emergency room, which is what veterans need
- Public Comment #15
  - a. Wife of 100% disabled WW II veteran
  - b. Do not have enough supplies or resources to take care of veterans we have now
  - c. Why spend money on new buildings and not resources needed currently?
  - d. Do not put air conditioning in the ceiling because it will be too cold
  - e. Need better medical care here
  - f. Husband has to ride in an ambulance for 1.5 hours to Fort Hamilton for basic care
  - g. Should allow privilege of private rooms
- Public Comment #16
  - a. Live in St. Albans area
  - b. Need a state of the art nursing home and veterans facilities here
  - c. Should have an emergency facility here
  - d. All land should be used for veterans
- Public Comment #17
  - a. Brian Simmon, Executive Assistant to Congressman Meeks
  - b. Favored BPO 4
  - c. But does not talk about square footage that would utilized or left over
  - d. Concern about what happens with left over land
  - e. Does not want park to be turned into too high of density housing
  - f. Need state of the art facility
  - g. Would like to receive more information about BPO 4
  - h. Make a better effort to make the community aware of what is going on so that more people can attend next meeting
- Public comment #18
  - a. Veteran, Disabled American Veterans (DAV)
  - b. Dislikes any non-veteran usage of veteran property
  - c. Keep veterans opportunities and benefits in place
  - d. LAP Member Response: Do not include spouses?
  - e. Speaker Response: Yes, would include spouses and significant others.
- Public Comment #19
  - a. Should upgrade, but nothing should be taken away
  - b. No sale of the property to outsiders

- c. Do not want to see an increase in population
  - d. Should concentrate on as many services for veterans as possible
  - e. Should build a meeting place and a place for children
  - f. These meetings should be better publicized
- Public Comment #20
  - a. Veteran and volunteer
  - b. Needs to be better publicity
  - c. Everyone who works for government should concentrate more on veterans
  - d. Stop cutting benefits for veterans
  - e. Enhance the quality of life for every veteran
  - f. Need an emergency room here
  - g. Over 7,000 people have signed the petition for the addition of an emergency room
- Public Comment #21
  - a. 100% disabled veteran
  - b. Favors BPO 1
  - c. Should only be used for veterans, and not for anyone else
  - d. Priority 6-8 should be able to use this hospital without fees
  - e. Need better data
  - f. Make transportation better to facility
  - g. Do not relocate it or close it down
  - h. Just add on and make more services available
  - i. Make it cost effective
  - j. Need affordable treatment

<Break from 3:53 PM – 4:10 PM>

**VII. Continue Public Comment**

- Public Comment #22
  - a. DAV, disabled veteran
  - b. Has used facility extensively over the past two years
  - c. Leave building intact
  - d. Money should go forth to refurbish and bring this building up to code
  - e. Veterans need this facility
  - f. Money for new construction would go to just make other people rich
  - g. New construction would disrupt the neighborhood as well as the minds and hearts of veterans
- Public Comment #23
  - a. This building is a work of art

- b. Building should not be demolished and should be refurbished
- c. Add emergency room
- d. Maintain Linden Boulevard entrance

<Break from 4:15PM to 5:08PM>

- Public Comment #24
  - a. Veteran
  - b. Agrees with constructing new facilities
  - c. Wants to know where the projection of decreasing veterans came from
  - d. Does not like the direction of our country when there is a war and there are hospitals closing
  - e. Wants healthcare to be maintained or get better
- Public Comment #25
  - a. Vietnam veteran
  - b. Retirees were required to pay co-payments, so they went to the VA
  - c. Works at the VA
  - d. Concerned about the VA being downsized
  - e. Does not want the VA to lose services
- Public Comment #26
  - a. Jewish war veteran
  - b. Do not have good quality of doctors in this facility
  - c. Brooklyn VAMC has better doctors
  - d. Too long of travel time to Brooklyn
- Public Comment #27
  - a. Has been coming to the VA since 1971
  - b. Goes to Fort Hamilton
  - c. Should talk about increasing services here to full service hospital
  - d. Give veterans what was promised to them
  - e. If we continue to get involved in wars, numbers will not drop. Numbers will increase
  - f. There is large commercial interest, and this is really about the large dollar amounts that are at play
  - g. Keep perspective on veterans being what is important

**VIII. Public Comment continued**

- Ms. Banks: Deeded land versus leased land?
  - a. Mr. Kormendi: Sale or deeding of property is not on the table. Enhanced use lease is on the table so that proceeds can be kept at the local or VISN level.
  - b. Mr. Schuster: Do all the leases have to be 75 years?

- c. Mr. Kormendi: No, 75 years is the maximum term for a lease. Depends on the situation.
  - d. Public Comment: Will a new nursing home allow for an enhanced use lease?
  - e. Mr. Kormendi: Only the land not built on will be available for enhanced use leases. Could still build a new nursing home.
- Public Comment: Can the government give up the right to terminate a lease?
  - Mr. Kormendi: Yes, government could give up the right, which would make it easier to sell to a lender.
  - What is the period during which the government gives up that right?
  - Mr. Kormendi: There are currently 15 and 30 year leases that are functioning.
- Public Comment: Widow's can be provided services?
  - Yes, the State Veterans Home would provide services to her.
- Public Comment: Could lose property to the state of New York or the federal government.
- Public Comment: Urge LAP to create their own options that expand services. Take a larger chunk of the land so that future expansion can be done if needed.
- Public Comment: What is your suggestion for veterans to keep these services?

<Break from 5:25M to 5:35PM>

#### **IX. Local Advisory Panel Deliberations on BPOs**

- Stephen Gonzenbach: Operating procedures and purpose of deliberations
- BPO 1
  - a. Does not require a vote
  - b. Mr. Schuster: Regardless of the option, a nursing home that is five or six stories is inappropriate. The nursing home should be no more than two stories. Would like to see various layouts of nursing homes. Should resemble a home.
  - c. Ms. Banks: Should allow atriums for a more pleasing environment.
  - d. Mr. Bornstein: Would like to see the complex retained as much as possible.
  - e. Dr. Adler: Issue of projection came up multiple times. Would question some of those projections. What happens with changes in eligibility? Would like to see both facilities as new buildings. Nursing home should

be enhanced with a legitimate hospice section and should be maximum of two stories. Outpatient Clinic should be maximum of three stories, and should enhance services, especially women's services. If there are funds to staff an emergency service care center, that should also be included. Options should avoid any demolition. If we move OPC to more remote locations on campus, could overcome transpiration issues by creating an effective busing service. Options should focus on serving veterans.

f. Mr. Schuster: Must have an open air environment, two story nursing home maximum, three story outpatient clinic maximum, include women's services. Contractor should study the feasibility of emergency services to focus on stabilization. Any enhanced use should be dedicated to veteran use. All should be incorporated into each option.

- BPO 2: Replacement near to the State Veterans Home
  - a. Will adjust space due to LAP's new recommendations
  - b. Entrance would be on 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue
  - c. Ms. Banks: Concerned that an entrance on 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be too disruptive.
  - d. Dr. Adler: If the footprint does not include demolition, would support this. Access can be resolved through an effective shuttle service.
  - e. Mr. Bornstein: Entrance on 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be too disruptive.
  - f. Ms. Niculescu: Would have to increase space for footprint.
  - g. Mr. DeMarco: Would not need 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue entrance. Just use Linden Boulevard entrance.
  - h. Mr. Smith: BPO 2 and 3 will essentially get folded into one option due to new LAP recommendations.
  - i. Mr. Schuster: BPO 3 would be better since BPO 3 is closer to Linden Boulevard.
  - j. Mr. Smith: 150 ft setback just a goal.
  - k. Ms. Niculescu: In BPO 2, it would be impossible to keep all buildings. In BPO 3, would lose E and F nursing home wings.
  - l. Mr. Kormendi: Will be a real estate tradeoff.
  - m. Mr. Schuster: How is keeping buildings a bad thing?
  - n. Mr. Kormendi: Could lose tens of millions of dollars. Secretary could say he was not interested if the LAP does not offer a reasonable amount of re-use.

## 10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- o. Mr. Weisbroth: Vote only shows potential geographic location of buildings?
  - p. Mr. Smith: Correct.
  - q. Vote: 1 Yes, 5 No. Option is not recommended by LAP for further study.
  
- BPO 3
  - a. Location nearer to 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue than State Veterans Home
  - b. Vote: 0 Yes, 6 No. Option is not recommended by LAP for further study.
  
- BPO 4
  - a. Location near to Linden Boulevard than BPO 3.
  - b. Demolition of all buildings except the Pratt Auditorium.
  - c. Mr. Bornstein: With not paying attention to 150 ft setback, would less demolition be necessary?
  - d. Ms. Niculescu: It is possible to grow more toward 115<sup>th</sup> Avenue, could keep everything besides E and F wings.
  - e. Ms. Banks: Concerned about cost effectiveness.
  - f. Ms. Niculescu: Much of the front part of the building would go down and would be very different.
  - g. Mr. Kormendi: Might need to think through modifying options and creating new options.
  - h. Mr. Halpern: Would be cleaner if you vote on current options and create new options.
  - i. Vote: 4 Yes, 2 No. Option is recommended to the Secretary for further study.
  
- BPO 5
  - a. Domiciliary would be close to the railroad
  - b. No demolition
  - c. Ms. Banks: Can we switch the two buildings around so the domiciliary is not by the railroad?
  - d. Ms. Niculescu: Without pulling down any of the existing building and the larger space needing to be less than or equal to two stories, would not be able to switch two buildings.
  - e. Mr. Schuster: Do not like nursing home being close to the railroad track.
  - f. Vote: 0 Yes, 6 No. Option is not recommended by LAP for further study.
  
- BPO 6
  - a. Could be built without demolishing existing buildings



- b. Mr. Weisbroth: Fuel tanks located where?
- c. Ms. Niculescu: Those tanks are right along the property line that faces the railroad. Those tanks would be quite far from the residence, approximately 70 feet. The needs of the garage would be addressed in the new facility. Fuel oil tank regulation is 25 feet from a building, and, because it is greater than that, those tanks would be controlled.
- d. Mr. Kormendi: Re-use would require significant renovation. Would probably get rid of fuel tanks and administrative buildings.
- e. Vote: 3 Yes, 3 No. Option is not recommended by LAP for further study.
- f. Mr. Halpern: Need to fully understand the reason why option did not go forward.
- g. Ms. Niculescu: Did not go forward because new facility would be surrounded by utilitarian buildings (e.g. a garage and tanks) and would not be ideal for a new building
- h. LAP: Agreed.

- BPO 7

- a. Do not need to bring down the Drug Treatment Facility if 150 ft setback is not an issue
- b. Chair: 150 ft setback is not an issue in general
- c. Closer to Baisley Boulevard.
- d. Ms. Niculescu: Thought the LAP directed Team PwC to just have access on Linden Avenue and provide a shuttle bus service.
- e. Dr. Adler: Agreed.
- f. Vote: 6 Yes, 0 No. Option is recommended to the Secretary for further study.

- BPO 8

- a. New facility would be for the Outpatient Clinic, and chapel and auditorium would remain
- b. Nursing Home would be renovated
- c. Moves facilities closer to Linden Boulevard
- d. Dr. Adler: Requires difficult renovations and shuffling of patients during renovations. Extremely disruptive.
- e. Ms. Niculescu: Correct. Would need to renovate first because you would need E and F wings for swing space, and that would take a long amount of time. Then could build new building.
- f. Vote: 0 Yes, 6 No. Option is not recommended by LAP for further study.

- BPO 9
  - a. New facility would be for the nursing home.
  - b. Renovate Outpatient Clinic.
  - c. Mr. Schuster: Easier to upgrade outpatient space than inpatient space. Could expedite building of nursing home since old nursing home building could be utilized during construction. Like main entrance still on Linden Boulevard. Offers more re-use space.
  - d. Dr. Adler: Not an ideal situation, but would still consider as a possibility.
  - e. Ms. Niculescu: Would you want a connection between inpatient and outpatient services?
  - f. Dr. Adler: Yes, would need some way to get from nursing home to clinic without going outdoors.
  - g. Ms. Banks: What would be demolished in this option?
  - h. Ms. Niculescu: Would not have to demolish any existing buildings.
  - i. Vote: 6 Yes, 0 No. Option is recommended to the Secretary for further study.
  
- “BPO 10” (New option added by LAP)
  - a. This is a new option representing a modified BPO 4 plus keeping the auditorium and the chapel.
  - b. Demolition of major portions of this campus is negative because it is expensive, the character of the campus is diminished, and enhanced lease opportunities could be hurt.
  - c. Mr. Smith: Per LAP’s earlier recommendation, will avoid demolition as much as possible.
  - d. Vote: 4 Yes, 2 No. Option is recommended to the Secretary for further study.
  
- Options the LAP recommends to the Secretary for further study are therefore: BPOs 1 (Baseline, automatic inclusion), 4, 7, 9 and 10 as seen in the following table:

BPO	Yea	Nay
2	1	5
3	0	6
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
5	0	6
6	3	3
<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
8	0	6
<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

10/11/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

10*	4	2
-----	---	---

\*New proposed option by LAP

**Meeting Adjourned: 6:50PM**