



TOWN OF GREENWICH

PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE (TPC) REPORT

Report Submitted on behalf of the POCD-Town Properties Committee by:

**John M. Lucarelli
POCD - TPC Chair**

Date Submitted: March 27, 2012

POCD Town Properties Committee – Executive Summary

Honorable First Selectman Peter J. Tesei:

The POCD Town Properties Committee (TPC) was appointed, convened, and commissioned on March 10, 2010, by the First Selectman, Hon. Peter J. Tesei to examine and advise on areas of the POCD affecting town properties. At its inception, the TPC set its mission to be: **“To develop a long-term plan for the preservation, maintenance, enhancement, and stewardship of Greenwich Town properties, for the prosperity of our town and the enjoyment and benefit of all its residents.”** Building off the original work completed by the Town Property Committee chaired by Mr. Eric Brower in 2001, the current TPC has identified 210 separate parcels owned by the Town of Greenwich. However, there are several properties whose controlling authority is still in question. Each property has been verified and authenticated through the considerable help of Mr. Theodore Gwartney and the Assessor’s Office Staff. To the greatest extent possible, this inventory and building data is sound and dependable. Based on our work, we respectfully offer the following findings and recommendations for consideration. Taken together, they constitute a plan of action to improve the management of the Town’s valuable property portfolio.

Findings and Recommendations:

- 1) Town needs to consistently review its long term plan for optimal property use, energy efficiency, “green initiatives”, universal application of industry best practices for management or consistent use, neglected properties, and leasing procedures.**

Recommendation: Establish a standing Town Properties mechanism (i.e. possibly a new Town department using existing personnel or hire outside real estate professionals or create a volunteer Town Property Management Committee, etc.) providing oversight on all Town property decisions, long term planning, property maintenance, capital improvements, leasing, best civic use, needed acquisitions and dispositions, and long term use and capital expenditure schedules.

- 2) Town property data is incomplete and what exists is dispersed across several Town departments.**

Recommendation: Establish a centralized town property data center to maintain all data on town properties, including surveys, title searches, maintenance schedules, capital expenditures, etc.

- 3) Town lease data is incomplete, inconsistent and disbursed across several departments.**

Recommendation: Establish centralized lease data center (including licenses, use agreements, etc.) to maintain all leases and standardize leasing procedures and provisions; such as insurance, expense reimbursement, utilities, maintenance, etc.

- 4) **Many of our Town's most important properties do not have established metes and bounds and what easements and right of ways exist on the Town's properties as well as on private properties.**

Recommendation: Hire an independent firm to perform a title search and surveys (if required) for critical Town properties.

- 5) **Town of Greenwich does not have capacity to buy properties in a timely manner as recommended in the POCD. The Town of Greenwich owns 210 properties. It may not need them all or it might need more to address future needs.**

Recommendation: Develop standardized Town property acquisition and disposition policies and procedures.

- 6) **Town has unique waterfront Town properties and should explore other alternatives for their management and development.**

Recommendation: Consider best options for unique waterfront Town properties to maximize residents' usage and enjoyment of our waterfront community referencing explicit guidelines in the POCD. Must take into account current use needs for Town operations on the waterfront and find alternate locations so the Town's waterfront can be better utilized by it's residents.

- 7) **Town needs better transparency on all Town Property/Land Use matters.**

Recommendation: The heads of the various town departments concerned with town properties appear once a year before the Land Use Committee of the RTM and state their views, and be questioned on the condition and needs of town properties. The department heads involved would include Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Conservation Commission, IWWA, and Planning and Zoning.

- 8) **Given the trends of the past thirty years, the Town will continue to have service need expansion in the future (Town service needs including infrastructure maintenance facilities, senior facilities, education, emergency shelters, etc.).**

Recommendation: Rather than buying extremely expensive properties and also dealing with NIMBY issues, the Town should develop multi-use strategies of existing town properties (i.e. railway properties adapted to host affordable housing, Senior center using other Town facilities that are only used at night, civic centers being used as emergency shelter, create sand/salt facility in Backcountry on Town/State properties, etc.). The Town needs to adopt best and creative multi-use property management practices to obtain the most value out of our town properties.

Our report addresses these eight recommendations in more detail and the many complexities that affect them. Overall, we recommend that the Town-owned properties need more coordinated management and protection in order to ensure that these important assets are not compromised.

The report is constructed based on these recommendations and is accompanied by appendices including a land map of all Town properties, a list of town properties with Town assessor values, Town Demographics, Town Property Statistics, other POCD committee executive summaries, list of town leases, licensing agreements and operating agreements, and DPW Superintendent property management, maintenance and condition reports.

We conclude our report with some of the concepts supporting our policy recommendations and trends that might affect our Town in the future. Our committee approved minutes and member biographies are also included.

The POCD Town Properties Committee has been honored and challenged by its responsibility. We look forward to assisting the First Selectman and the Town in the future by helping develop sound real estate management practices for our considerable and vital Town properties.

Respectfully Submitted By:

**John M. Lucarelli
POCD - Town Property Committee Chair**

POCD – Town Properties Committee Report Index:

- Town Properties Committee – Findings and Recommendations	P. 6
- Public Safety, Affordable Housing and Administration Properties Committee Advisory Comments	P. 12
- Open Space and Park Properties Committee Advisory Comments	P. 21
- Education, Library and Museum Properties Committee Advisory Comments	P. 25
- Infrastructure and Railroad Properties Committee Advisory Comments	P. 28
- Land Disposition Policy Committee Advisory Comments	P. 32
- Land Acquisition Policy Committee Advisory Comments	P. 35
- Appendix I. – GIS Map of all Town of Greenwich Properties	P. 38
- Appendix II. – 2010 Town of Greenwich Property Audit / Inventory	P. 40
- Appendix III. - Town of Greenwich Demographics	P. 48
- Appendix IV. – Town of Greenwich Property Statistics	P. 49
- Appendix V. - POCD Transportation Committee Executive Summary	P. 51
- Appendix VI. - POCD Downtown Planning Committee Executive Summary	P. 54
- Appendix VII. - POCD Housing Task Force Committee Executive Summary	P. 56
- Appendix VIII. – RTM Finance Committee Report on Property Agreements Executive Summary	P. 66
- Appendix IX. - DPW Superintendent Facilities Index Status Report	P. 68
- Appendix X. – TPC - Public Safety, Affordable Housing and Administration Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments	P.75
- Appendix XI. - Open Space and Park Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments	P.84
- Appendix XII. - Education, Library and Museum Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments	P.86
- Appendix XIII. - Infrastructure and Railroad Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments	P.90
- Appendix XIV. - Notable Town Planning and Property Management Quotes	P.92
- Appendix XV. - Trends that might impact Town Properties in the Future	P.93
- Appendix XVI. – Approved Committee Minutes	P.99
- Appendix XVII. – TPC Mission Statement / Assigned POCD Action Items / TPC Committee Members	P.110
- Appendix XVIII. – TPC Committee Member Biographies	P.111
- Appendix XIX. - Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen’s Environmental Task Force Green Building Policy Resolutions	P.113

Town Property Committee – Findings and Recommendations:

- 1) **Town needs to consistently review its long term plan for optimal property use, energy efficiency, “green initiatives”, universal application of industry best practices for management or consistent use, neglected properties, and leasing procedures.**

Recommendation: Establish a standing Town Properties mechanism (i.e. possibly a new Town department using existing personnel or hire outside real estate professionals or create a volunteer Town Property Management Committee (TPMC), etc.) providing oversight on all Town property decisions, long term planning, property maintenance, capital improvements, leasing, best civic use, needed acquisitions and dispositions, and long term use and capital expenditure schedules.

Any private real estate portfolio the size of Greenwich's has a professional staff and well developed policies for achieving this goal.

- The Town property management mechanism could be in the form of one of the following options:

- 1) Creating a new Town Real Estate Department (if the budget process can afford it).
- 2) Hire an experienced real estate professional solely dedicated to making Town property management decisions and reporting to an existing Town Department.
- 3) Create a Town Property Management Committee appointed by the Board of Selectmen and approved by the RTM using volunteers from the Town’s real estate community with ex officio members from the Board of Selectmen (BOS), Board of Estimate and Taxation (BET), Board of Education (BOE), Department of Public Works (DPW), Planning and Zoning (P&Z), Conservation Commission (CC), Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency (IWWA), Flood and Erosion Control Board (FECB), Tree Warden, Legal Department, Etc.

- Town property mechanism would also employ the various modern methodologies, systems, technologies and policies needed to ascertain the appropriate “**highest and best civic use**” for each Town property. Town should pursue an analysis using property data by: neighborhood focus, natural/man-made features, size, current use, Needs Focus (present, future). In the future, the Town should consider the following ‘Use’ decision criteria:

- Description of Use (create template form of information - Perhaps Town could create a Property Use Application Form (PUAF)
- Duration of Use
- Co-Use Potential (Symbiotic Factors)
- Intensity Factor (Impacts on surrounding area, infrastructure, services, etc.)
- Prejudice on Future Uses:

1. Prohibitive (uses no longer possible)
 2. Site Improvement (sewer, gas, remediation, etc.)
- Cost Benefit (Real Value vs. Service Value)
 - Lifetime Cost (Capital, Operational, etc.)
 - Highest and Best Civic Use analysis
 - Guiding Town Policy and POCD comments on property
 - Each Town property can be categorized into three major use-categories: present, optimal, and secondary
 - Use changes do happen and Town should be aware of this possibility
- Better organization and accountability will allow Town properties to be more efficient, easier to maintain, scale existing maintenance assets, and further explore instituting Town-wide “green” initiatives to allow properties to be more self-sustainable.
 - New mechanism would also oversee Department of Public Works on operational maintenance schedules and a long term prioritization plan for town properties. These plans would prevent the destruction either by neglect or outright demolition of town buildings or properties by developing a process which identifies purposefully deteriorating buildings and provides an opportunity for interested groups and agencies to come forward with proposals while structures are still attractive enough to be of interest. A similar principle may be developed for cutting of trees on town properties.
 - Mechanism would address open liabilities on Town properties:
 - 1) Work with Town departments to develop plan for open liability properties and structures, for instance the Seton House on the Pomerance Property. This committee proposes long-term leasing the property (or perhaps selling the parcel only with the building) to the Boy Scouts of America Greenwich Council for a nominal amount so the building can be renovated by the Council for future use and benefit the Town’s Boy Scouts (and perhaps include a museum/education component to the renovation with adequate parking access to the building.
 - 2) Provide oversight on liability management reports that reviews Town exposure to liability (i.e. schools, administration buildings, trees along roads, parks, etc.)
 - Ensure that any rights such as leases, licenses or other rights granted to third parties affecting the use of town properties be thoroughly vetted with the community.
 - A central mechanism would make sure that all appropriate town boards/ agencies/ committees are brought in on issues dealing with town properties that may affect them and for which they may have some input – economic or otherwise. Such a mechanism should ensure consistency with the goals of the POCD. Such a mechanism

might also encourage the development of public-private partnerships to effectively use the town's assets. Our understanding of the process by which town-owned buildings and land are managed indicates that "silos" exist and that town officers originally charged with these tasks are no longer involved. The Town should learn more about how other towns effectively manage their buildings' usage.

- The mechanism should consolidate Town department reports and opinions and help distribute to the public and the RTM on set intervals (i.e. annually, project specific milestones and on an as needed basis).

2) Town Property data is incomplete and what exists is dispersed across several Town departments.

Recommendation: Establish a centralized town property data center to maintain all data on town properties, including surveys, title searches, maintenance schedules, capital expenditures, etc.

3) Town lease data is incomplete, inconsistent and disbursed across several departments.

Recommendation: Establish centralized lease data center (including licenses, use agreements, etc.) to maintain all leases and standardize leasing procedures and provisions; such as insurance, expense reimbursement, utilities, maintenance, etc.

4) Many of our Town's most important properties do not have established metes and bounds and what easements and right of ways exist on the Town's properties as well as on private properties.

Recommendation: Hire an independent firm to perform a title search and surveys (if necessary) for critical Town properties.

Town needs to appropriate funds to hire an independent firm to perform a title search for the most critical Town properties to establish metes and bounds and what easements and right of ways exist on the Town's properties as well as on private properties. Identify special situations where residents are occupying Town land and determine whether or not the use is acceptable (and if so, seek adequate compensation and indemnification from these inhabitants).

- Although adverse possession laws do not affect municipal properties the Town still needs to protect the Towns property interests against encroachment by developers and private interests. It would be a wise investment to do a title search of these properties to establish: 1.) any restrictions, and 2.) the "metes and bounds" or boundaries of each property. It has been estimated that a professional title search can be completed at a bulk rate of roughly \$500 per Town property). There would be an additional cost to survey each property which

does not currently exist for the vast majority of Town properties. This would spotlight problem areas, and avoid a great deal of legal fees defending the Town's rights against private encroachment. There are many properties where the Town has only an approximation of its property lines. For critical properties, such as downtown, the Town should have certified surveys performed. In addition, the Town of Greenwich will be able to identify special situations where residents are occupying Town land and determine whether or not the use is acceptable (and if so, seek adequate compensation and indemnification from these inhabitants). These two projects would provide an iron clad inventory for the Town's use in management and planning, and fulfill the basic needs of real estate ownership.

- Another goal of our committee was to inventory other property rights which the Town may control, or which may control Town properties. These include such real asset instruments as leases, deed restrictions, easements, right-of-ways, and communal- use designation. For example, the New Lebanon School property (Parcel ID#: 04-4602/S) was donated to the Town, but discontinuance of an educational use causes the property to revert back to the donor's family. Some Town parkland is statutorily dedicated as open space or parkland, and cannot be used in any other way. These may severely reduce the value and constrain the utility of the property for the Town. The listed parcels in the Property Audit/Inventory (See Appendix II.) are noted as having some property use restrictions where it could be verified. Properties not so noted may still be restricted, and should be updated as the information is developed. Property rights held by the Town on private parcels are also of real value, both financially and operationally. They may have resale, enforcement, or planning value. Complete inventory of all such rights held by the Town would avoid redundant capital expenditures, such as buying sewer easements which duplicate existing rights. Enforcement of conservation zones in subdivisions and other P&Z permits could be better achieved. While the TPC has endeavored to answer some of these questions, more financial resources need to be allocated and more in-depth research must be completed to answer these questions.

5) Town does not have capacity to buy properties in a timely manner as recommended in the POCD. Town owns 210 properties. It may not need them all or it might need more to address future needs.

Recommendation: Develop standardized Town property acquisition and disposition policies and procedures.

The objective is to ensure that no town-owned properties are disposed of or new ones purchased without all interested agencies, town groups, and residents being given enough notice and opportunity to comment. But at the same time, be done in a timely matter to be able to take advantage of opportunities as they arise. In addition to notice and hearing time, there

should be procedures in place to see that any such acquisition and/or disposition are subject to procedural safeguards.

- Another example might be the Town land adjacent to the “hole in the ground” property on West Putnam Avenue which by being sold enabled a developer to amass sufficient square footage to permanently affect a parcel that could have adverse non-economic dimensions (such as drainage) for the town. **(See specific chapters on acquisition and disposition policies and procedures).**

6) Town has unique waterfront Town properties and should explore other alternatives for their management and development.

Recommendation: Consider best options for unique waterfront Town properties to maximize residents’ usage and enjoyment of our waterfront community referencing explicit guidelines in the POCD. Must take into account current use needs for Town operations on the waterfront and find alternate locations so the Town’s waterfront can be better utilized by it’s residents.

- There are several waterfront properties currently not used for recreational purposes. These include the storage shed next to Roger Sherman Baldwin Park, the sign building on the Mianus River at Route 1 and River Road, the waterfront park along the Byram River, and the DPW storage area on Strickland Road. Use of these prime waterfront spots for storage is suboptimal. Waterfront property is scarce and should be used to maximize waterfront recreational activities. There is a need for comprehensive space in Town for DPW to house its vehicles, material and equipment. Current DPW space in Town is scattered in waterfront properties.
- The public reaction generated by the rumors that the Steamboat Road pier might be sold (and could be sold) focused public attention on the necessity for treating considerations other than pure economics when entertaining the idea of selling town properties.

7) Town needs better transparency on all Town Property/Land Use matters.

Recommendation: The heads of the various town departments concerned with town properties appear once a year before the Land Use Committee of the RTM and state their views, and be questioned on the condition and needs of town properties. The department heads involved would include Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Conservation Commission, IWWA, and Planning and Zoning.

- As part of the RTM’s Land Use Committees procedure, the chair of the Land Use Committee could then summarize the department head’s comments in a report to the RTM. This should occur at the beginning of the budget cycle in September or October. We believe the language in the POCD that resulted in the creation of the TPC, and the other committees, was the frustration on the part of many RTM members that recommendations contained in the POCD were being ignored by town departments. This recommendation would respond to that concern.

- 8) **Given the trends of the past thirty years, the Town will continue to have service need expansion in the future (Town service needs including infrastructure maintenance facilities, senior facilities, education, emergency shelters, etc.).**

Recommendation: Rather than buying extremely expensive properties and also dealing with NIMBY issues, the Town should develop multi-use strategies of existing town properties (i.e. railway properties adapted to host affordable housing, Senior center using other Town facilities that are only used at night, civic centers being used as emergency shelter, create sand/salt facility in Backcountry on Town/State properties, etc.). The Town needs to adopt best and creative multi-use property management practices to obtain the most value out of our town properties.

- Multi-uses of Town properties should be encouraged where appropriate to make the most of the resources we have. This concept is financially efficient and also consistent with “green” practices as it can make a single facility serve more than one purpose, thereby reducing the need to create or maintain another facility. Examples of existing shared uses include civic centers being used as emergency shelters and the Cos Cob marina parking lots used by railroad commuters during the day and by boaters nights and weekends. Examples of potential shared uses include railway properties adapted to host affordable housing and the Senior Center using other Town facilities that are only used at night (i.e. Teen Center).

Recommendation: Identify potential shared uses of Town properties by looking at current uses of the properties and soliciting input from stakeholders and Town officials.

- There could be legal issues that would need to be considered when trying to marry shared uses. For example, there could be current leases that would need to be modified requiring the consent of the current tenant as well as the Town officials that approved the original lease(s).

Recommendation: Seek assistance from the Law Department to identify potential issues on specific proposed shared uses, negotiate revisions to the leases if necessary and seek required approvals.

- There may be technical issues to consider, depending on the nature of the facility and shared uses. Examples of such issues could include zoning or the physical ability of the property to support all the uses proposed.

Recommendation: The stakeholders involved would commission the necessary studies, seek necessary approvals and perform the physical work to the properties to accommodate the shared uses.

Public Safety, Affordable Housing, Administration Properties Committee Advisory Comments:

- Police/Public Safety Building – this building is more than adequate for the foreseeable future needs of our Town.
- It is this committee’s belief, that after observing the 2010 Central Fire House debates, the Town should complete a comprehensive future fire suppression plan (i.e. optimal fire house locations, size, needs assessment, etc.) with a Town-wide grand strategy. Fire suppression technologies and techniques change every twenty years and the Town should approach its fire suppression planning and town property management with this in mind.
- Fire/Public Safety Plan should be comprehensive and must understand the future nature of the relationship between volunteer and paid firemen. Until the long term fire suppression plan is completed and vetted by the Public, no future Fire stations work should be funded. Other Items to consider when making future property decisions regarding Fire house locations:
 - Efficient deployment of manpower
 - Strategic locations for Fire House locations to maximize coverage and response times.
 - Alternative or supplementary facilities such as dry hydrants, reservoirs, etc.
 - Rolling equipment inventory, deployment and variety. (What are the equipment tasks required by fire service in Greenwich? Do we have the appropriate rolling stock? Do our fire safety facilities accommodate this inventory appropriately?)
 - ISO ratings and the linkage to fire service competency and insurance rates. (What are the range of factors which positively affect rates?)
 - Examine past Fire House Constructions (i.e. North street, Glenville, Cos Cob, etc.) rehabilitations for process, management, and success.
- All safety buildings should be maintained and developed to meet current and potential future building codes. The goal is to have these buildings in use for a very long time.
- GEMS should own and maintain its own facilities throughout Town. Though, given the current building code restrictions GEMS does not require super-restrictive code buildings which allow the Town the ability to re-use other existing Town facilities for GEMS use.
- Town should develop a shared plan amongst Fire and Police for optimal property utilization and operational efficiency.
- In light of recent storms (March, 2010 and August, 2011), all administration and public meeting facilities should have upgraded generators so they may be used in the event of an emergency.

- Space needs and satisfaction studies should be performed – also need an asset allocation plan to better optimize all Town departments and the space they utilize.
- Establish procedure to preserve value of town properties and institute property/land preservation procedure to retain properties deemed of future value in a cost effective that possibly has an income potential to the Town.
- AAA bond rating is not only achieved because of the full faith and credit of it's tax payers, but also because of its +\$1.7 billion real estate collateral.
- Property value in a wealthy Town like Greenwich even for Municipal properties are not only appraised using location, existing buildings and comparable sales, but also by the amount of on-site parking (for commercial or civic buildings), possible FAR expansion, and potential change of use.
- Leasing, sub-leasing and land preservation are the easiest ways to recapture the value of some Town properties left dormant, as long as there does not exist an immediate civic need for the property.
- Public and Private Partnership initiatives need to be expanded in Town for Town property sustainability (i.e. Greenwich Green and Clean, Western Greenwich Civic Center, Greenwich Point Innis Arden Cottage, etc.).
- Over the next few decades, the Town needs to actively pursue acquiring properties adjacent to town properties (most importantly around open space, education and library properties) as discussed in POCD Action Items 6.26 and 6.28.
- Explore expanding Town-wide "Green" initiatives for toilets, water use, conservation studies, etc.
- Be mindful of Town budget and government spending to avoid long term expenses when properties are so neglected it costs the Town more to rebuild the structure than to maintain it in the first place.
- Properties need to be properly maintained. If the Town cannot muster the appropriate funding to maintain our portfolio of buildings then the Town should seek private partnerships to complete the task (i.e. The Bruce Museum, Nathaniel Witherell, The Griff Golf Course, Western (Bendheim) Civic Center, Tod's Point, etc.). "81% of American voters want to redevelop older areas rather than building new." – National Association of Realtors (REALTOR.ORG), October 5, 7, 9-10, 2007 Telephone Survey

Possible Oversight Mechanism - Create Volunteer Town Property Management Committee (TPMC):

- Our committee believes the creation of a volunteer Town Property Management Committee is essential to protect the long term interests of the Town and should establish long term policies and priorities for Town properties. Volunteer committee should be created to: maintain

properties, make sure there is adherence to Town Property Management Plan, seek appropriations for funds to maintain or rebuild certain properties, present plans to various Town committees/entities, have more transparency on town property decisions. The new committee would be a steering committee reporting directly to the Selectman's office (monthly meetings to analyze current and future property management needs and give public access/responsiveness to the community, perhaps through a Town property hotline. New committee would evaluate Town Service delivery system categories: Health, Safety, Education, Recreation, Transportation, Housing, etc.; Collateral categories for each property would include: Infrastructure (locations for water supply/pumps, sewers and treatment facilities, utilities, etc.), Industrial (Fleet garages, Dumps, etc.), Safety (Public headquarters for Police, Fire, and GEMS and communication delivery systems), Educational, Cultural, Recreational, and Historical. Here are suggestions to establish this committee:

1. Volunteer Town Property Management Committee(TPMC) should be nominated by Board of Selectment and Appointed by RTM)
2. Hold inter-department conferences as needed and on a case by case basis (BOS,BET, P&Z, DPW, etc.)
3. Take into account long term property considerations
4. Create a Town Property Management Policy Agenda
5. Promote ongoing discussions of property management tools, strategies and potential upgrades

Here is a list of suggestions we think the new TPMC should explore and oversee with the help of the Department of Public Works:

- Oversee different departments and functions: Cleaning, engineering, accounting, construction, leasing, asset management, protection, fire/life safety
- Tenant/inter-Town department relations, budget development and management
- Maintain stacking plans
- Maintain rent rolls, lease expiration reports, lease abstracts, provide copies of leases online and searchable
- Deferred maintenance priorities vs. preventative maintenance vs. predictive maintenance
- Employ inter-department communication devices (i.e. E-mail-Blackberry, radios, face-to-face, telephone, form letters)
- Tenant/Town Department requests
- Implement work order system for operational/budget management
- Institute visitor badging system for operational and security management
- Green/sustainability planning
- Energy reduction policies

- Solar panels on roofs exploration
- Install programmable thermostats
- Explore ice chiller plant installations
- Co-generation ideas
- Explore infrared scans – Hot spot identifications (predict electrical shorts ahead of time)
- Air filters ongoing installation plan
- Roof maintenance and upgrades (i.e. silver coating, insulation, etc.)
- Install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD's) on motors – shut motors down or use them less in non-peak times
- Real-time energy monitoring
- Leed Certified Compliance
- More efficient appliances and systems
- Lighting retrofits – T12 bulbs to thinner TH Bulbs
- Seek credits from CL&P for better fuel efficiency
- Switch to double pane, insulated windows
- Use a thin film over glass to shield warm sunlight – less drag on AC - hot days
- Switch to 1.6 gallon toilets instead of larger ones – conserve cost of water
- Data Books (Minutia level details on every property...window manufacturer, height of slabs, VFD's, etc.)
- “Send/Word Now” – Emergency alert goes to everyone in the building – Fire, Security, Floods, etc. – Everyone in building gets the alert: Employees, tenants, staff, etc.
- **Town Property Management Checklist/Suggestions:**
 - Need a well-defined operating plan for each property that includes detailed operating and capital budgets.
 - Have a readily available and comprehensive list of all Town properties.
 - Maintain a constantly up-to-date comprehensive list of all current and potential civic uses
 - Use any and all modern technologies and software to organize Town property data collection
 - Make sure Town is responsive to the real estate needs of the community...avoid any disruptions and inefficiency of Town's core operations and services.
 - Establish and ongoing monitoring of Town Inventory and conditions, life cycle and potential opportunities with Town holdings (direct analysis...not second hand)
 - Understand what may be large trend changes (sea level, demographics, etc.), Mutations in Town real property and infrastructure needs
 - Identify future Town property needs (20-50 years out)
 - Match present holdings to trends and future requirements, determine flexibility of use, identify vacancies in holdings, better asset allocate/optimize existing assets and Town department usage.
 - Identify present holdings solutions
 - Identify gaps in present ability to match future needs

- Explore and recommend Town policies and organization for sound real asset Management

- **Establish Volunteer Town Property Management Committee to oversee property inventory data analysis by DPW and other Town departments:**

Facility Data

- Highest and Best Civic Use (Existing, Utilization rate, Possible alternative use)
- General description of property
- General improvements (Existing and proposed)
- Size of Building (SF, # of floors, etc.)
- Land Size
- Year Constructed, Renovated
- Zoning regulations affecting property (Proposed Municipal Improvement Zones?)
- Acquisition Cost (if applicable)
- Capital Improvements
- Estimate of current market value
- Capital needs

Leasing

- Summary of lease terms
- Options to renew
- Leasehold improvements
- Estimate of current comparable rents
- Needed improvements

Miscellaneous Data

- Property sewer tax data
- Maintenance and repair records
- Property deeds, easements, licenses, rights-of-way, title insurance, surveys
- Blueprints or floor plans
- Expansion space
- Copies of all leases
- Space allocation reports discerning percent of utilization
- Mortgages or leverage tools used to build/maintain Town properties
- Physical evaluation reports (DPW – Al Monelli analysis)
- Long-range plans for each individual property and ongoing evaluation of how Town is achieving the long-range plan

- **New Town Volunteer Property Management Committee should also create co-ventures and share research with not-for-profit groups, such as 1,000 Friends of Connecticut (dedicated to preserving, preserving and growing CT in smart ways), Urban Land Institute, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, Regional Plan Association, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, etc.**
- Create a mechanism to make sure that all appropriate town boards/ agencies/ committees are brought in on issues dealing with town properties that may affect them and for which they may

have some input - economic or otherwise. Such a mechanism should ensure consistency with the goals of the POCD. Such a mechanism might also encourage the development of public-private partnerships to effectively use the town's assets. Our understanding of the process by which town-owned buildings and land are managed indicates that "silos" exist and that town officers originally charged with this no longer are. We would like to see the Town of Greenwich explore how other towns effectively manage their building's usage.

- Focus on better Town property transparency – Town citizens should know the Town plan for every property in the portfolio. Some properties have been neglected over the past few years and it is important for townspeople to know the future of each property.
- Potential property management tools include....electrical upgrades and gas line improvements, cleanup of hazardous materials, and removal of severely neglected buildings.
- Each Town property should be evaluated to find what drives/serves the community's needs. Evaluations should be evaluated town-wide every 5 years. Each property can be collateralized for bonding and should be prioritized by its value to the Town.
- Need to enforce encroachments vigorously. Unenforced encroachments devalue our Town's portfolio and might one day diminish its utility.
- Take special care of non-conforming (i.e. FAR) buildings since they are more valuable and not easily replaced (i.e. Central Fire House).
- Continue to maintain and update Town Property Inventory/Audit Report that would include the following information:
 - Assessors ID#
 - Current/Future Civic Use
 - Town Department Responsible for property
 - Physical Description (size, topography, location, improvements, buildings, etc.)
 - Constraints (Legal, Physical, Town Policy, Zoning, Location, Other)
 - Map/Survey of property
 - Current/Projected Value of property
 - Last Town Action

“Greening” of our Town Properties (See: Appendix V. – Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen’s Environmental Task Force Green Building Policy Resolutions)

- Potential effects of changing weather patterns over the next 100 years:
 - Global sea levels are expected to rise between 10 inches and two feet which will increase the frequency and severity of damaging storm surges and coastal flooding.
 - CT cities [and Towns] can expect a dramatic increase in the number of days over 100 degrees.
 - The Northeast is projected to see an increase in winter precipitation by 20 to 30 percent with less snow and more rain.

- Winter ice cover will become increasingly thin and shorten its duration making Town properties more susceptible to higher risks of liability (i.e. public skating at the Mianus River, Binney Pond, etc.)
 - Rising summer temperatures, coupled with little change in summer rainfall, are projected to increase the frequency of droughts.
- DPW continues to make energy efficiency a priority. However, we hope the Town prioritizes future physical plant upgrades including improved insulation (like sealing air leaks and installing new, more efficient windows) and more efficient furnaces (utilizing geothermal heating processes, converting to renewable energy sources and clean technologies like hydrogen fuel cells and solar). Buildings last a long time so going back and retrofitting is important. As well, new standards for building codes need to be explored to use energy more efficiently. Source: Union of Concerned Scientists based on *Confronting Climate Change in the US Northeast: Science, Impacts and Solutions*, a report of the Northeast Climate Impacts Assessment (NECIA, 2007).

Historical Buildings – Adaptive Re-use Strategy – This committee wholly supports this land development strategy in the public and private sector. Examples of this strategy include the following buildings:

- 1881 The Mill – Converted to office space (Pemberwick)
- The Mill – Former train depot converted to retail use (Pemberwick)
- Former Town Hall - Converted to Senior Civic Center and Arts Council (Downtown)
- The Old Glenville School – Converted to Western Greenwich Civic Center (Glenville)
- Downtown School House – Converted to Town Hall Annex (Downtown)
- Mianus Civic Center – Converted to Bridges School (North Mianus)
- Power Plant Water Intake Facility – Converted to Greenwich Adult Day Care Center (Cos Cob)
- Former High School – Converted to Town Hall (Downtown)
- Greenwich / Tod’s Point Innis Arden Cottage - We fully support the work completed by the Friends of Greenwich Point. We especially like how “green” sustainability/energy saving techniques were applied to the restoration including: the grey water collection system, increased insulation, geothermal heating and cooling technology, and wind turbines. “The Innis Arden Cottage Restoration Project is an example of how Greenwich can approach similar property renewal efforts.” (Greenwich time, Sunday, March 20, 2011)
- Future Preservation... Lyons House – Our committee strongly urges Town leadership to support this project. In the right location with adequate parking (i.e. possibly adjacent to the Dorothy Hamill Skating Rink), it could become an income-producing museum and education facility.

Senior Center Space Issues:

- “Prior to the recession of 2008, nearly one in four Americans reported they did not intend to retire when they hit their sixties, as was once considered the norm. Some of these seniors may end up in full-time jobs, but many others will work part time or may serve as mentors to younger businesses. In any case, the seniors may well prove less of a burden and more a powerful reserve force for the American economy.” – Ann Hynek, “Senior Citizens Look to Re-Enter the Workforce,” Foxbusiness, March 30, 2009.

The analysis of the current Senior/Arts Center building to determine its suitability for the center of the future has identified the following concerns:

1. The net usable floor area of the current building is +/- 14,000 square feet.
2. A revision of the Perkins Eastman Program Area Analysis proposes program spaces for the senior center that require a net usable floor area in excess of 35,000 square feet.
3. A draft of a reduction from the Perkins Eastman proposal was done, eliminating such spaces as the fixed-seating Lecture Hall and two of the Exercise Rooms, reducing the square footage of the Weight Room and the Locker Rooms/Bathrooms, and reconfiguring the Health and Wellness Center office space that yielded a net usable floor area requirement of @25,000 square feet.
4. The program spaces in the current building are situated and separated from each other by hallways in ways that make flexible adaptation by combining larger and smaller areas questionable.
5. Renovation of the building for a future senior center could require that the program be moved to another location during the times key elements would be out of service such as the elevator, the heating and A/C system, plumbing and wiring and the kitchen.
6. The lack of sufficient dedicated senior center member parking limits its attractiveness for the younger senior population the expanded programs are intended to serve.

Finding: The current Senior/Arts Center does not have sufficient space over the Long-term, the adaptable spaces nor the parking cannot accommodate the proposed senior center needs.

“A multipurpose Center is recognized as the focal point for senior services in the Town in a building that is inviting, attractive, adaptable and accessible, and is the site of a full range of services and programming that enhances the physical, emotional and social lives Of seniors and their families.” – Focus on Seniors: Vision Conference 2005 (Junior League of Greenwich partnered with the Greenwich Commission on Aging Parking and condition of facility are the two major issues facing Senior Center as stated in the Market Analysis and Planning Study (TOG Senior Center) – Commission on Aging

Parsonage Cottage / Nathaniel Witherell:

Parsonage Cottage and Nathaniel Witherell are located on a single parcel of land given to the Town of Greenwich by the Witherell Family for a Healthcare institution. There is a reversion clause (like the YMCA and New Lebanon School) if such use is discontinued. There was a renegotiation with the family to convert Nathaniel Witherell from a hospital to a nursing home in the mid 1990's.

Parsonage Cottage:

About fifteen years ago, Parsonage Cottage was an official "Almshouse", the only one left in CT, and was financed by the Medicaid kind of State payments as Nathaniel Witherell currently receives. State prejudice decided to reformulate legislation so "Almshouses" did not qualify. The BET was not going to pick up the costs and "ordered" the Board of Social Services to close it since they would not fund Parsonage Cottage in the following Budget. The RTM voted overwhelming to keep Parsonage Cottage. The BET continued funding while a solution was

worked out. Finally through a tax credit sale corporation, The Housing Authority took over the facility run as a senior residence. The project was funded by a tax credit sale, a few loans from the Town of Greenwich, and substantial gifts from local residents. It is currently under the control of the HATG Board and Administration, but run as an independent entity. While there are always upgrades and maintenance required, the facility is in top shape and there are no foreseeable large capital investments anticipated.

Nathaniel Witherell:

About twelve years ago, the Town started a concerted effort to modernize and upgrade Nathaniel Witherell. The last major capital investment had been the new wing built in 1960's. The structure still has 4-bed "wards" which appear to be uneconomical and arcane. The Town has been through three complete and excellent Boards since the 1960's. Finally, the RTM stated Town Policy that the Town should retain and operate a Nursing Home at Nathaniel Witherell. Since then, several successive plans have been created to modernize and replace antique infrastructure. The latest, "Project Renew", is a scaled back version of a \$40 million reconstruction. Now at approximately \$22 million, the Board has received all necessary State approvals (Certificate of Need). Currently, it requires BET and the RTM approval of a self liquidating, 20 year municipal bond of approximately \$20 million to perform the project. A major part of the Municipal Bond would be retired by State per diem payments. It is anticipated that most, if not all, of the remainder would be financed out of Nathaniel Witherell operational earnings. Around one half of the construction costs would replace the old infrastructure which needs to be completed even if Project Renew is not passed. The other half of Project Renew is to convert the Quad wards and reconfigure for more efficient operations. If Nathaniel Witherell were to be closed it would require State approval (an additional Certificate of Need), which is extremely improbable. The shut down expense to the Town would be about \$15-\$17 million. The property would revert to the Witherell family, leaving no re-purpose use or financial value for the Town.

Key points:

- Reversion clause of deed exists.
- RTM Resolution to keep Nathaniel Witherell as a Town operation.
- Closing Nathaniel Witherell (unlikely to get State authorization) would cost approximately \$15-\$17 million compared to \$22 million for Project Renew.
- No resale value of closed property.
- Half the Project Renew is to replace old infrastructure.
- Nathaniel Witherell over the last thirty years has self financed 95% of its expense.

Open Space and Park Properties Committee Advisory Comments:

Open space has long been recognized as an important part of the Greenwich's landscape. From the manicured parks to the undeveloped natural areas, residents enjoy the benefits of these open tracts of land. With increasing pressure from development on private lands, the protection and management of public open space has been pushed to the forefront not only in Greenwich but for all of the State of Connecticut. In Greenwich, our public lands are managed by the Department of Parks and Recreation in coordination with the Conservation Commission.

Open space means many things to many people. To some it is the forested land like the Babcock Preserve that protects our drinking water supply. To others it is a well developed public park with ball fields, picnic areas, and a concession stand. However it is defined, the services provided by open space are many. Open space provides for clean water, clear air, wildlife habitat and biodiversity, moderation of temperatures, flood storage, scenic vistas, recreation and education.

- This committee believes in the Town protecting its valuable parks and open space. However, we find that it is also important to balance the Town's needs with these spaces in the event future development is necessary to deliver additional services to the community. Open space must also be defined as a particular element of the Town Infrastructure. Each Open Space property should be planned and have a created engineering purpose which is part of the Town's integrated management plan (for example, addressing issues such as protection of drinking water supply, cleaning the air of pollution, neighborhood and use zone buffers, noise reduction, border definition, inland/wetland management, drainage, etc.). Open Space is not just unused land waiting for a better use, or reserved space for future use.
- Town should encourage public access to all open space properties in the Town of Greenwich.
- Town should work with Bruce Spaman to fund clearing "liability" trees to avoid a repeat of what happened to Town infrastructure (i.e. trees near the sides of the roads and power lines) in Spring, 2010 and August, 2011.
- Forestry Stewardship Plan should be undertaken for all Town Parks– like the one created by EEOS at the Tuchman property understanding regional context, topography, landscape overview, tree inventory, wildlife inventory, Summary of Planned Management Activities.
 - Parks and Trees Division Responsibilities:
 - Total Land owned by Town of Greenwich – 1,992 acres (6.4% of approximate 31,000 total acres in Greenwich)
 - 1,098 acres; 40 properties
 - Open Space / Natural Parks – 703 acres
 - Mowing/Leaf collection – 235 maintained acres
 - Traffic Islands and cul-de-sacs – 308 maintained properties
 - Non park properties maintained (Town Hall, Senior Center, Fire Stations, etc.) – 9 maintained properties
 - Formally landscaped properties - 31 traffic islands

- Abandoned cemeteries – 16 properties
 - Schools – 16 properties / 251 acres
 - Athletic fields – 61 fields at 27 locations on over 75 acres of athletic turf (maintained organically)
 - Trees (Roadside Forest) – 8,850 trees in inventory over 643 Acres (265 miles of Town roads; assuming +/-10ft on either side) – appraised at \$36,253,310
- Park entrance fees should be adjusted to reflect the cost of the Town from out of Town visitors – Unfair for Town residents to subsidize the cost of out of town “free riders”.
 - “Waterfront parks and gardens...represent a unique open space opportunity because water edges are natural magnets for people and can be valuable recreational and visual resources.” – Cy Paumier (World renowned urban design and landscape architect)
 - “Streets and their sidewalks, and the main public places of a city [town], are its most vital organs.” – Jane Jacobs (Urban planning, renewal and decay activist from the 1950’s)
 - “The design and development of generous sidewalks...encourages property owners and merchants to activate their frontage and enliven the street experience.” -- Cy Paumier (World renowned urban design and landscape architect)
 - Explore new plans for existing open space and parks – Arch Street Promenade? Eastern Greenwich Civic Center renovation? Renovating existing skating rink or possible add additional public rinks (i.e. Stamford Twin Rinks, Rye Playland Twin Rinks, etc.)?
 - What legal restrictions exist on specific properties (deed, legal dedication as parkland, regulations)? Are the regulations displayed on dedicated land?
 - Merritt Parkway Conservancy joint effort to maintain the beauty of one of our Town’s most treasured open space assets...the Merritt Parkway. Enable private and public partnership to help continue the restoration of the natural character of Town lands around the Parkway. Continue discussions regarding bike/hiking trail along Merritt Parkway
 - Use of National Register of Historic Places (like the Conservation Commission’s and Greenwich Point Conservancy’s proposal to set Tod’s Point aside for this designation) and other National designations as a step toward deed restricting development on Town properties needs to be better explored (i.e. ramifications against the Town’s long term interests)
 - Pomerance – BSA Original Meeting Place Building – Renewed interest by the BSA Greenwich Council should prompt reconsideration of long-term leasing the building back to the BSA for renovation (or perhaps selling the parcel of land only with the building). Every effort should be made to restore this historical building and allow parking access to the building on a limited basis so the BSA Greenwich Council can use this asset in earnest once again. Potential BSA usages could be a museum to Ernest Thompson Seton, Town of Greenwich and possibly include other BSA operations for scouting events. Given the historical significance, the Town of Greenwich and the Boy Scouts should explore designating this property a historical landmark.

- Town should prioritize maintaining open space water ways. Many properties, including Binney Park, Bruce Park, Grass Island, Mill Pond, etc., need to be reviewed for better waterway management. Silting of these waterways on Town properties should be addressed.
- Town-Owned Buildings on Open Space/Park Properties: Upkeep, deterioration, demolition - The Town should go to great lengths to try and preserve quality properties that are damaged by either neglect or outright demolition. There should be a transparent process that identifies purposefully deteriorating buildings and provides an opportunity for interested groups and agencies to come forward with proposals while structures are still attractive enough to be of interest. A similar principle may be developed for cutting of trees on town properties. Current town government structures do not provide high level oversight of long-term building utilization and maintenance in a way that reflects broad citizen input and concerns. Perhaps, the Department of Public Works can create a building maintenance schedule with funds allocated by the BET and perhaps by private interested groups. The neglect and decay of certain structures should not occur without a transparent analysis of possible alternatives and non- economic factors.
- Current town government structure does not provide high level oversight of long-term building utilization and maintenance in a way that reflects broad citizen input and concerns. DPW updates a building maintenance schedule with funds allocated by the BET. The neglect and decay of structures such as the Art Barn and the Innis Arden Cottage should not occur without transparent analysis of possible alternatives and non- economic factors. The buildings on the Pomerance property are an example of a "wasting asset" and one which should be discussed before all interested agencies and groups.
- There are many town properties subject to leases, licenses or other use agreements in favor of third parties. These appear to have developed in a discretionary way and one in which alternate uses or lessees might have been overlooked. The Havemeyer Building and the Arts Council use of space at 299 Greenwich Avenue, and other similar issues aired in the local press have heightened awareness of this as an issue. Another example are licenses for river access given to Mianus River property owners.
- Ensure that changes to uses, operations and improvements of Town properties are properly vetted through the appropriate town agencies and interested parties.
- Act on 2009 POCD recommendation to maximize waterfront lands for recreational purposes.
- Develop a plan to house DPW equipment in permanent and functional space not along scarce waterfront properties.
- There are several waterfront properties currently not used for recreational purposes. These include the storage shed next to Roger Sherman Baldwin Park, the sign building on the Mianus River at Route 1 and River Road, the waterfront park along the Byram River. Use of these prime waterfront spots for storage is suboptimal. Waterfront property is scarce and should be used to maximize waterfront recreational activities. There is a need for comprehensive space in Town

for DPW to house its vehicles and equipment. Current DPW space in Town is scattered in waterfront properties.

- Our understanding of the process by which town-owned buildings and land are managed indicates that "silos" exist and that town officers originally charged with this no longer are. We would like to learn more about how other towns effectively manage their buildings' usage.
- The public reaction generated by the rumors that the Steamboat Road pier might be sold (and could be sold) focused public attention on the necessity for treating considerations other than pure economics when entertaining the idea of selling town properties.
- Another example might be the Town land adjacent to the "hole in the ground" property on West Putnam Avenue which by being sold enabled a developer to amass sufficient square footage to permanently affect a parcel that could have adverse non-economic dimensions (such as drainage) for the town.
- There are many town properties subject to leases, licenses or other use agreements in favor of third parties. These appear to have developed in a discretionary way and one in which alternate uses or lessees might have been overlooked. The Havemeyer Building and the Arts Council use of space at 299 Greenwich Avenue, and other similar issues aired in the local press have heightened awareness of this as an issue. Another example are licenses for river access given to Mianus River property owners.
- When evaluating our Town's vast Open Space portfolio our committee believes the following archived reports should be taken into consideration:
 - 2002 Open Space Plan
 - 2003 Plan for the Cos Cob Power Plant Site
 - 2004 Waterfront Access Planning and Design Study
 - 2007 Byram Comprehensive plan
 - 2009 Greenwich Parks Historic Plan and Analysis Bruce, Binney, Pinetum and Byram
 - 2011 A Waterways Vision – a report by the First Selectman's Coastal Resources Advisory Committee
- Other reports referenced in the POCD (POCD page numbers for each are in parentheses) that also should be considered:
 - 2002 Town Parking Supply and Demand Study (p.43)
 - 2001 Bicycle Master Plan (p.44)
 - Plans adopted by the board of Selectmen for the Cos Cob Power plant (p.48)
 - Study to evaluate the reuse of the Havemeyer Building (p.48) – completed by ad hoc Performance Arts Center Committee
 - There are also references to both State and Southwest Regional Planning Conservation and Development Plans (p.50 and 61).
 - Transportation Master Plan as presented by the POCD Transportation Committee

Education, Library and Museum Properties Committee Advisory Comments

Education Properties:

- Aesthetics need to be a major concern for all school construction/renovation designs going forward (especially in the middle schools).
- Shared Services between Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and the Board of Education were explored during the time of this committee – It was a worthy idea to explore. Our committee hopes the goal of this exploration will yield a consistent level of maintenance across all properties not withstanding which Town departments are responsible.
- Education facilities – Properties need to be reviewed and a plan implemented to allow our education properties to be more flexible when student enrollment ebbs and flows. Classroom size and school configuration need to be better managed for capacity fluctuations. Overall school system enrollment changes are different among the different school properties (i.e. Greenwich High School can absorb a 5% uptick in enrollment much better than a local elementary school).
- Annual property (16 facilities) review are performed and budgeted by year end and implemented by end of school year. Multi-year facilities upgrade for key infrastructure budgeted as part of CIP (i.e. roofs, boilers, asbestos, windows, flooring, etc.).
- Clear definition of ownership and control between the BOE and Town over components of sites (BOE-Building, Parks and Recs- Green space, DPW- parking lots, driveways and walks). These issues do create a greater need for coordination and standardization of approach. Current work between the various departments have been adequate but should be re-examined.
- Babcock frontage on North Street easement should be kept in place and unrestricted for possible school property (i.e. overflow) in the future.
- Town should seriously consider approaching St. Mary's/Greenwich Catholic School to lease or purchase ball fields for athletics and infrastructure usage – take pressure off existing Town ballfields and facilities and could possibly be considered as a new home for the Board of Education.
- “Tools for Schools” program should be enhanced – program evaluates Board of Education infrastructure every year – especially air quality and generators but will extend to all facets of the buildings.
- No Town department owns overall public school maintenance. Need a better way to maintain all education facilities.
- Havemeyer Building Debate – Building is currently used for temporary storage and administrative space. What is the future plan for the building? This building is not currently included in Board of Education 15 year plan but a place-holder was added to the plan by First

Selectman Peter Tesei. **(Remember: Havemeyer family permanently deed restricted the property for education use only when they gifted the property to the Town)**

- What is the long term education property plan for future demographic shifts in Town – Town is getting older (Average age of resident has increased by 2+ years to 42 years old average since the last census)?
- Sunday, February 14, 2010, Greenwich Time – Superintendent Sidney Freund comments during a BET Budget Committee about the physical condition of Greenwich schools –
 - “(The schools) are not in nearly the condition that I would have expected from Greenwich.”
 - “I don’t think you’ve done a good job improving and maintaining your facilities (based) on what I’ve seen in other districts a lot less affluent.”
 - “The funding model on facilities...yes, it has served you [the Town] well in terms of maintaining and stabilizing the tax rate, which is an admirable goal, but I don’t think it’s necessarily served your schools.”
 - “Much is provided in the way of technology, furniture and supplies, the physical buildings are not what I would have expected in a community such as Greenwich.”
- Education and the link between property values...“I look at it as a businessman, there’s a direct correlation between property values and school quality. People are not going to want to pay Greenwich prices for poor schools.” – Bob Horton Column, Greenwich Time, August 20, 2010

Library Properties:

- **What is the defined policy of maintenance, operating, and capital expense between the Town and the friends of the libraries?** Libraries are staffed by Town employees but reside within a privately owned structure and on a privately owned property. The Town does not have a lease with the private landlord, but finances the maintenance and operations. The Town might have also financed some of the library capital improvements in the past. We are also concerned about who insures these properties.

To date, this committee has found no legally binding document governing the relationship between the Town and the Friends of Greenwich Library nor the liabilities if any damage or injury takes place on these properties (i.e. physical damage, vehicle damage, personal injuries, etc.). In the future, the Town needs to formalize this relationship in the event the Town ever considers relocating library facilities, libraries become bankrupt, or if technology and information delivery systems (i.e. Internet, e-mail, electronic books, etc.) render libraries obsolete. It is unclear what happens in these scenarios...Does the Town become the legal successor to the Friends? Does the Town claim the physical property? Does the Town have to start from scratch to build a new central library plant, inventory, and operational organization? It is absolutely necessary both the Town and the Friends of Greenwich Library understand the liabilities and responsibilities to one another.

According to Greenwich Library Fiscal Year 2009-2010 report, 72% of the funds for the Greenwich Library come from the Town of Greenwich.

- This committee believes the Town needs to consider procuring and finding ways to finance purchases of additional properties located around existing library facilities (and education properties) to deliver future services to the Town (i.e. additional infrastructure, parking, etc.).
- The land of the main library and the Cos Cob branch are owned by the Greenwich Library, a 501(c)(3) corporation. The land of the Byram Shubert branch is owned by the Town and leased to the branch for \$1 a year. The buildings of the main library, the Cos Cob branch and the Byram Shubert branch are owned by the Greenwich Library. The Perrot land and building are separately owned. The Peterson Wing of the main library (to the left as you enter the front entrance) was constructed with funds provided by the Peterson Foundation. The Foundation was created pursuant to the will of Clementine Peterson and funded with a gift of \$25,000,000. Pursuant to an agreement between the Foundation and the Library, eight of the main library employees, and the portion of the main library maintenance costs attributable to the Peterson Wing, are financed by the Foundation, which pays the required amount annually to the Library which then pays the same to the town. The Greenwich Library prepares an annual budget that is submitted as part of the annual budgeting process. The personnel of all four libraries, including maintenance personnel, are Town employees. Including the contribution of the Peterson Foundation described above, the Town pays the library personnel and pays for the maintenance of the four libraries. From time to time the Greenwich Library conducts a capital campaign to fund a defined capital expense. There is an annual appeal to fund special library programs and enhancements. It is the committee's finding that this public/private arrangement works well.

Museum Properties:

- The Bruce Museum land and building are owned by the Town pursuant to a gift from Robert Bruce. As stated in the gift documents, the museum must be a museum of art and science. If the museum fails to do this, the land and building revert to the heirs of Robert Bruce. The Bruce Museum, a 501(c)(3) corporation, operates the museum. The personnel of the museum, including maintenance personnel, are Town employees. The Board of Directors prepares a budget that it submits to the Town as part of the annual budgeting process. Pursuant to an agreement between the museum and the Town, the Town provides an annual fixed sum to fund the budget of the museum. Subject to the acceptance of the museum's budget, the Town pays for the maintenance of the museum. The museum has an annual campaign to fund various programs at the museum. This committee finds the public/private arrangement at the Bruce Museum works well. The Bruce Museum stands as an exemplary template of public and private coordination with Town property management and facility maintenance.

Infrastructure and Railroad Properties Committee Advisory Comments

Infrastructure Properties:

The infrastructure of a community is what is essential for all else that thrives and prospers.

Without sound and robust infrastructure, the community subsides into a "third world" frontier town. There are two infrastructures of a community:

1.) Plant asset, structures and systems. Infrastructure is the physical "silent majority" of municipal operations. On the back of this public infrastructure system rides all of the private enterprise and value appreciation of our Town. Without this foundation, all other efforts will fail. It is our roads, sewers, nursing homes, emergency service, and infrastructure which provides the platform for all private activities in Greenwich.

2.) The other is the "invisible" infrastructure: the intellectual development system. This is the public infrastructure which is never identified as such, and thus, often not considered, or thought to be largely optional by degree of interest. Yet the long range impacts of this second system maybe even more critical to our Town's survival.

The challenge to Greenwich is to design and fund a responsible financial program to deliver a consistently healthy infrastructure. This is where most divide the discussion into capital and operational expenditures. Our Town Budget is structured that way. But these are not separate and isolated "silos" of tax levy expense. The BET has clearly established, in its exhaustive examination of capital proposals, the inextricable impact on long term, operational budgets by capital projects. They talk of "buy backs", predicated staffing outcomes (plus or minus), and increased efficiencies.

In the past, municipalities invested up to twenty (20) percent in Capital infrastructure each year to maintain an on-going and healthy infrastructure service. Today, no town or city can ignore this annual investment. There is no savings to the taxpayer, only temporal avoidance. Any delay will cost more in price escalation and, more wastefully, ineffective and inefficient increases of operational budgets to compensate. What is not spent today on capital, will be spent instead today in operational budgets. Ultimately, there will be no savings in delay. There will almost certainly be a greater and inevitable cost reflected in the later tax levies.

Our only choice is in how we construct our annual budgets to accommodate this reality and fact of life. Fortunately for Greenwich, and its taxpayers, the BET, First Selectman, and all the Town staff have resisted panic, and constructed a sound, pragmatic approach to the Town budgets. Greenwich has structured a firm recovery, without any "sticker shock" to the taxpayer, and without any discernible diminishment of service to its residents.

The strength of Greenwich, and why it has weathered this monstrous world crash, where other communities have been shattered on the shoals of financial foolishness, is a participating government. Nothing over the long run is opaque. Everything eventually is known to the public. With a steady hand, we have avoided financial catastrophe and are heading into a better, more

stable financial future. There is no more, real basis for panic and fear. Greenwich has and will continue to prosper where other Towns have foundered.

This committee has found that much of the infrastructure and railways meet the current needs of the Town but improvements are needed like drainage, certain elements of the sewer system, and traffic/road improvements. Town drainage plans are under way (Please refer to Town of Greenwich - Flood and Erosion Control Board Plan 2011). One of the problem areas this committee recognizes as immediate is the Bible Street/Cos Cob Avenue project that has been affecting Town residents for over 70 years. The Committee also recognizes the need to improve the Route 1 culvert near the High School. When the High School was built, a large wetland was filled in. Severe downstream flooding at Route 1 occurred thereafter. A project should be adopted to alleviate the problem. In addition, there are other projects the FECB deems as high priority to address in the near future.

Below are other issues facing the Town's Infrastructure Properties:

- Make investments in the Town's infrastructure. It is better for the long term interests of the community.
- Investments in infrastructure should always keep in mind community return on investment, not necessarily monetary return but community benefit return.
- Are infrastructure properties under sole control of the Town? Are there legal, deed, regulatory constraints on these properties? What properties do these three issues above mostly affect? Town must investigate these issues on a go forward basis.
- Holly Hill Redevelopment – Separating commercial and residential use - Some thought must be used to redesign our transfer station for the future needs of all parties concerned (commercial and residential).
- Flood and Erosion Control Board Findings (2011) - The FECB has set the priorities of many Town projects– Strickland Brook / Cos Cob Avenue and Bible Street issues need to be addressed immediately. Much of the flooding problems that exist today were created by improper flooding engineering and waterway management techniques used during developments at Bible Street town properties, the expansion of Cos Cob School, and construction projects over the years at Greenwich High School.
- Pemberwick/Byram River Issues – Many houses were developed after 1977 Army Corp of Engineer's Report warning people of the risk....some house were built on stilts as a result. Town needs to reconcile flooding issues are not solely the result of new development since the flooding issues existed well before the new developments in the Backcountry during the 1980's through the 2000's.
- Need to identify properties for DPW Sand/Salt shed expansion in Backcountry. Perhaps we can cross-use other property like The Griff parking lot, North Street properties, Newly acquired State land near the Merritt Parkway (Riversville area). Instituting a mutual use

agreement with the existing State of Connecticut Salt Shed on Merritt Parkway would be optimal and we can access this State facility using adjacent Town roads.

- Grass Island Sewer Treatment Plant is safe for at least another generation and there is room for expansion as needed. Though, the property is vulnerable to flooding and should be redesigned to better insure against potential flooding issues. In 1992, flooding came up to the top of stairs and almost flooded facility.
- Future initiative: Highway sheds should be upgraded and ongoing upkeep and maintenance cannot be deferred.
- Pump Stations – Some pumps stations are antiquated and need to be upgraded. Ongoing upkeep and maintenance cannot be deferred.
- Possible need to purchase private areas to reduce liability and plan for the future – Indian Spring Pump Station (Stillman/Glenville Road), no need to purchase private area at Indian Spring. Pump station was built by the developer and the Town is working with them with the goal of the Town eventually accepting the station. Angus Lane Pump House, Station and Collection System is a private system. There would likely be upgrades to the system needed before the Town would take it over. It is our understanding the Town frequently (maybe even daily) observes the pump stations (even the private ones) to see if there are any problems.
- POCD proposed moving DPW away from waterfronts...where would they go? “Intensity Factor” arises...Parking issues, zoning issues, DPW shed access and “NIMBY” issues affect these decisions.
- Town Drainage – Flood Control and Drainage improvement studies and designs have been underway for some time and the DPW and FECB are maintaining a list of proposed projects. Funds need to be appropriated to implement the projects. The DPW has developed a comprehensive drainage manual to be used for new development and to prevent neighbor to neighbor drainage issues. Three metrics evaluated – rate of runoff, volume of runoff, and water quality.

Railroad Properties:

- Town needs to have a more transparent relationship with Metro-North/Amtrak/other railway authorities over jurisdiction and who maintains each property.
- The Old Greenwich station is served by three commuter parking lots and an area of on-street parking along Iron Horse Lane. The two lots adjacent to the tracks on the east and west bound sides are owned by the State. The lot south of the tracks and the on-street parking on Iron Horse Lane are permit only parking locations. The third lot is just south of this lot and is owned entirely by the Town. This lot and the lot north of the tracks have permit, daily and handicapped parking spaces. Daily and permit parking spaces within all Town owned lots are identified both by signage and by the striping of the spaces. Permit spaces are striped white and daily spaces are yellow. Annual permits to park at the Old Greenwich station cost \$279. Daily parking is available

for \$5. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Riverside station is served by two commuter parking lots and an area of on- street parking along Carrona Place. Both parking lots are owned by the State. The lot south of the tracks and the on-street parking north of the tracks are permit-only parking locations. The lot north of the tracks, south of Carrona Place, has permit and daily parking spaces. Annual permits at the Riverside station cost \$279. Daily parking is available for \$5. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Cos Cob station is served by seven commuter parking lots. Two lots, one on Strickland Rd. and the other at Strickland and Station Place Rd. are owned by the Town; the remaining lots are owned by the State. The Town lot on Strickland Rd. is for daily parkers only. The daily parking rate is \$5. The six other lots are permit-only lots. Annual permits at the Cos Cob station cost \$279. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Greenwich station is served by an attached parking structure, three surface lots and on-street parking. The Greenwich Plaza garage is privately owned and operated. The Town leases 369 spaces on the first level of the garage. These spaces are permit spaces only with no daily capacity. Annual permits to park at the Greenwich Plaza garage cost \$488. The higher rate is due to the structure's close proximity to the Greenwich station as well as the fact that this is the only covered parking available to Greenwich rail commuters. The three surface lots are owned by the own. (Source: POCD Transportation Committee Report)

Proposed Land Disposition Policy Committee Advisory Comments:

Before Town engages in an asset disposition, the Town must pay particular attention to the value of the property – location analysis, zoning regulations for property, physical description, alternative uses, etc. The Town should also engage with many reputable commercial brokers and real estate professionals to truly understand the market value of the asset before sale.

Establish procedure for selling Town owned land (from discussion with Town Attorney John Whetmore) – When identifying properties with no current and future civic use:

- Establish who has title to the property through a title search. Identify metes and bounds and understand whether other easements exist.
- Establish if the said property has deed restrictions for certain municipal uses (i.e. open space, education, DPW, etc.). The sale price would be dependent on these restrictions or designations such as historic buildings. Refer to relevant Town departments and agencies for opinion on sale.
- Refer said property to local civic groups for opinions on open space, land buffers, landscape and “greenscape”, additional sidewalks, additional parks, additional bike paths, etc.
- Review property for environmental impact, flooding and erosion, drainage, etc.
- Board of Selectman vote on whether it is in the Town’s best interest to sell property.
- Purchasers intended use should be a consideration and properties should be sold to projects that conform to the current version of the POCD.
- If Board of Selectman have approved selling property, the property is referred to Planning and Zoning for municipal improvement to evaluate and determine of whether property should be sold.
- Appraisals on property completed (refer for valuation to both the Town Assessor’s Office and a third party, objective appraiser). Assess whether property has other intrinsic value (i.e. increased FAR for abutting neighbors, enhanced business potential for commercial buyer, etc.).
- A minimum selling price for property is established taking into account current private sale comparisons, Town Assessor recommendations, and intrinsic value analysis.

- A legal notice for the sale of the property is written and placed in the Greenwich Times to be run at least one week. Any interested parties are sent the information on the property.
- Any bids received for the property are opened and reviewed by the Purchasing Agent, then submitted to the Board of Selectmen with a recommendation.
- If the recommendation is to sell and the Board of Selectmen agrees the matter is submitted to the RTM for their approval.
- If the property was acquired by foreclosure, then it must be sold following a public auction or private sale in accordance with the Town Charter. Said sale to be approved by the Board of Selectmen, BET and RTM.

Greenwich Municipal Code - Article 8. Sales of Realty.

- Sec. 2-35. Sale of property; public notice; sale price.

(a) The Selectmen are authorized, subject to the approval of the Board of

Estimate and Taxation, to:

- 1) Sell any property acquired by the Town by virtue of judgments in tax lien foreclosure proceedings or by conveyance in lieu thereof, either at public auction or private sale; and,
- 2) Execute all contracts and instruments of conveyances thereof. Such sales shall be on such terms as to credit as the Selectman shall deem fit, except that no mortgage shall be taken above fifty percent (50% of the purchase price.

(b) No such property shall be sold at private sale unless previously advertised in the local newspapers for bids thereon. No private sale of such property shall be made of any property for a price less than the highest bid so received. (Ords. & Reg., §18-1, 10/21/46.)

- Sec. 2-36. Foreclosure sale; Posting of sign.

No recommendation by the Board of Selectmen for sale of town-owned property acquired by foreclosure shall be approved unless the property has been posted with an appropriate sign showing ownership by the town and making reference to inquiry to the Board of Selectmen. (Ords. & Reg. §18-1, 10/21/46.)

- Sec. 2-37. Purchase of property to pay taxes.

(a) The purchaser of property acquired by the town because of default in the payment of taxes or assessments shall be required, in addition to the price bid,

to pay an amount in lieu of taxes, apportioned to the remainder of the year, computed on the basis of the purchase price at the current town and sewer maintenance tax rates.

(b) If the conveyance is made after June 1, the purchaser shall pay an additional amount in lieu of the town and sewer maintenance taxes for the following year, computed on the basis of the price at the town and sewer tax rates for the following year, if determined; if not determined, then at the current rates. The purchaser shall assume the payment of all installments of sewer construction assessments coming due after the conveyance. (Ords. & Reg. §18-1, 10/21/46.)

Proposed Land Acquisition Policy Committee Advisory Comments:

"How does Greenwich Government align itself to acquire needed property within town?" – This issue with could be best addressed by proposed volunteer Town Property Management Committee reporting directly to the Selectman's Office and with the help of the relevant Town departments who need the additional property.

- The POCD - Implementation Committee raised an issue about the Town's ability to acquire land in a speedy fashion, often required by opportunities in the marketplace. While there is a better chance for the Town decision/appropriation system to acquire properties that have been generally identified as desirable if offered, there is little chance of "snapping up" an important, but unexpectedly offered, parcel of real estate. It might be easier to grab a parcel of "open space" in a residential zone, but practically impossible for any other type of real asset. This was exemplified by the Greenwich Avenue Post Office offering (if the Town had felt it critical to secure).

- **Civic space procurement requirements:**
 - Review of current and planned space needs
 - Review of Town plans and conformance with staff and space needs
 - Identification of potential locations
 - Understand financial implications (i.e. cost analysis and how is Town going to pay for the property)
 - First Selectman's Recommendation to Town (i.e. BET, RTM, DPW and other relevant Town department heads)
 - Upon approval, detailed analysis of locations and site selection
 - Design and construction planning
 - Concurrent with construction, planning for department relocations and staffing issues
 - Planning the disposition of existing buildings
 - Occupy the space

- **Suggested legislative approach and Town organizations to help identify and acquire future Town properties:**
 - Planning and Zoning public hearings compiles a descriptor of needed or important types of real estate to acquire in a planning document.

 - The Board of Selectmen send the document for adoption to the RTM (or to amend the POCD).

 - A newly formed Town Property Management Committee (TPMC) is established to oversee and guide real asset business of the Town, according to policies established by the proper Town authorities.

- The TPMC is the gateway to any acquisition opportunities or offers for the Town. The Committee would vet a property against the standards established by the POCD planning document. The TPMC would make the appropriate proposals to the BOS, BET, P&Z, etc.
- When "green lighted", the TPMC then would work with Law, DPW, and other interested Town agencies and departments to construct an acquisition strategy. The TPMC takes the lead in the purchase negotiations, with a standing similar to that of a Town Building Committee and is responsible for passage through all appropriate Town bodies for necessary authorizations and approvals. It would be the de facto lead agency. The creation, composition, and powers of the TPMC would be critical to ensuring the best interests of the Town are protected.
- **Finance of Acquisitions:**
 - To acquire land efficiently, there needs to be a system created by the budget and financial authorities which would allow rapid access to funding, or at least statutory appropriation for special case acquisitions.
 - Past proposals have included: land banks as collateral for Town funds set aside to finance desirable acquisitions, earmarked revenues for special purpose acquisition, and Town 501(c) bodies such as the Parks & Recreation Fund. Many have been prohibitively wary of funds lurking unused to fund a specific real asset project. Some have felt that a "place marker" in the CIP List would be sufficient preparation for a fortuitous land purchase. Though, this option would not be sufficient for a speedy acquisition of a real estate opportunity.
 - **The optimal financing solution is to create a real estate revolving fund or line of credit which the Town can access in extreme cases of needing to procure property in a competitive bid situation (i.e. land near a school or library, a municipal shed in backcountry, etc.). The Town should not be at a disadvantage with the private sector if it has to act quickly to purchase land.**
- **Long range preparation for acquisition of new Town properties:**
 - The public and the various Town officers must be prepared for the creation of a process for speedy acquisition of real estate. We need a progression and disclosure of small steps so the public is made fully aware of the new process. Suggested work by the various Town departments:
 1. The TPMC makes recommendations on how best to address the problem and structure the financial vehicles for implementation.
 2. The P&Z considers the manner of identifying and standardizing the process of approving potential acquisitions.

3. The BET address the issue of special funds for acquisition (such as the Capital Reserve Fund), so that funds are available if needed.
4. The First Selectman address the structural and legal requirement of setting up an administrative process for acquisition.
6. Establish a volunteer Town Properties Management Committee (TPMC) to oversee and advise on the present real assets of the Town, and make recommendations as needed for existing management policies.

Complete public disclosure is the overall goal and will be achieved as the various public bodies will have had plenty of discussion on every aspect of the Town property acquisition.

Appendix I. – GIS Map of all Town Properties

Page intentionally blank as a place marker for GIS Map of all Town Properties

Appendix II. – 2010 Town Property Audit/Inventory

- Attribution of Town Properties (by Town appraised value):

Public Safety, Affordable Housing and Admin Properties	\$376,832,757	21.34%
Open Space and Park Properties	\$497,209,457	28.15%
Education, Library and Museum Properties	\$621,868,186	35.21%
<u>Infrastructure and Railroad Properties</u>	<u>\$270,227,500</u>	<u>15.30%</u>
Total Town Properties	\$1,766,137,900	100.00%

- **Catalog / Inventory Audit** - A complete inventory of existing title held properties of the Town was compiled as of September, 2010. It is as complete as could be possibly assured given our available Town resources. Building off the original work completed by the Town Property Committee chaired by Mr. Eric Brower in 2001, the current TPC has identified 210 separate parcels owned by the Town of Greenwich. However, there are several properties whose controlling authority is still in question. Each property has been verified and authenticated through the considerable help of Mr. Theodore Gwartney and the Assessor's Office staff. To the greatest extent possible, this inventory is sound and dependable.
- The true value of the aggregate real asset holdings of the Town, as estimated from the new inventory, is conservatively valued at more than \$1.7 billion. As a comparison, this ranks the Town of Greenwich as one of the largest property owners in the State, rivaled by the State of Connecticut, Yale University and the City of Stamford. What our Committee found troubling was there is not a single person, nor a specific office, responsible for real estate asset management in our Town's government. There is no comprehensive policy for the disposition, maintenance, and stewardship of the Town's real assets.

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property Audit/Inventory

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for 2010 Town Property
Audit/Inventory**

Appendix III. Town of Greenwich Demographics (Source: CERC Town Profile 2010):

- Population: 1990 58,441; 2000 61,101; 2010 60,551; 2015(projected) 59,774
- Population projected growth/year from '09-'14 = -1.2%
- Grand List (2009): \$33,107,539,880
- Town Bond Rating (2010): Moody's: AAA / S&P's: AAA / Fitch's: AAA
- Land Area: 48 square miles, and includes 32 miles of shoreline, 5 zip codes
- Population/Square Mile (2010): Town 1,265 vs. County 1,435 vs. State 701
- Median Age (2010): Town - 43 Years vs. County - 40 years vs. State – 40 years
- Median Age (2000): Town - 40.2 Years vs. County – 37.3 years vs. State – 37.4 years (15.9 % were over the age of 65 years in 2000)
- Households (2009): 22,804
- Median Household Income (2009): \$130,498
- Poverty Rate (1999): Town 3.6% vs. County 7.5% vs. State 8.7%
- Education - Adults over 25 years old: 17% Only high school education; 16% Some college education; 62% Bachelors or more
- Housing Stock (2008): 24,973 Total Single Units; Percentage Single Units: 69.6%
- Housing Stock (2000): 42.4% housing units built before 1950
- Owner Occupied Dwellings (2000): 15,988 (65% of total dwellings)
- Total Town School Enrollment (2005-2006 School Year): 8,761 Students; Graduation Rates (2006): 97.2%
- Top Five Grand List (2009): Greenwich Plaza Inc. (\$157,057,460); Greenwich American, Inc. (\$144,352,880); Pickwick Properties (\$125,554,380); Prop Conn OBJLW 1 Corp (\$113,084,930); GRC Realty Corp (\$101,500,000)

Appendix IV. Town of Greenwich Property Statistics:

- Total Land owned by Town of Greenwich – 1,992 acres (6.4% of approximate 31,000 total acres in Greenwich)
- Total approximate square footage (SF) of all structures currently maintained by the Town of Greenwich: 2,708,388 (Source: 2010 Town Assessor’s Field Cards including structures, canopies, non-paving impervious slabs, water/sewer treatment containers, decking, etc. – Square footage was calculated by totaling each Town of Greenwich field card’s data statistic marked ‘UF’, ‘SF’, ‘FO’, and ‘FD’).
- Total Number of Town Owned Properties as determined by Individual Assessor Cards – 210 Properties
- Open Space / Natural Parks – 703 acres
- Mowing/Leaf collection – 235 maintained acres (does not include Highway Department)
- Traffic Islands and cul-de-sacs – 308 maintained properties
- Non-park properties maintained (Town Hall, Senior Center, Fire Stations, etc.) – 9 maintained properties
- Formally landscaped properties - 31 traffic islands
- Abandoned cemeteries – 16 properties
- Public Schools – 16 properties / 251 acres
- Public Athletic fields – 61 fields at 27 locations on over 75 acres of athletic turf (maintained Organically)
- Public Roads – 265 Miles of Town roads
- Trees (Roadside Forest) – 8,850 trees in inventory over 643 Acres (265 miles of Town roads assuming +/-10ft on either side) – appraised at \$36,253,310
- Total Stand Alone Restrooms maintained by DPW: 18; Total Combined Resource Restrooms: 12 - Town Restrooms are divided into two categories: Stand Alone and or Combined Resource. Stand Alone restrooms are individual structures that function only as a restroom. A Combined Resource restroom is inside a building that houses an additional function besides being a public restroom. This list does not include public restroom in large buildings such as police, community centers, fire stations, etc.: Concession/Restroom - Greenwich Point, Locker Building - Grass Island, Chimes Building - Greenwich Point, Caretakers/Lav - Island Beach, Boat Locker - Byram Park, 8th Hole Maintenance Garage – Griff Harris Golf, Mianus Dock Master Building, Pool House

- Byram Park, Administration Bldg – Griff Harris Golf, Cos Cob Railroad Station, Riverside Railroad Station, Old Greenwich Railroad Station
- Public Community/Civic Centers – 9 Properties (Arch Street Teen Center, American Legion Post #29, Greenwich Adult Day Care Center, Senior/Art Center, Byram Veterans, Cos Cob Rifle, Eastern Greenwich CC, Western Greenwich CC, Pemberwick CC)
- Public Fire Safety Facilities - 6 Properties (Central, Old Greenwich, Glenville, Round Hill, North Street, Cos Cob)
- Public Museums – 2 Properties (Bruce Museum, Innis Arden)
- Public Libraries – (Byram Shubert, Greenwich, Cos Cob, Perrot - Old Greenwich)
- Public Ice Skating Rinks - 1 Property (Dorothy Hamill Ice Skating Rink)
- Public Boating Clubs/Facilities - 6 Properties (Byram, Grass Island, Greenwich, Mianus, Cos Cob, Old Greenwich)
- Public Golf Courses – 1 Property (Griffith E. Harris Golf Course)
- Public Rail Road Stations – 4 Properties (Greenwich, Riverside, Cos Cob, Old Greenwich)
- Public Convalescent Homes – 2 Properties (Nathaniel Witherell and Parsonage Cottage)
- Public Transfer/Recycling Centers – 1 Property (Holly Hill)

Appendix V. - POCD Transportation Committee Executive Summary

1. The Committee believes there is a clear need to hire and/or designate a current employee to serve as the Town's Transportation Planner ("TTP"). The TTP would be responsible for transportation and traffic planning, setting policies and goals, and have ownership and responsibility to insure that those goals are met. This is a critically important function since future town development necessarily demands clear and meaningful transportation policies to provide a safe and community-friendly environment for both residents and visitors.

2. The Town of Greenwich has multiple transportation services and providers, but these services are not well known to its residents and are not integrated into Town-wide transportation planning. The committee recommends the First Selectman appoint a Greenwich Transportation Advisory Committee (**GTAC**), whose mission would be to promote public and private transportation services and the integration of said services, review existing and proposed transportation plans, review and propose needed infrastructure improvements, and respond to changing needs of residents and businesses. As conceived by this POCD Transportation Committee, **GTAC** would formally meet semi annually, and operate with subcommittees. Proposed membership could include: A Selectman, P & Z Deputy Town Planner, DPW Transportation Coordinator, Director of Parking Services, Traffic Division Commander of GPD, bus coordinator from the Board of Education, RTM Transportation Committee Chairperson, a Greenwich SWRPA Representative, Executive Director of TAG, Chairperson of Greenwich Safe Cycling, and the President of Greenwich Chamber of Commerce.. Recommended maximum committee size is 13.

3. Based upon a preliminary review of the preliminary build-out analysis of a portion of the Central Business District, approximately 1.8 million square feet of new development may occur on Greenwich Avenue and Mason Street in the coming years. The timing of this development is not known nor can the effect of such development on parking and congestion anticipated. The Transportation Committee believes urgent action is required to estimate the impact of this potential new development on Town residents since the Committee found no coordinated planning process of parking, transportation, and new project development. Coherent and forward-looking Town policies are needed to insure that we have adequate parking, public and private utility infrastructure, and alternative means of transportation to effectively handle new demands on limited Town resources caused by future development.

4. Several parking studies of the CBD ("Central Business District" of Greenwich Avenue) have been completed in the last 5 years. Rather than redoing the studies, the TC recommends that the DPS, DPW, and the GPD update the data section of the 2003 Desman Parking Study and the 2002 Traffic Management Study with a then/now analysis based on currently available information.

5. The Committee has reviewed the [2001 Bicycle Master Plan](#) ("BMP") and believes that the recommendations of the Plan are still relevant. Cycling is an important, ecologically sound and healthy form of transportation. The Committee recommends that annual phased funding for improvements, as set forth in the BMP, be implemented.

6. The Committee recommends that the Board of Education ("BOE") formalize a uniform, school-wide policy encouraging walking and biking to school. The Committee also encourages continuing efforts

by the BOE to find greater efficiencies in the public and private school busing programs. School busing is a major line item in the BOE's budget.

7. The South Western Regional Planning Agency ("SWRPA") is currently conducting a review of the [Route 1 Corridor](#), which study should be completed in the spring of 2012. The TC recommends reconvening in 2012 to review the Study and make comments and recommendations. Based on initial observations, the SWRPA study could provide a useful development template for future Greenwich development along the Route 1 Corridor and the Central Business District.

CONCLUSION:

One of the eleven key goals of the 2009 POCD is to "develop and implement a Town-wide traffic plan that emphasizes transportation and access - rather than parking - to achieve a living and working environment that is controlled and focused on sustainability in terms of systems design, environmental impact and energy-efficiency with the least amount of congestion."

The members of the POCD Transportation Committee believe this is an achievable goal over the next 8 years if there is commitment of human resources to plan and implement the recommendations set forth in our report and in the POCD. Committee members believe that the capital costs and ongoing budget allocations associated with implementing our recommendations are not a limiting factor. Quite the contrary, effective allocation of scarce resources to build viable transportation alternatives to connect our town will most certainly enhance the desirability of working and living in Greenwich and generate increased tax revenue.

Our review clearly demonstrated the need to enhance and integrate multimodal transportation services, improve Town wide connectivity, and boldly implement emerging vehicular and non-motorized transportation designs to meet the needs of residents and businesses in the Town of Greenwich. Effective Town Planning requires the strong coordination of both new development planning with integrated transportation planning. This coordination currently does not exist. Failure to incorporate effective transportation planning into Town development planning will have a negative impact on the quality of life for current residents and future generations.

Recent census data confirms that we having an aging population with changing housing needs and a diminishing younger population that is constrained by the availability of affordable housing. Both age groups seek a mix of commercial and retail services, community services, and recreational options, all connected by a mix of transportation alternatives. If these amenities are not available and continue to be neglected, residents will leave and the appeal of living in Greenwich will diminish over time. The Town must think and act strategically to address these needs.

- Town Property Committee Transportation Comments:

Downtown, Muni Lots – Need to review parking district constraints and opportunities. Are P&Z regulations tying Downtown retail to parking in Muni lots?

"Three-fourths of Americans believe public transportation and smarter development will do more to cure traffic than building [expanding] new roads." -- National Association of Realtors (REALTOR.ORG), October 5, 7, 9-10, 2007 Telephone Survey.

Sidewalk Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan and Merritt Parkway Plan should be explored further but was not considered by this committee.

This committee supports all DPW attempts to make our roadways safer (i.e. better traffic signals, continued audits on how to make our roads safer, working with Aquarion and Fire Department for fire hydrant location markers and maintenance, etc.).

Appendix VI. - POCD Downtown Planning Committee Executive Summary

The 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development for the Town of Greenwich seeks to encourage vibrancy and vitality in the Downtown. The objectives of Action 4.1 through 4.3 are for guidance in promoting economic vitality in the Downtown and the development of a master plan which addresses the overall streetscape, residential housing, pedestrian safety, parking and traffic congestion, cultural activities, and the highest and best use of its landmark buildings. Subsequently, the Downtown Planning Committee (DPC) was created to discuss, debate, and ultimately craft recommendations to the town. Through rigorous discussion and review, the Committee defined the connotation of vibrancy into specific and, more importantly, actionable recommendations.

Over the course of 21 months, the DPC gained input from town departments, local stakeholders, and private enterprises, merchants, Community Board representatives, related professionals and the other POCD Committees. The Committee created a process for preparing the final report that included the creation of individual recommendations, a first vote for initial review, a period of discussion and revision, and a final vote for approval and inclusion in this report. The structured recommendation process resulted in forty-six initial Recommendations and thirty-four of them were passed by the Committee. They are presented in this report.

Topics ranged from boundaries to safety to character-defining qualities covering a wide dispersion of issues. For this report, each Recommendation is organized in the following broad classifications:

- Boundaries – the delineation of the Central Business District for Zoning Purposes within the Greater Downtown area
- Character – suggestions on aesthetics and design
- Geographic Locations – specific thoughts on defined geographic locations
- Safety and Infrastructure – public infrastructure and safe-making concepts
- Buildings and Space – specific comments on town-owned buildings
- Amenities – public amenities
- Financial Related – a financial services district.

Each of the thirty-four Recommendations was further organized into categories which offers framework for future planning and design:

- Design Recommendations - aesthetic improvements which create a sense of unified place
- Opportunity Recommendations – projects which take advantage of opportunities or situations which normally do not occur with regular frequency
- Safe-making Recommendations – projects that enhance the pedestrian experience
- Dependent Recommendations – projects which require a coordinated decision by town governing bodies to move forward
- Usage Recommendations – suggestions that add to the community’s experience in the public realm that make up the Downtown

All of these recommendations are tethered together by the desire to improve community life in the Downtown – its vitality and vibrancy. Greenwich’s uniqueness stems from its topography and character-

laden main street, “the Avenue” with picturesque, tree-lined streetscape. Dotted with a myriad of architectural styles and historical landmarks, the rhythm of the street itself and its offerings invites both the resident and the visitor to stay and stroll by providing dining, retail, culture and recreation. And permeating all of our Recommendations is the focus on the human element in the public realm -- our streets, our parks, and our public space.

The committee succeeded in establishing a solid framework for The First Selectman, the Planning & Zoning Commission, and the Board of Estimate and Taxation. This group has the opportunity to take our Recommendations, individually and/or collectively, and implement them.

There is an opportunity to 1) establish design standards in the streetscape; 2) to encourage more Downtown residential, and 3) to protect and beautify our public space. Combined with the efforts of the other POCD Subcommittees, these Recommendations can be further integrated with the assistance of professionals and funds.

Greenwich has the ability to shape its future by proactively defining its stated goals more explicitly in actionable items and by setting specific targets. As page ii of the POCD states “Changes in Greenwich must be motivated by, and addressed to, our quality of life choices and not motivation by chance or economic motivation.” The Recommendations found herein support a holistic approach for the betterment of the Community.

TPC Joint Session with Downtown Committee – February 17, 2011 - Our committee met with the POCD – Downtown Planning Committee on February 17, 2011. We discussed their planning for a more vibrant Downtown and an overview of Town properties in the Downtown area. For our analysis, we concur with their findings with regards to Downtown planning and how it pertains to Town Properties. We support their process is the best way to analyze the Downtown District using the following metrics: walk-ability, mix of business and land use regulations, diversity between residential and commercial properties, population, aesthetics, architecture and design.

Appendix VII. POCD Affordable Housing Task Force Executive Summary

- The TPC believes any affordable housing decision should take into account a Town property's "highest and best civic use" and also consider the "intensity factor" of how a chosen Town property use affects the Town infrastructure (i.e. parking, traffic, sewage needs, drainage, etc.).

Furthermore, our committee studied current State and Federal Affordable Housing PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) Programs for the 46 Affordable Housing Tax Exempt properties in Town. It is our belief the Town should research PILOT funding more thoroughly and publicly to ensure the Town is receiving a commensurate amount of PILOT funding for these properties. It is this committee's recommendation no new Town properties should be set aside until we obtain the appropriate level of PILOT funding or are satisfied with how much money we currently receive from the various PILOT agencies.

It is also important the townspeople understand that on October 23, 1989, the RTM ratified a resolution that designated the Housing Authority as the Site Development Agency for the Town. For more information on this designation please read the following sections of the resolution:

"Section 1. Housing Site Development Agency – Pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §8-216b, the Housing Authority of the Town of Greenwich is hereby designated by ordinance as a Housing Site Development Agency pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §8-216b (a).

Section 2. Powers, Duties and Transfers – The Housing Site Development Agency shall be authorized to plan, contract for and carry out housing and community development projects within the Town as provided in Conn. Gen. Stat. §8-216b(b). All grants in-aid awarded to the Housing Site Development Agency shall be used for acquisition, rehabilitation, improvement, construction, renovation, relocation enforcement or administrative costs in connection with an approved housing and community development project as provided in Conn. Gen. Stat. §8-216b(c). The Housing Site Development Agency shall be authorized to make transfers of property for less than cost or fair market value to: (1) a housing authority or (2) other regulated housing entity pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §8-216b(d). The powers, duties and transfer authorization provided in this ordinance shall also be subject to regulations adopted by the commissioner of housing of the State of Connecticut."

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force Executive Summary

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

**Page intentionally blank as a place marker for POCD Affordable Housing Force
Executive Summary**

Appendix VIII. RTM Finance Committee – Report on Property Agreements (Executive Summary)

See RTM Finance Committee - March, 2012 Summary of Lease Abstracts for specifics on lease, licensing, and operating agreements.

In December 2010, the Representative Town Meeting (RTM) authorized the RTM Finance Committee (FinCom) to study the property agreements of the Town of Greenwich (Town). These agreements include leases, licenses, and management/operating agreements between the Town and various business and non-profit entities.

A Subcommittee (SubCom) was subsequently empowered to execute the resolution. The SubCom conducted independent research and analyzed 43 leases, licenses and other agreements. The SubCom determined the following:

- **The Town has no formal policy governing the use of Town property by an outside person or entity;**
- **The Town does not currently fully comply with the Town Charter requirement that all leases and similar agreements governing the use of Town property be approved by the RTM;**
- **The Town has no clearly defined chain of command for the administration of real property use agreements;**
- **The Town has insufficient information on the value of subsidies provided to entities using Town property; and**
- **The information provided to the RTM is insufficient for members to assess the total value and benefit of a proposed agreement.**

Based on these findings, the SubCom urges the Town to adopt a formal process to improve transparency and accountability. The Town should implement the recommendations summarized below by the end of 2012:

- 1. Use of Town Property:** The Town should develop a formal, written policy governing the use of Town property by outside entities using written agreements in a consistent format adopted through a transparent approval process which includes submission to the RTM for approval. The policy should explicitly define 'licenses' and clarify which licenses may be delegated and to whom.

2. Compliance with Law; Delegation: All leases, management agreements, and similar arrangements for the use of Town property *MUST* be submitted to the RTM. The RTM should adopt a new ordinance expressly delegating authority to approve certain short term and occasional uses similar to the authority delegated to Parks and Recreation under the Town Charter.

3. Town Administration of Property Agreements: The Town should designate one employee as the individual responsible for the management and administration of all real property agreements as described in the steps in Section D of this report.

4. Reporting the Value of Town Property: Annually, the Town should produce a comprehensive statement of the cost to the Taxpayers for the use of Town property by outside entities pursuant to a real property agreement.

5. Presentation to the RTM: Each proposed real property agreement should be accompanied by a complete Lease Abstract describing the material terms, the cost benefit analysis brought forth in this report and, in the case of a renewal, any changes from the prior contract.

6. The SubCom offers specific observations and recommendations on the following:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. Greenwich Arts Council | d. Boat and Yacht Clubs |
| b. Wireless Technology | e. Innis Arden Cottage |
| c. Nathaniel Witherell Apartments | f. GEMS |

Appendix IX. - DPW Superintendent Facilities Index Status Report

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS Building Construction & Maintenance Division MEMORANDUM

The following is a status report of the Facilities Index which monitors the condition of Town owned buildings. This year marks the 10th year of the Index being in existence and a full review and inspection was undertaken to mark this anniversary.

Background:

In 2001, the Building Construction & Maintenance Division developed the Facilities Index to grade the condition of the Town's inventory of buildings. Each building is subjected to an inspection where nine (9) components of a building are evaluated using a three (3)-point value scale, Good (1), Fair (2) and Poor (3). Buildings with the highest total score are the ones in most need of repair with maximum score of 27. A building with no issues and in the best state of repair will score 9.

The score for a building to meet the acceptable Town Standard is 15.

Due to the wide array and inordinate amount of Town owned buildings it was evident in 2001 that the buildings needed to be further sorted by their importance to the Town. The importance level was developed to reflect a building's use with regards to its relationship with governmental processes, environmental regulations and operational requirements.

Each building was subjected to a 'yes/no' rating utilizing eight specific categories to determine its importance. Five distinct levels of importance were developed after the ratings were applied with Level 1 being the most important.

A building's condition score in combination with its importance level directs the project priority in the Capital Improvement Plan. The importance level rating and the condition score are the standards used in requesting capital funding.

Index Status:

At the time of the Index inception, Town buildings were an average of 50 years old. Building conditions on the whole were poor and the plan to bring them up to any acceptable standard was so expensive that the building inventory was classified into separate funding categories to better manage the financial impact.

- **Capital Buildings** - Buildings valued at over \$25,000. Projects involving these buildings requiring capital improvements greater than \$25,000 are included in the DPW 10-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
- **Capital Maintenance** – Projects that replace components of capital buildings such as roofs, boilers and air conditioning equipment that exceed \$25,000 in value are included in DPW's 10-Year CIP.
- **Expense Buildings** - Buildings whose replacement value is less than \$25,000. These projects are absorbed in the annual BC&M operating budget.
- **Excess Inventory** – Buildings that have no specific use or current need and/or cannot be repaired without exceeding their total replacement cost. These buildings are kept closed to the maximum extent possible until final determination is made regarding their status.

In applying the importance and condition scores along with the above funding categories to the building inventory, the impact to the 10-Year Capital Plan has been greatly reduced and allows capital funds to be directed to the buildings most in need that have the greatest use in operating the Town government.

The number of Town buildings has always been a concern to BC&M for a variety of reasons including the ratio of manpower to square footage. Reducing the inventory allows for better and more consistent maintenance of the remaining buildings.

Several methods have been utilized over the last ten years to reduce the building count besides demolition. Leasing, enterprise funds, and decentralized control of specific Town operations all have contributed to the reductions that have been realized.

Town Owned Building Count*

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2011</u>
Capital Buildings	99	94
Sewer Buildings	19	0
Expense Buildings	26	23
Excess Buildings	7	4
Nathaniel Witherell	2	0
Parking Garages	2	0
Sub-Total	155	121
Leased Buildings	9	12
Total	164	133

** Railroad Stations are maintained but not owned by the Town and are not included above.*

While it appears that the most of the reductions were gained by eliminating Sewers, Witherell and parking garages from the above list, the core inventory of buildings, capital, expense and excess buildings have decreased 8% in the ten year period through elimination.

Building Condition Status

Utilizing the current Index the following tables show the improvement in the condition of buildings in both the Capital and Expense categories with a score over the acceptable score of 15 points.

Capital Buildings

Importance Level	2001 Bldg. Count	2001 Building w/ Score >15	2011 Bldg. Count	2011 Buildings w/ Score >15	% Improvement 2001 -2011 Scores >15
1	21	13	28	10	23%
2	30	18	28	12	33%
3	19	14	21	9	35%
4	12	3	11	2	33%
5	11	6	6	2	66%
6	6	5	0	0	100%
Total	99	59	94	35	40%

Note: 1 - The Level 6 Capital Buildings identified in 2001 have all been eliminated. There are no Level 6 Buildings listed for the 2011 review.

Expense Buildings

Importance Level	2001 Bldg. Count	2001 Buildings w/ Score >15	2011 Bldg. Count	2011 Buildings w/ Score >15	% Improvement 2001 -2011 Scores >15
1	0	0	0	0	0%
2	0	0	0	0	0%
3	0	0	1	0	0%
4	6	2	6	0	100%
5	19	3	16	3	0%
6	1	0	0	0	0%
Total	26	5	23	4	20%

Notes: 1 – The Police Traffic Booth was the only building in the Level 6 Expense in 2001. When it received Historical status it moved up to Level 5 thus eliminating Level 6 Expense for the 2011 review.

Excess Inventory:

Currently there are four (4) buildings that are considered excess inventory to the Town’s needs. There are no planned expenditures, capital or expense, to maintain these buildings. BC&M only expends funds for their security.

	Building	Level	Grade	Remarks
1	Thomas Lyon House	5	27	Possible Lease
2	Playground Lav. ECC	5	25	Elimination
3	91 Orchard Street (Seton House)	5	27	Excess
4	91 Orchard St Garage	5	19	Excess

Leased Buildings:

The Town of Greenwich owns a number of buildings that are leased to non-profit organizations that maintain the buildings without any substantial funding from the Town. The Town’s portion of responsibility to each building varies from lease to lease. A new initiative has been underway involving the leases as they expire. Renewal agreements shift all the real property improvements and maintenance to the lessee.

1. Byram Shore Yacht Club
2. Greenwich Boat & Yacht Club
3. Old Greenwich Yacht Club
4. Pinetum Main Building
5. Arch Street Teen Center
6. Pigeon Club Building
7. Glenville American Legion
8. Mianus River Yacht Club
9. The Bruce Museum
10. 101 Orchard Street (Pomerance Property) ARC
11. 101 Orchard Street Garage (Pomerance Property) ARC
12. Mianus Pump Station, GADC

New Initiatives:

The Greenwich Historic Building Initiative which was submitted to the Town Administrator for review identifies 6 buildings currently in the Town inventory that have no operational value or are excess to the inventory. If the proposed Historic Initiative was accepted and put into effect, there is the potential to remove an additional six (6) buildings from the list.

Pending Adjustments to Building Inventory:

The Horseneck Fire Station will temporarily increase the inventory by two buildings. When the Central Fire Station project is complete it is intended to demolish the dorm structure and then relocate the

apparatus garage to Bruce Park thus eliminating the existing Mosquito Barn which currently carries a Condition Score of 24.

The Master Plan at Holly Hill will require that the Pigeon Club building be eliminated to improve the entrance roadway of the Transfer Station. DPW is currently conducting negotiations with the Club to relocate operations to the Western Greenwich Civic Center thus allowing for the elimination of the building.

The Strickland Road Greenhouse, located at the Cos Cob Wastewater Pump Station, is slated for removal as part of a future improvement to eliminate underground structures in place at this location. The site is needed for DPW storage and staging, a critical need given DPW's loss of such sites throughout the Town.

Buildings that should be considered for future permanent removal:

- Eastern Greenwich Civic Center Playground Lavatory
- 91 Orchard Street – Seton House
- 91 Orchard Street – Garage
- Tool Shed at Pemberwick Community Center
- North Lavatory – Pinetum
- Woods Road Lavatory – Bruce Park

Conclusion:

Since the inception of the Facility Index, significant progress has been made in the reduction of the Town building inventory. As previously stated in the categories of capital, expense and excess the building inventory has been decreased by 8%. At the same time the capital building condition scores have improved 40% and the expense building scores have improved 20%. Most high profile building projects have now been either completed or are planned to be undertaken in the next few years. The less glamorous projects; i.e.: maintenance sheds, caretaker houses, highway operation sheds, etc, lay ahead and will not be as easy to improve because of physical location, ADA requirements, condition of existing building, functional requirements, capacity, etc.. Many of these buildings will then require total replacement to meet present regulatory or operational requirements. BC&M will continue to evaluate user group needs of these buildings.

A constant concern is the inordinate number of Town buildings and the associated cost to maintain, clean and provide energy to them. Any reasonable method to consolidate operations to reduce the inventory must be explored. Further, the individual user groups must take a greater responsibility in long-term custodial care so that the Town's investments will remain protected.

Appendix X. – TPC Public Safety, Affordable Housing, Administration Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments (Authored by: Dick Kriskey, Ellen Avellino, Michael Carter and John Lucarelli):

- Police/Public Safety Building – this building is more than adequate for the foreseeable future needs of our Town.
- It is this committee’s belief, that after observing the 2010 Central Fire House debates, the Town should complete a comprehensive future fire suppression plan (i.e. optimal fire house locations, size, needs assessment, etc.) with a Town-wide grand strategy. Fire suppression technologies and techniques change every twenty years and the Town should approach its fire suppression planning and town property management with this in mind.
- Fire/Public Safety Plan should be comprehensive and must understand the future nature of the relationship between volunteer and paid firemen. Until the long term fire suppression plan is completed and vetted by the Public, no future Fire stations work should be funded. Other Items to consider when making future property decisions regarding Fire house locations:
 - Efficient deployment of manpower
 - Strategic locations for Fire House locations to maximize coverage and response times.
 - Alternative or supplementary facilities such as dry hydrants, reservoirs, etc.
 - Rolling equipment inventory, deployment and variety. (What are the equipment tasks required by fire service in Greenwich? Do we have the appropriate rolling stock? Do our fire safety facilities accommodate this inventory appropriately?
 - ISO ratings and the linkage to fire service competency and insurance rates. (What are the range of factors which positively affect rates?)
 - Examine past Fire House Constructions (i.e. North street, Glenville, Cos Cob, etc.) rehabilitations for process, management, and success.
- All safety buildings should be maintained and developed to meet current and potential future building codes. The goal is to have these buildings in use for a very long time.
- GEMS should own and maintain its own facilities throughout Town. Though, given the current building code restrictions GEMS does not require super-restrictive code buildings which allow the Town the ability to re-use other existing Town facilities for GEMS use.
- Town should develop a shared plan amongst Fire and Police for optimal property utilization and operational efficiency.
- In light of recent storms (March, 2010 and August, 2011), all administration and public meeting facilities should have upgraded generators so they may be used in the event of an emergency.

- Space needs and satisfaction studies should be performed – also need an asset allocation plan to better optimize all Town departments and the space they utilize.
- Establish procedure to preserve value of town properties and institute property/land preservation procedure to retain properties deemed of future value in a cost effective that possibly has an income potential to the Town.
- AAA bond rating is not only achieved because of the full faith and credit of it's tax payers, but also because of its +\$1.7 billion real estate collateral.
- Property value in a wealthy Town like Greenwich even for Municipal properties are not only appraised using location, existing buildings and comparable sales, but also by the amount of on-site parking (for commercial or civic buildings), possible FAR expansion, and potential change of use.
- Leasing, sub-leasing and land preservation are the easiest ways to recapture the value of some Town properties left dormant, as long as there does not exist an immediate civic need for the property.
- Public and Private Partnership initiatives need to be expanded in Town for Town property sustainability (i.e. Greenwich Green and Clean, Western Greenwich Civic Center, Greenwich Point Innis Arden Cottage, etc.).
- Over the next few decades, the Town needs to actively pursue acquiring properties adjacent to town properties (most importantly around open space, education and library properties) as discussed in POCD Action Items 6.26 and 6.28.
- Explore expanding Town-wide "Green" initiatives for toilets, water use, conservation studies, etc.
- Be mindful of Town budget and government spending to avoid long term expenses when properties are so neglected it costs the Town more to rebuild the structure than to maintain it in the first place.
- Properties need to be properly maintained. If the Town cannot muster the appropriate funding to maintain our portfolio of buildings then the Town should seek private partnerships to complete the task (i.e. The Bruce Museum, Nathaniel Witherell, The Griff Golf Course, Western (Bendheim) Civic Center, Tod's Point, etc.). "81% of American voters want to redevelop older areas rather than building new." – National Association of Realtors (REALTOR.ORG), October 5, 7, 9-10, 2007 Telephone Survey

Possible Oversight Mechanism - Create Volunteer Town Property Management Committee (TPMC):

- Our committee believes the creation of a volunteer Town Property Management Committee is essential to protect the long term interests of the Town and should establish long term policies and priorities for Town properties. Volunteer committee should be created to: maintain properties, make sure there is adherence to Town Property Management Plan, seek

appropriations for funds to maintain or rebuild certain properties, present plans to various Town committees/entities, have more transparency on town property decisions. The new committee would be a steering committee reporting directly to the Selectman's office (monthly meetings to analyze current and future property management needs and give public access/responsiveness to the community, perhaps through a Town property hotline. New committee would evaluate Town Service delivery system categories: Health, Safety, Education, Recreation, Transportation, Housing, etc.; Collateral categories for each property would include: Infrastructure (locations for water supply/pumps, sewers and treatment facilities, utilities, etc.), Industrial (Fleet garages, Dumps, etc.), Safety (Public headquarters for Police, Fire, and GEMS and communication delivery systems), Educational, Cultural, Recreational, and Historical. Here are suggestions to establish this committee:

7. Volunteer Town Property Management Committee(TPMC) should be nominated by Board of Selectment and Appointed by RTM)
8. Hold inter-department conferences as needed and on a case by case basis (BOS,BET, P&Z, DPW, etc.)
9. Take into account long term property considerations
10. Create a Town Property Management Policy Agenda
11. Promote ongoing discussions of property management tools, strategies and potential upgrades

Here is a list of suggestions we think the new TPMC should explore and oversee with the help of the Department of Public Works:

- Oversee different departments and functions: Cleaning, engineering, accounting, construction, leasing, asset management, protection, fire/life safety
- Tenant/inter-Town department relations, budget development and management
- Maintain stacking plans
- Maintain rent rolls, lease expiration reports, lease abstracts, provide copies of leases online and searchable
- Deferred maintenance priorities vs. preventative maintenance vs. predictive maintenance
- Employ inter-department communication devices (i.e. E-mail-Blackberry, radios, face-to-face, telephone, form letters)
- Tenant/Town Department requests
- Implement work order system for operational/budget management
- Institute visitor badging system for operational and security management
- Green/sustainability planning
- Energy reduction policies
- Solar panels on roofs exploration

- Install programmable thermostats
- Explore ice chiller plant installations
- Co-generation ideas
- Explore infrared scans – Hot spot identifications (predict electrical shorts ahead of time)
- Air filters ongoing installation plan
- Roof maintenance and upgrades (i.e. silver coating, insulation, etc.)
- Install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD's) on motors – shut motors down or use them less in non-peak times
- Real-time energy monitoring
- Leed Certified Compliance
- More efficient appliances and systems
- Lighting retrofits – T12 bulbs to thinner TH Bulbs
- Seek credits from CL&P for better fuel efficiency
- Switch to double pane, insulated windows
- Use a thin film over glass to shield warm sunlight – less drag on AC - hot days
- Switch to 1.6 gallon toilets instead of larger ones – conserve cost of water
- Data Books (Minutia level details on every property...window manufacturer, height of slabs, VFD's, etc.)
- “Send/Word Now” – Emergency alert goes to everyone in the building – Fire, Security, Floods, etc. – Everyone in building gets the alert: Employees, tenants, staff, etc.
- **Town Property Management Checklist/Suggestions:**
 - Need a well-defined operating plan for each property that includes detailed operating and capital budgets.
 - Have a readily available and comprehensive list of all Town properties.
 - Maintain a constantly up-to-date comprehensive list of all current and potential civic uses
 - Use any and all modern technologies and software to organize Town property data collection
 - Make sure Town is responsive to the real estate needs of the community...avoid any disruptions and inefficiency of Town's core operations and services.
 - Establish and ongoing monitoring of Town Inventory and conditions, life cycle and potential opportunities with Town holdings (direct analysis...not second hand)
 - Understand what may be large trend changes (sea level, demographics, etc.), Mutations in Town real property and infrastructure needs
 - Identify future Town property needs (20-50 years out)
 - Match present holdings to trends and future requirements, determine flexibility of use, identify vacancies in holdings, better asset allocate/optimize existing assets and Town department usage.
 - Identify present holdings solutions
 - Identify gaps in present ability to match future needs
 - Explore and recommend Town policies and organization for sound real asset Management

- **Establish Volunteer Town Property Management Committee to oversee property inventory data analysis by DPW and other Town departments:**

Facility Data

- Highest and Best Civic Use (Existing, Utilization rate, Possible alternative use)
- General description of property
- General improvements (Existing and proposed)
- Size of Building (SF, # of floors, etc.)
- Land Size
- Year Constructed, Renovated
- Zoning regulations affecting property (Proposed Municipal Improvement Zones?)
- Acquisition Cost (if applicable)
- Capital Improvements
- Estimate of current market value
- Capital needs

Leasing

- Summary of lease terms
- Options to renew
- Leasehold improvements
- Estimate of current comparable rents
- Needed improvements

Miscellaneous Data

- Property sewer tax data
- Maintenance and repair records
- Property deeds, easements, licenses, rights-of-way, title insurance, surveys
- Blueprints or floor plans
- Expansion space
- Copies of all leases
- Space allocation reports discerning percent of utilization
- Mortgages or leverage tools used to build/maintain Town properties
- Physical evaluation reports (DPW – Al Monelli analysis)
- Long-range plans for each individual property and ongoing evaluation of how Town is achieving the long-range plan

- **New Town Volunteer Property Management Committee should also create co-ventures and share research with not-for-profit groups, such as 1,000 Friends of Connecticut (dedicated to preserving, preserving and growing CT in smart ways), Urban Land Institute, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, Regional Plan Association, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, etc.**
- Create a mechanism to make sure that all appropriate town boards/ agencies/ committees are brought in on issues dealing with town properties that may affect them and for which they may have some input - economic or otherwise. Such a mechanism should ensure consistency with the goals of the POCD. Such a mechanism might also encourage the development of public-

private partnerships to effectively use the town's assets. Our understanding of the process by which town-owned buildings and land are managed indicates that "silos" exist and that town officers originally charged with this no longer are. We would like to see the Town of Greenwich explore how other towns effectively manage their building's usage.

- Focus on better Town property transparency – Town citizens should know the Town plan for every property in the portfolio. Some properties have been neglected over the past few years and it is important for townspeople to know the future of each property.
- Potential property management tools include....electrical upgrades and gas line improvements, cleanup of hazardous materials, and removal of severely neglected buildings.
- Each Town property should be evaluated to find what drives/serves the community's needs. Evaluations should be evaluated town-wide every 5 years. Each property can be collateralized for bonding and should be prioritized by its value to the Town.
- Need to enforce encroachments vigorously. Unenforced encroachments devalue our Town's portfolio and might one day diminish its utility.
- Take special care of non-conforming (i.e. FAR) buildings since they are more valuable and not easily replaced (i.e. Central Fire House).
- Continue to maintain and update Town Property Inventory/Audit Report that would include the following information:
 - Assessors ID#
 - Current/Future Civic Use
 - Town Department Responsible for property
 - Physical Description (size, topography, location, improvements, buildings, etc.)
 - Constraints (Legal, Physical, Town Policy, Zoning, Location, Other)
 - Map/Survey of property
 - Current/Projected Value of property
 - Last Town Action

“Greening” of our Town Properties (See: Appendix V. – Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen’s Environmental Task Force Green Building Policy Resolutions)

- Potential effects of changing weather patterns over the next 100 years:
 - Global sea levels are expected to rise between 10 inches and two feet which will increase the frequency and severity of damaging storm surges and coastal flooding.
 - CT cities [and Towns] can expect a dramatic increase in the number of days over 100 degrees.
 - The Northeast is projected to see an increase in winter precipitation by 20 to 30 percent with less snow and more rain.
 - Winter ice cover will become increasingly thin and shorten it's duration making Town properties more susceptible to higher risks of liability (i.e. public skating at the Mianus

River, Binney Pond, etc.)

- Rising summer temperatures, coupled with little change in summer rainfall, are projected to increase the frequency of droughts.

- DPW continues to make energy efficiency a priority. However, we hope the Town prioritizes future physical plant upgrades including improved insulation (like sealing air leaks and installing new, more efficient windows) and more efficient furnaces (utilizing geothermal heating processes, converting to renewable energy sources and clean technologies like hydrogen fuel cells and solar). Buildings last a long time so going back and retrofitting is important. As well, new standards for building codes need to be explored to use energy more efficiently. Source: Union of Concerned Scientists based on *Confronting Climate Change in the US Northeast: Science, Impacts and Solutions*, a report of the Northeast Climate Impacts Assessment (NECIA, 2007).

Historical Buildings – Adaptive Re-use Strategy – This committee wholly supports this land development strategy in the public and private sector. Examples of this strategy include the following buildings:

- 1881 The Mill – Converted to office space (Pemberwick)
- The Mill – Former train depot converted to retail use (Pemberwick)
- Former Town Hall - Converted to Senior Civic Center and Arts Council (Downtown)
- The Old Glenville School – Converted to Western Greenwich Civic Center (Glenville)
- Downtown School House – Converted to Town Hall Annex (Downtown)
- Mianus Civic Center – Converted to Bridges School (North Mianus)
- Power Plant Water Intake Facility – Converted to Greenwich Adult Day Care Center (Cos Cob)
- Former High School – Converted to Town Hall (Downtown)
- Greenwich / Tod’s Point Innis Arden Cottage - We fully support the work completed by the Friends of Greenwich Point. We especially like how “green” sustainability/energy saving techniques were applied to the restoration including: the grey water collection system, increased insulation, geothermal heating and cooling technology, and wind turbines. “The Innis Arden Cottage Restoration Project is an example of how Greenwich can approach similar property renewal efforts.” (Greenwich time, Sunday, March 20, 2011)
- Future Preservation... Lyons House – Our committee strongly urges Town leadership to support this project. In the right location with adequate parking (i.e. possibly adjacent to the Dorothy Hamill Skating Rink), it could become an income-producing museum and education facility.

Senior Center Space Issues:

- “Prior to the recession of 2008, nearly one in four Americans reported they did not intend to retire when they hit their sixties, as was once considered the norm. Some of these seniors may end up in full-time jobs, but many others will work part time or may serve as mentors to younger businesses. In any case, the seniors may well prove less of a burden and more a powerful reserve force for the American economy.” – Ann Hynek, “Senior Citizens Look to Re-Enter the Workforce,” Foxbusiness, March 30, 2009.

The analysis of the current Senior/Arts Center building to determine its suitability for

the center of the future has identified the following concerns:

7. The net usable floor area of the current building is +/- 14,000 square feet.
8. A revision of the Perkins Eastman Program Area Analysis proposes program spaces for the senior center that require a net usable floor area in excess of 35,000 square feet.
9. A draft of a reduction from the Perkins Eastman proposal was done, eliminating such spaces as the fixed-seating Lecture Hall and two of the Exercise Rooms, reducing the square footage of the Weight Room and the Locker Rooms/Bathrooms, and reconfiguring the Health and Wellness Center office space that yielded a net usable floor area requirement of @25,000 square feet.
10. The program spaces in the current building are situated and separated from each other by hallways in ways that make flexible adaptation by combining larger and smaller areas questionable.
11. Renovation of the building for a future senior center could require that the program be moved to another location during the times key elements would be out of service such as the elevator, the heating and A/C system, plumbing and wiring and the kitchen.
12. The lack of sufficient dedicated senior center member parking limits its attractiveness for the younger senior population the expanded programs are intended to serve.

Finding: The current Senior/Arts Center does not have sufficient space over the Long-term, the adaptable spaces nor the parking cannot accommodate the proposed senior center needs.

“A multipurpose Center is recognized as the focal point for senior services in the Town in a building that is inviting, attractive, adaptable and accessible, and is the site of a full range of services and programming that enhances the physical, emotional and social lives Of seniors and their families.” – Focus on Seniors: Vision Conference 2005 (Junior League of Greenwich partnered with the Greenwich Commission on Aging Parking and condition of facility are the two major issues facing Senior Center as stated in the Market Analysis and Planning Study (TOG Senior Center) – Commission on Aging

Parsonage Cottage / Nathaniel Witherell:

Parsonage Cottage and Nathaniel Witherell are located on a single parcel of land given to the Town of Greenwich by the Witherell Family for a Healthcare institution. There is a reversion clause (like the YMCA and New Lebanon School) if such use is discontinued. There was a renegotiation with the family to convert Nathaniel Witherell from a hospital to a nursing home in the mid 1990's.

Parsonage Cottage:

About fifteen years ago, Parsonage Cottage was an official "Almshouse", the only one left in CT, and was financed by the Medicaid kind of State payments as Nathaniel Witherell currently receives. State prejudice decided to reformulate legislation so "Almshouses" did not qualify. The BET was not going to pick up the costs and "ordered" the Board of Social Services to close it since they would not fund Parsonage Cottage in the following Budget. The RTM voted overwhelming to keep Parsonage Cottage. The BET continued funding while a solution was worked out. Finally through a tax credit sale corporation, The Housing Authority took over the

facility run as a senior residence. The project was funded by a tax credit sale, a few loans from the Town of Greenwich, and substantial gifts from local residents. It is currently under the control of the HATG Board and Administration, but run as an independent entity. While there are always upgrades and maintenance required, the facility is in top shape and there are no foreseeable large capital investments anticipated.

Nathaniel Witherell:

About twelve years ago, the Town started a concerted effort to modernize and upgrade Nathaniel Witherell. The last major capital investment had been the new wing built in 1960's. The structure still has 4-bed "wards" which appear to be uneconomical and arcane. The Town has been through three complete and excellent Boards since the 1960's. Finally, the RTM stated Town Policy that the Town should retain and operate a Nursing Home at Nathaniel Witherell. Since then, several successive plans have been created to modernize and replace antique infrastructure. The latest, "Project Renew", is a scaled back version of a \$40 million reconstruction. Now at approximately \$22 million, the Board has received all necessary State approvals (Certificate of Need). Currently, it requires BET and the RTM approval of a self liquidating, 20 year municipal bond of approximately \$20 million to perform the project. A major part of the Municipal Bond would be retired by State per diem payments. It is anticipated that most, if not all, of the remainder would be financed out of Nathaniel Witherell operational earnings. Around one half of the construction costs would replace the old infrastructure which needs to be completed even if Project Renew is not passed. The other half of Project Renew is to convert the Quad wards and reconfigure for more efficient operations. If Nathaniel Witherell were to be closed it would require State approval (an additional Certificate of Need), which is extremely improbable. The shut down expense to the Town would be about \$15-\$17 million. The property would revert to the Witherell family, leaving no re-purpose use or financial value for the Town.

Key points:

- Reversion clause of deed exists.
- RTM Resolution to keep Nathaniel Witherell as a Town operation.
- Closing Nathaniel Witherell (unlikely to get State authorization) would cost approximately \$15-\$17 million compared to \$22 million for Project Renew.
- No resale value of closed property.
- Half the Project Renew is to replace old infrastructure.
- Nathaniel Witherell over the last thirty years has self financed 95% of its expense.

Appendix XI. – TPC Open Space and Park Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments (Authored by: Ginny Gwynn, John Nelson, Scott Johnson, Karen Sadik-Khan and John Lucarelli):

Open Space Sub-committee of the Town Properties Committee: Report Recommendations

(1) Town-owned Property Acquisition and Disposition:

Objective and Recommendation: Ensure that no town-owned properties are disposed of or new ones purchased without all interested agencies, town groups and residents being given notice and opportunity to comment. In addition to notice and hearing time, there should be procedures in place to see that any such acquisition and/or disposition are subject to procedural safeguards. The "Procedure For Sale of Town Owned Land" prepared by Town attorney John Wetmore in 1998 is an example of such a safeguard but is not sufficiently clear or detailed to meet this objective.

Background: The public reaction generated by the rumors that the Steamboat Road pier might be sold (and could be sold) focused public attention on the necessity for treating considerations other than pure economics when entertaining the idea of selling town properties. Another example might be the "hole in the ground" on West Putnam Avenue which by being sold enabled a developer to amass sufficient square footage to permanently affect a parcel that could have adverse non-economic dimensions (such as drainage) for the town.

(2) Creation of rights in favor of third parties covering Town Owned Properties

Objective and Recommendation: Ensure that any rights such as leases, licenses or other rights granted to third parties that would affect the use of town properties be thoroughly vetted with the community. At one of our TPC meetings John Lucarelli distributed a Finance Committee Sense of the Meeting Resolution Re:Leases that might be a good source to consider when making a recommendation for a policy to cover this issue.

Background: There are many town properties subject to leases, licenses or other use agreements in favor of third parties. These appear to have developed in a discretionary way and one in which alternate uses or lessees might have been overlooked. The Havemeyer Building and the Arts Council use of space at 299 Greenwich Avenue, and other similar issues aired in the local press have heightened awareness of this as an issue. Another example are licenses for river access given to Mianus River property owners.

(3) Town-Owned Buildings on Open Space/Park Properties: Upkeep, deterioration, demolition

Objective and Recommendation: Prevent the destruction either by neglect or outright demolition of town buildings or properties by developing a process which identifies purposefully deteriorating buildings and provides an opportunity for interested groups and agencies to come forward with

proposals while structures are still attractive enough to be of interest. A similar principle may be developed for cutting of trees on town properties.

Background: Current town government structure does not provide high level oversight of long-term building utilization and maintenance in a way that reflects broad citizen input and concerns. DPW updates a building maintenance schedule with funds allocated by the BET. The neglect and decay of structures such as the Art Barn and the Innis Arden Cottage should not occur without transparent analysis of possible alternatives and non-economic factors. The buildings on the Pomerance property are an example of a "wasting asset" and one which should be discussed before all interested agencies and groups.

(4) Use, Operation and Improvements of Town Properties

Objectives and Recommendations:

- a. Ensure that changes to uses, operations and improvements of Town properties are properly vetted through the appropriate town agencies and interested parties
- b. Act on 2009 POCD recommendation to maximize waterfront lands for recreational purposes
- c. Develop a plan to house DPW equipment in permanent and functional space not along scarce waterfront properties

Background: There are several waterfront properties currently not used for recreational purposes. These include the storage shed next to Roger Sherman Baldwin Park, the sign building on the Mianus River at Route 1 and River Road, the waterfront park along the Byram River. Use of these prime waterfront spots for storage is suboptimal. Waterfront property is scarce and should be used to maximize waterfront recreational activities inappropriate and not optimal. There is a need for comprehensive space in Town for DPW to house its vehicles and equipment. Current DPW space in Town is scattered in waterfront properties and in

(5) Administrative Coordination and Oversight

Objective and Recommendation: Create a mechanism to make sure that all appropriate town boards/ agencies/ committees are brought in on issues dealing with town properties that may affect them and for which they may have some input – economic or otherwise. Such a mechanism should ensure consistency with the goals of the POCD. Such a mechanism might also encourage the development of public-private partnerships to effectively use the town's assets.

Background: Our understanding of the process by which town-owned buildings and land are managed indicates that "silos" exist and that town officers originally charged with this no longer are. We would like to learn more about how other towns effectively manage their buildings' usage.

Appendix XII. – TPC Education, Library and Museum Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments (Authored by: William Galvin, Michael Bodson, Arthur Norton, and John Lucarelli):

Education Properties:

- Aesthetics need to be a major concern for all school construction/renovation designs going forward (especially in the middle schools).
- Shared Services between Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and the Board of Education were explored during the time of this committee – It was a worthy idea to explore. Our committee hopes the goal of this exploration will yield a consistent level of maintenance across all properties not withstanding which Town departments are responsible.
- Education facilities – Properties need to be reviewed and a plan implemented to allow our education properties to be more flexible when student enrollment ebbs and flows. Classroom size and school configuration need to be better managed for capacity fluctuations. Overall school system enrollment changes are different among the different school properties (i.e. Greenwich High School can absorb a 5% uptick in enrollment much better than a local elementary school).
- Annual property (16 facilities) review are performed and budgeted by year end and implemented by end of school year. Multi-year facilities upgrade for key infrastructure budgeted as part of CIP (i.e. roofs, boilers, asbestos, windows, flooring, etc.).
- Clear definition of ownership and control between the BOE and Town over components of sites (BOE-Building, Parks and Recs- Green space, DPW- parking lots, driveways and walks). These issues do create a greater need for coordination and standardization of approach. Current work between the various departments have been adequate but should be re-examined.
- Babcock frontage on North Street easement should be kept in place and unrestricted for possible school property (i.e. overflow) in the future.
- Town should seriously consider approaching St. Mary's/Greenwich Catholic School to lease or purchase ball fields for athletics and infrastructure usage – take pressure off existing Town ballfields and facilities and could possibly be considered as a new home for the Board of Education.
- “Tools for Schools” program should be enhanced – program evaluates Board of Education infrastructure every year – especially air quality and generators but will extend to all facets of the buildings.
- No Town department owns overall public school maintenance. Need a better way to maintain all education facilities.

- Havemeyer Building Debate – Building is currently used for temporary storage and administrative space. What is the future plan for the building? This building is not currently included in Board of Education 15 year plan but a place-holder was added to the plan by First Selectman Peter Tesei. **(Remember: Havemeyer family permanently deed restricted the property for education use only when they gifted the property to the Town)**
- What is the long term education property plan for future demographic shifts in Town – Town is getting older (Average age of resident has increased by 2+ years to 42 years old average since the last census)?
- Sunday, February 14, 2010, Greenwich Time – Superintendent Sidney Freund comments during a BET Budget Committee about the physical condition of Greenwich schools –
 - “(The schools) are not in nearly the condition that I would have expected from Greenwich.”
 - “I don’t think you’ve done a good job improving and maintaining your facilities (based) on what I’ve seen in other districts a lot less affluent.”
 - “The funding model on facilities...yes, it has served you [the Town] well in terms of maintaining and stabilizing the tax rate, which is an admirable goal, but I don’t think it’s necessarily served your schools.”
 - “Much is provided in the way of technology, furniture and supplies, the physical buildings are not what I would have expected in a community such as Greenwich.”
- Education and the link between property values....“I look at it as a businessman, there’s a direct correlation between property values and school quality. People are not going to want to pay Greenwich prices for poor schools.” – Bob Horton Column, Greenwich Time, August 20, 2010

Library Properties:

- **What is the defined policy of maintenance, operating, and capital expense between the Town and the friends of the libraries?** Libraries are staffed by Town employees but reside within a privately owned structure and on a privately owned property. The Town does not have a lease with the private landlord, but finances the maintenance and operations. The Town might have also financed some of the library capital improvements in the past. We are also concerned about who insures these properties.

To date, this committee has found no legally binding document governing the relationship between the Town and the Friends of Greenwich Library nor the liabilities if any damage or injury takes place on these properties (i.e. physical damage, vehicle damage, personal injuries, etc.). In the future, the Town needs to formalize this relationship in the event the Town ever considers relocating library facilities, libraries become bankrupt, or if technology and information delivery systems (i.e. Internet, e-mail, electronic books, etc.) render libraries obsolete. It is unclear what happens in these scenarios....Does the Town become the legal

successor to the Friends? Does the Town claim the physical property? Does the Town have to start from scratch to build a new central library plant, inventory, and operational organization? It is absolutely necessary both the Town and the Friends of Greenwich Library understand the liabilities and responsibilities to one another.

According to Greenwich Library Fiscal Year 2009-2010 report, 72% of the funds for the Greenwich Library come from the Town of Greenwich.

- This committee believes the Town needs to consider procuring and finding ways to finance purchases of additional properties located around existing library facilities (and education properties) to deliver future services to the Town (i.e. additional infrastructure, parking, etc.).

- The land of the main library and the Cos Cob branch are owned by the Greenwich Library, a 501(c)(3) corporation. The land of the Byram Shubert branch is owned by the Town and leased to the branch for \$1 a year. The buildings of the main library, the Cos Cob branch and the Byram Shubert branch are owned by the Greenwich Library. The Perrot land and building are separately owned. The Peterson Wing of the main library (to the left as you enter the front entrance) was constructed with funds provided by the Peterson Foundation. The Foundation was created pursuant to the will of Clementine Peterson and funded with a gift of \$25,000,000. Pursuant to an agreement between the Foundation and the Library, eight of the main library employees, and the portion of the main library maintenance costs attributable to the Peterson Wing, are financed by the Foundation, which pays the required amount annually to the Library which then pays the same to the town. The Greenwich Library prepares an annual budget that is submitted as part of the annual budgeting process. The personnel of all four libraries, including maintenance personnel, are Town employees. Including the contribution of the Peterson Foundation described above, the Town pays the library personnel and pays for the maintenance of the four libraries. From time to time the Greenwich Library conducts a capital campaign to fund a defined capital expense. There is an annual appeal to fund special library programs and enhancements. It is the committee's finding that this public/private arrangement works well.

Museum Properties:

- The Bruce Museum land and building are owned by the Town pursuant to a gift from Robert Bruce. As stated in the gift documents, the museum must be a museum of art and science. If the museum fails to do this, the land and building revert to the heirs of Robert Bruce. The Bruce Museum, a 501(c)(3) corporation, operates the museum. The personnel of the museum, including maintenance personnel, are Town employees. The Board of Directors prepares a budget that it submits to the Town as part of the annual budgeting process. Pursuant to an agreement between the museum and the Town, the Town provides an annual fixed sum to fund the budget of the museum. Subject to the acceptance of the museum's budget, the Town pays for the maintenance of the

museum. The museum has an annual campaign to fund various programs at the museum. This committee finds the public/private arrangement at the Bruce Museum works well. The Bruce Museum stands as an exemplary template of public and private coordination with Town property management and facility maintenance.

Appendix XIII. – TPC Infrastructure and Railroad Properties Sub-Committee Advisory Comments (Authored by: Aubrey Mead, Harry LeBien, Sue Baker and John Lucarelli):

The Infrastructure and Railroad Properties Sub Committee's area of interested included the sanitary sewer collection system, including pumping stations, the Grass Island Sewage Treatment plant, the Transfer Station, drainage systems and railroad properties. The process included the review of maps and meeting with DPW Commissioner, Amy Seibert and members of her staff.

Infrastructure:

The infrastructure is essential. Without sound and robust infrastructure, the community can experience failures of systems that could impact property values, health and safety issues and standard of living. This committee has found that the infrastructure is being monitored by appropriate Town staff studying various components of the infrastructure, make recommendations on upgrades and seek funding for maintenance and capital improvements. Examples of issues currently being studied include:

- Holly Hill Transfer Station: Revisions to the layout are being considered to better serve the community. Separating commercial and residential users is one idea being looked at. DPW soil contamination monitoring needs to be continued.
- Flood Control & Drainage Systems: many of the drainage systems and watercourses have been studied and projects intended to improve flooding conditions are being considered. Now that the studies are being completed, the Flood & Erosion Control Board has begun to prioritize projects to seek funding for. Though, the prominence of recent flooding problems requires the Town to make these projects a high priority.
- There is a need to establish a location of a sand/salt storage facility in the Backcountry. Such a facility would greatly enhance the DPW's ability to maintain roads in wintertime, saving time and fuel by avoiding the need to make trips to the Indian Field Road facility in Cos Cob.
- Grass Island Sewer Treatment Plant: The property is vulnerable to flooding and should be redesigned to better insure against potential flooding issues. In 1992, flooding came up to the top of stairs and almost flooded facility. Land surrounding the plant should be preserved for future expansion of the plant should that become necessary with ever changing treatment requirements. Also, other locations should be considered for long term solutions in the event higher water levels materialize.
- There have been suggestions to move DPW facilities away from the waterfront to make room for other uses. It should be kept in mind that these facilities are important to the operation of the Town and that before any are moved, alternate sites would have to be identified, approvals obtained and facilities built prior to abandoning existing facilities. These steps are often difficult.
- Continued review of the sanitary sewer collection system will determine areas that need to be upgraded or repaired.

Railroad Properties:

The Old Greenwich station is served by three commuter parking lots and an area of on-street parking along Iron Horse Lane. The two lots adjacent to the tracks on the east and west bound sides are owned by the State. The lot south of the tracks and the on-street parking on Iron Horse Lane are permit only parking locations. The third lot is just south of this lot and is owned entirely by the Town. This lot and the lot north of the tracks have permit, daily and handicapped parking spaces. Daily and permit parking spaces within all Town owned lots are identified both by signage and by the striping of the spaces. Permit spaces are striped white and daily spaces are yellow. Annual permits to park at the Old Greenwich station cost \$279. Daily parking is available for \$5. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Riverside station is served by two commuter parking lots and an area of on-street parking along Carrona Place. Both parking lots are owned by the State. The lot south of the tracks and the on-street parking north of the tracks are permit-only parking locations. The lot north of the tracks, south of Carrona Place, has permit and daily parking spaces. Annual permits at the Riverside station cost \$279. Daily parking is available for \$5. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Cos Cob station is served by seven commuter parking lots. Two lots, one on Strickland Rd. and the other at Strickland and Station Place Rd. are owned by the Town; the remaining lots are owned by the State. The Town lot on Strickland Rd. is for daily parkers only. The daily parking rate is \$5. The six other lots are permit-only lots. Annual permits at the Cos Cob station cost \$279. Hourly parking is not available. All parking is available on a first-come, first-serve basis. The Greenwich station is served by an attached parking structure, three surface lots and on-street parking. The Greenwich Plaza garage is privately owned and operated. The Town leases 369 spaces on the first level of the garage. These spaces are permit spaces only with no daily capacity. Annual permits to park at the Greenwich Plaza garage cost \$488. The higher rate is due to the structure's close proximity to the Greenwich station as well as the fact that this is the only covered parking available to Greenwich rail commuters. The three surface lots are owned by the Town. (Source: POCD Transportation Committee Report)

Each railroad property should be studied to see if there are symbiotic uses that could be added. For example, could housing be built over current parking lots? Such uses could be "green" as it locates housing near public transportation and might not increase impervious coverage as the parking lots are already there. Shared parking arrangements exist at the Strickland Road parking lots and should be encouraged elsewhere. The parking lot is used by commuters during work days and by boaters evenings and weekends.

Parking lots in Town should be designed to reduce runoff and improve the quality of runoff. This not only improves drainage conditions but sets an example for private property owners to follow. Use of porous pavement and other best management practices should be implemented.

Appendix XIV. - Notable Town Planning and Property Management Quotes:

When implementing our mission statement this committee took into account the following quotes:

- POCD – Town Properties Committee (POCD Pg. 49) “First Selectman should create a special committee to look into the present and potential uses of Town owned properties for long term needs. First Selectman should re-establish a Town Properties committee to evaluate Town assets and develop long term plans for their highest and best [civic] use. Suggested this committee so that all departments having responsibilities for implementation of POCD recommendations will have a committee chaired by the First Selectman to oversee future plans for all departments on town properties.”
- “Make no little plans;...Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die.” – Daniel H. Burnham (Architect and creator of the master plan of Chicago, downtown Washington D.C., and famous buildings such as New York’s Flat Iron Building and Washington D.C.’s Union Station)
- “The measure of any great civilization is in its cities [towns], and the measure of a city’s [town’s] greatness is to be found in the quality of its public spaces, its parks and squares.” – John Ruskin (19th century English art critic and social thinker...writings on art and architecture were extremely influential in the Victorian and Edwardian eras)
- “World-class cities demonstrate the social, economic and environmental benefits that evolve from the creation of great civic places.” -- Cy Paumier (World renowned urban design and landscape architect)
- “[Town] Planners work on behalf of a public mostly unconcerned and largely unfamiliar with the day-to-day routine of land use decisions. Busy earning livelihoods from enterprises not connected with the land, most people want local government invisible and reliable, and they ask only that it provide an untroubled atmosphere in which private life can flourish...Their support for planning, to the extent it exists at all, reduces to a sentiment that good planning is necessary work and somebody ought to do it.” – Kristina Ford, “Planning Small Town America – Observations, Sketches and a Reform Proposal,” American Planning Association, 1990.
- “Smaller, more nimble urban regions promise a better life than the congested megalopolis...efficient cities [towns] are where most middle- and working-class Americans, and their counterparts around the world, will find the best places to achieve their aspirations.” -- Joel Klotkin (OpEd, WSJ, 11/26/2010)
- “Rather than ignore consumer choice...suburbs need to focus on basic tasks like creating jobs, improving schools, developing cultural amenities and promoting public safety. It is these more mundane steps – not utopian theory or regulatory diktats – that ultimately make successful communities.” – Joe Klotkin (OpEd, WSJ, 7/6/10)

Appendix XV. - Trends that might impact Town of Greenwich Properties in the Future

- "More people want to live in the suburbs - people also want short commutes, access to sidewalks, proximity to cities, etc. So people who prefer to live in suburbs also want to live in a very particular type of suburb like Greenwich." – www.smartgrowthamerica.org – National Association of Realtors
- "Globally integrated 2050, the World will have over 9 billion people with mounting issues of water stress, heat waves, coastal flooding, etc." – 'The World in 2050' by Lauren C. Smith
- **Connecticut Municipalities Must Follow Smart Growth Policies in Order to Reach Smart Growth Goals**

While the term "smart" or "responsible" growth has been used in Connecticut policy debates and state law in recent years, "we still aren't really doing it - walking the walk, growing smartly," writes Hartford Courant columnist Tom Condon. Condon is urging all mayors, council members and planners to read *The Smart Growth Manual*. Written by New Urbanism co-founder Andres Duany, with fellow planners Jeff Speck and Mike Lyden, this compendium of ways to stop "urban disinvestment and wasteful suburban sprawl" shows the state must do much more to reach its sustainability goals.

The columnist mentions at least a dozen steps Connecticut should take, since few towns are taking the advantage of what's already legislatively allowed or what they change and pursue on their own. "Government should be organized to correspond with the physical structure of settlement," he quotes from the manual. "For regional planning to be truly effective, property taxes should be shared among the municipalities."

Officials also should spread property tax revenue "equitably" across the region, coordinate transportation and land-use planning, concentrate development "in the pedestrian sheds" of present or planned transit, shun "dumb growth locations" for government buildings, discourage development along countryside roads, require shares of "subsidized dwellings" in all areas, stop making the car a priority over other modes, ensure easy use of transit, convert parking to "more productive" uses; replace policies threatening older schools, adopt "form-based" zoning, and build only in areas with plentiful water. "If we want to achieve the smart-growth goals of clean air, less dependence on foreign oil, protecting farms and forests and reviving cities, we need to use smart-growth policies," he concludes. Smart Growth Online-[District of Columbia](#)-3/ 7/10

- **Outer Connecticut Suburbs Absorbing Too Much of State Population**

“One of the main drivers of energy use is sprawl — low-density, auto-dependent development patterns that encourage, or often require, more gas and more driving to get to work, shopping or recreational venues,” says a *Hartford Courant* editorial. According to Census data, outer-ring suburban towns top Connecticut’s list of fastest-growing communities between July 2007 and July 2009.

Disturbed by decades of sprawl impacts — energy waste, air and water pollution, farmland and open space loss, urban infrastructure abandonment and social isolation - some forward-looking state lawmakers and commissioners helped set up “a nascent smart-growth program,” but the census data indicate it “has not yet taken hold.”

As Hartford and New Haven shrank slightly, the editorial notes, Stamford capitalized on its proximity to New York and made the fastest-growing list as the only large city among small suburban towns — East Windsor, Ellington, Somers, Oxford, Ridgefield and East Lyme — some of their growth added by “active adult” housing. “Towns love housing for people over the age of 55, because it means property-tax revenues without school expenses,” the editorial observes. “But while keeping seniors in the state is good for the economy, the boom in this sector has done nothing to address the shortage of housing for young people, which is one of the factors that causes so many 25- to 34-year-olds to leave the state.”

With the state “still chewing up farms and fields, increasing pollution and energy use and creating the need for more infrastructure,” its Council on Environmental Quality estimates farmland loss at 1,800 acres a year, but others fear it’s more. “This is not the way things ought to be going,” the editorial concludes. “The era of cheap and easy oil is coming to an end. We need to repopulate city and town centers and serve them with transit. Some of the state’s smart-growth laws are too new to have had much effect, but we need to keep pushing. If the census figures for the next three years don’t begin to show a significant shift, this state will be in trouble.” – *Hartford Courant* Editorial, July 8, 2010

- **Long Term Trends to watch in the Town of Greenwich:**

“According to the most conservative estimates, the U.S. by 2050 will be home to at least four hundred million people, roughly one hundred million more than live here today....the addition of a hundred million more residents also will place new stresses on the environment, challenging the country to build homes, communities, and businesses that can sustain an expanding and ever-more-diverse society. America will inevitably become a more complex, crowded, and competitive place, highly dependent, as it has been throughout its history, on its people’s innovative and entrepreneurial spirit...In order to accommodate the next hundred million Americans, new environmentally friendly technologies and infrastructure will be required, to reduce commutes by bringing work closer to or even into the home and by finding more energy-efficient means of transportation.” – Joel Kotkin, “The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050”, The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 1-3

“America still boasts the highest fertility rate: 50 percent higher than Russia, Germany, or Japan and well above China, Italy, Singapore, Korea, and virtually all of eastern Europe....America will expand its population in the midst of a global demographic slowdown.” - Joel Kotkin, “The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050”, The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 4-5

“Suburbia – currently the predominant form of American life – will probably remain the focal point of innovations in development....80 percent or more of the total U.S. metropolitan population growth has taken place in suburbia, confounding oft-repeated predictions of its inevitable decline.” – Chris Leinberger, “The Next Slum?” Atlantic, March, 2008; Richard Florida, “How the Crash Will Reshape America,” Atlantic, March, 2009

“Over the next few decades, suburban communities will evolve beyond the conventional 1950’s-style “production suburbs,” vast housing tracts constructed far from existing commercial and industrial centers. The suburbs of the 21st century will increasingly incorporate aspects of preindustrial villages. They will be more compact and self-sufficient, providing office space as well as surging home-based workforce....as a result, they will be less reliant on major cities and on long-distance commuting. Boasting traditional urban functions like markets, churches, museums, monuments, and culture, they will be more like traditional villages. Their primary advantage will be quality of daily life, but with a huge added difference – instantaneous communication links with the rest of the world.” - Joel Kotkin, “The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050”, The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 16

“The suburbs of the 21st century will also be more diverse than in the past, with more seniors, singles, and minorities.” – “Fast Facts: Baby Boomers Statistics on Empty Nesting and Retiring,” Del Webb Backgrounder, 2005

“Preserving suburbs is thus critical for our demographic vitality, not least for attracting immigrants. Suburbs serve, in many ways, as nurseries of the nation and epitomize much of what constitutes – particularly for immigrants and the aspiring middle class – the American dream.” – Mark Shill and Joel Klotkin...<http://www.newgeography.com/content/00218-cities-children-and-future>.

“Suburbs of tomorrow will have a diversity of housing types, thriving town centers, and growing cultural and religious institutions. They will provide more opportunities to walk, ride bikes, and walk at nearby companies...But what makes these suburban villages so different is not so much design as their vibrant economic and social self-sufficiency. They testify not only to the fundamental attraction of lower-density living but also the growing role of suburban communities as cultural, religious, entertainment, and business centers.”- Joel Kotkin, “The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050”, The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 72

- **Suburban Growth**

“In the postwar era the pace of suburbanization again accelerated, accounting for a remarkable 84 percent of the nation’s population increase during the 1950’s. In that decade the suburbs grew at six times the rate that cities did...Since 1950 the suburban share of the nation’s total population has doubled to its current 50 percent mark.” – Kenneth T. Jackson, “Crabgrass

Frontier: The suburbanization of the United States,” Oxford University Press, 1987; Donaldson, “Suburban Myth”; Fred Siegel, “The Future Once Happened Here: NY, DC, LA, and the Fate of America’s Big Cities,” New York: Free Press; 1997.

“In the 1990’s, the gaps in growth between central city and suburb widened. During the first seven years of the new millennium, a period much dominated by discussion of an “urban renaissance,” the suburbs – and even more so, the peripheral exurbs – enjoyed the lion’s share of all population growth in metropolitan areas, accounting for upward of 80 percent of the total. The farthest-out exurbs experienced the fastest rise in overall population, benefiting most particularly from the migration to these communities from central counties.” – “Outlying Counties Grew Faster than Central Counties Between 2000 and 2007,” U.S. Census Bureau, June 17, 2009.

“Brainwashing ourselves into believing that we can go back to a time before sprawl is fundamentally doomed. Yearning for the day when people took the train to work, Main Street was the primary shopping venue, and everything revolved around the ‘central city’ is nostalgia, not connected to practical reality.” – Karrie Jacobs, “The Manchurian Main Street,” Metropolis, June, 2005.

“‘Greenurbia’ is a system that seeks a path to development that is not only sustainable environmentally but also meets the needs of diverse families and businesses.... ‘Greenurbia’, a way of life that transcends the urban and the exurban, is not intrinsically anti-urban; nor is it opposed to all forms of planning. It would simply open up new economic opportunities for people who choose to live in communities that ‘leapfrog’ the metropolis” - Joel Kotkin, “The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050”, The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 85, 236.

“If suburban life is undesirable, the suburbanites themselves seem blissfully unaware of it.” – Herbert Gans (American Sociologist), 1969.

“If a multiethnic society is working out in America, it will be worked out in [these] places....The future of America is in the suburbs.” – James Allen; Frey, “Melting Pot Suburbs”; Anne-Marie O’Connor, “Learning to Look Past Race,” Los Angeles Times, August 25, 1999.

“Families have long clustered in suburbs, and they seem likely to continue to do so.” – Heath Foster, “The 2000 Census: Looking for Kids? Baby Booms in the Cities and Towns,” Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 21, 2001.

Aging empty nesters will play a critical role in future suburbia. The baby boom generation far outnumbers its successor, Generation X, by roughly 76 million to 41 million. By 2030, due largely to the boomers more than one in five Americans will be over sixty-five. ‘Downshifting boomers’...who are still working but are trying to cut down their hours – will make choices on where to live that will be critical for new residential and commercial development.” – “Fast Facts: Baby Boomers Statistics on Empty Nesting and Retiring,” Del Webb Backgrounder, 2005.

“Most people retire in place. When they move, they don’t move downtown, they move to the fringes.” – Sandra Rosenbloom - Director of the Drachman Institute at the University of Arizona and a Professor of Planning at the Institute for Land and Regional Development Studies

"In 1969 only 11 percent of the nation's largest companies were headquartered in the suburbs; a quarter-century later roughly half had migrated to major cities' outskirts." – Peter Muller, "The Suburban Transformation of the Globalizing American City," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 551, No. 1, May, 1997; Jonathan Friedmann, "The Prospect of Cities," University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

"Downtowns will remain important, but mainly in symbolic terms, as regional meeting places or cultural centers. America's economic geography has changed...In the coming decade, these communities will reinvent themselves in ways that will sustain their economic and social viability." - Joel Kotkin, "The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050", The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 95.

"Remarkably, suburbs – once derided for their uniformity and homogeneity – are becoming the new melting pots of American society." – "Into the Suburbs," *Economist*, March 11, 2004; Nicole Stelle Garnett, "Suburbs as Exit, Suburbs as Entrance," *Michigan Law Review* 106, November, 2007.

"'Third Wave' society will break away from the 'behavioral code' of 'Second Wave' industrialism, where work and family were purposely segregated. Social and technological forces are converging to change the locus of work back to the home, neighborhood, and village." – Alvin Toffler, "The Third Wave" William Morrow, 1980.

"Neighborhoods need landmarks or "eye-catchers" – even something as basic as an old water tower – that are associated with their organic development....if architecture in the crowded mid-21st century is going to attract large numbers of permanent residents and families...it will have to become more responsive to human needs and scale." – Jane Jacobs, "The Life and Death of Great American Cities," Vintage Books, 1961; Francis Morrone, "When Buildings Stopped Making Sense," *Wall Street Journal*, November 23, 2007.

"Families and individuals need to convince developers that they prioritize a coherent community life by demanding what they want, along with a security system, access to thriving community association, or a neighborhood-oriented online social network. Developers and city planners are unlikely to provide these features reliably by themselves. The successful community of the future will rely more on grassroots expressions of the New Localism." - Joel Kotkin, "The Next Hundred Million – America in 2050", The Penguin Press, 2010, p. 198-199.

"Traditional 'bedroom' communities on the periphery will evolve toward more efficient, more decentralized, and less commuter-dependent 'Greenurbias'. Houses may be smaller – lot sizes are already shrinking as a result of land prices – but they will remain, for the most part, single-family dwellings." – "The Future of Homes and Housing," *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 5, 2005.

"Preserving the quality of the environment should be a primary national concern, but strong economic growth remains a necessity for a nation that will be adding one hundred million people over the next decades...Without robust economic growth but with an expanding population, a country will have to accept a massive decline in living standards...there is no way

the United States could rely on slow growth – by overregulating, taxing entrepreneurs, or rigidly limiting suburban development – without rapidly diminishing the quality of life.” – Paul D. Gottlieb, “Growth without Growth: An Alternative Economic Development Goal for Metropolitan Areas,” Brookings Institution, February, 2002; Longman, “Empty Cradle”; “Banking the ‘Demographic Dividend’,” Rand Policy Brief, 2002; Mike Wendling, “Is Too Few People the New ‘Population Problem’,” Grist, December, 2005; Phil Longman, Population Bombing,” National Review, May, 2008

- **Disconcerting Trends - Infrastructure Investment**

“Despite the staggering private wealth generated by the stock market and real estate in New York, the city’s public infrastructure has been neglected – and could worsen during a prolonged economic slump. The city’s controller’s office has estimated that infrastructure spending levels in the late 1990s and early 2000s were barely half of what was required to maintain the city’s streets, main roads, and railways in “systematic state of good repair.” Subways and rail lines in America’s richest city are frequently shut down after heavy rains due to floods caused by poor drainage.” – William Neuman, “New York Transit Failings similar to Those in 2004,” New York Times, August 9, 2007; Harry Siegel, “Maybe Bloomberg Should Try Getting Angry,” New York Observer, August 10, 2007; Nicole Gelinas, “NY’s Sick Transit,” New York Post, April 24, 2007.

“Similarly, California’s once envied water-delivery systems, roadways, airports and education facilities are in serious disrepair, and the state, once known for its high degree of creditworthiness, is now virtually bankrupt. In the 1960s infrastructure spending accounted for 20 percent of all state outlays. But as the technocratic perspective-the belief that knowledge and technology business alone could fuel the economy-took hold in Sacramento, public infrastructure investment fell to just 3 percent of all expenditures, despite the rapid growth of the state’s population.” – “Funding,” California Infrastructure Coalition, Calinfrastructure.org

“To succeed in the mid-21st century, Americans will need to attend to the country’s basic investments and industries. Some assume that the American future can be built around a handful of high-end “creative” jobs and that it will not require reviving the ‘old industrial economy’ or the basic infrastructure for the successful dispersion of the economy...In reality a more prosperous future is possible, but only if the country focuses both on developing the intellectual prowess of its citizenry and on maintaining the physical infrastructure necessary for basic production and transportation. As single-minded emphasis on non-tangible industries is a dangerous delusion, particularly for a country that must accommodate one hundred million more people over the next few decades.” – Alvin and Heidi Toffler, “Creating a New Civilization” Turner Publishing, 1994; Richard Florida, “The New American Dream,” Washington Monthly, March, 2003; Richard Florida, “Financial Recovery Needs Money – and a Massively Different Mindset,” Toronto Globe and Mail, November, 2009; Paul Glader, “Monuments to Labor,” Wall Street Journal, August 10, 2004.

Appendix XVI. – Approved Town Property Committee Minutes

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

An organizational meeting of the Town Properties was held on Wednesday, March 10, 2010 at 7:00 PM

Attendance

Dianne Fox, Karin Sadik-Kahn, Bruce Spaman, Denise Savigeau, Michael Chambers, Ted Gwartney, Louisa Stone, Chris von Keyserling, John Nelson, Lexy Tanner, John Avellino, Richard Kriskey, Emerson Stone, Ellen Avellino, Michael Carter, Arthur Norton, Dustin Anderson, Ginny Gwynn, Aubrey Mead Jr., Joe Siciliano and Scott Johnson, Peter Tesei, Diane Fox, Bruce Spaman, Denise Savageau, John Lucarelli (Chair)

1. First Selectman Mr. Tesei and Town Properties Committee Chair Mr. Lucarelli greet and acknowledge the committee. Meeting is called to order at 7:00 PM
2. Diane Fox, Town Planner, describes selected current Town properties and the Planning and Zoning strategy for their management. Ms. Fox went on to provide context for the community's work in relation to the Plan Implementation Committee and transparency of the process to residents.
3. Bruce Spaman, Parks Superintendent and Tree Warden, discussed Town-owned land management from the Parks and Recreation perspective. In doing so, he detailed the challenges of balancing the needs of open space and active spaces throughout the Town.
4. Denise Savigeau, Conservation Director, discussed the State and regional work that has been done regarding climate change and its immediate effects on the Town of Greenwich. Particular attention was paid to rising coast lines, flood and erosion, and general community health and infrastructure.
5. There was general discussion regarding what properties really need to be open space and what deed restrictions need to be applied and where.
6. Next Steps:
 - a. Draft a committee profile
 - b. Begin to examine what the policy and procedure should be for selling of Town-owned properties
 - c. Inventory all land-use reports
 - d. Committee members should submit to Mr. Lucarelli what their perceived purpose of the committee is

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH 2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE
FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 2nd meeting of the Town Properties was held on Wednesday, April 14, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the CAPP Room of the Public Safety Building. Attendance: John Lucarelli(Chair), Diane Fox, Karin Sadik-Kahn, Harry LeBien, Michael Chambers, Ted Gwartney, Chris von Keyserling, John Nelson, Lexy Tanner, Arthur Norton - BET Representative, Dustin Anderson, Ginny Gwynn, Aubrey Mead Jr., Bill Galvin, Al Monelli, Amy Siebert, Peter Tesei and Mike Bodson

1. Meeting was called to order at 7:06 PM by Chair Lucarelli
2. Minutes of the 3-10-2010 meeting were reviewed and approved
3. Mr. Lucarelli conducted the following procedural actions:
 - a. Appointed the following individuals:
 - Aubrey Mead – Co-chair
 - Lexy Tanner – Communications
 - b. Reviewed the agenda for the evening
4. Mr. Tesei briefly addressed the Town’s position on the Post Office issue as well as explaining the function and composition of the POCD Committee
5. Ted Gwartney presented information on the assessment process in the Town of Greenwich, this included the following points:
 - a. Valuation process
 - b. Price to parcel size explanations
 - c. Detailed case studies of assessments of public buildings
 - Binney Park
 - Havermeyer, Police and Post Office
 - d. Explanation of how mill rate and assessment works
6. Amy Siebert and Al Monelli presented information on public property – including buildings – in the Town of Greenwich. Topics included:
 - a. Definition of “Town Building”
 - b. Review of condition indices
 - c. Space limitations and their impacts on cost control
 - d. Building index
 - Importance
 - Point system
 - Rankings of facilities
 - Condition rating
 - e. Leasing buildings
7. Diane Fox presented information on the Post Office situation
 - Historic District concerns
 - State Historic District explanation
 - Retrofitting the existing building
 - Parking concerns
 - Rights of first refusal /Historic District Overlay
8. Next Steps
 - Committee agreed that they will meet every last Thursday of the month,
 - Establish a set process for the Town to acquire property in an expedited manner

Meeting was adjourned at 8:51 PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 3rd meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, May 27, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the Cone Room of Town Hall.

Attendance

Dianne Fox, Karin Sadik-Kahn, Denise Savageau, Chris von Keyserling, John Nelson, Ellen Avellino, Richard Kriskey, Michael Carter, Ginny Gwynn, Peter Berg, Don Heller, Sue Baker, Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice Chair), John Lucarelli (Chair) and Scott Johnson

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:15 PM.
2. Minutes of the 4-14-2010 meeting were reviewed and approved
3. Divided TPC into subcommittees: a) Infrastructure and Railway Properties (Baker, LeBien, Mead) b) Education and Library Properties (Bodson, Galvin, Norton, Tanner) c) Open Space, Parking and Park Properties (Gwynn, Johnson, Sadik-Kahn, Nelson) d) Administration, Housing and Safety Properties (Avellino, Carter, Kriskey, Lucarelli)
4. Discussed TPC mandate and how it pertains to future work performed by sub-committees.
5. Decided to approach DPW and obtain Building Inventory, Index and Capital Planning document from Al Monelli. Sub-committees thought this would be a good starting point in identifying issues facing Town Properties. Although, there was sentiment that the sub-committee work performed should maintain independence from department head opinions.
6. Overall organization discussion ensued with inputs from Don Heller, Diane Fox, and Denise Savageau.
7. A great fear among TPC members remains Town's past policy of "Demolition by neglect." TPC will strive to implement new policies aimed at better informing Town's citizens about Town property management decisions and avoid these problems in the future.
8. Next Steps:
 - Obtain DPW document for distribution.
 - Begin identifying priority properties for analysis.
 - Provide Denise's staff with Property ID Numbers (in order) so they can provide the TPC with GIS maps of all Town properties at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 4th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, June 24, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the Mazza of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Amy Siebert, Chris von Keyserling, Lexy Tanner (Secretary), Sue Baker, Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice Chair), Dustin Anderson, Michael Carter, Harry LeBien and John Nelson

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:08 PM.
2. Minutes of the 5-27-2010 meeting were reviewed and approved
3. The chair reviewed applicable current events and their potential implications to the POCD Town Properties Committee
4. A discussion of the current operation of the sub-committee structure and potential improvements took place
5. The Chair reviewed with the group a series of GIS maps that detailed the location of four types of Town-owned property:
 - a. Education and library
 - b. Administration, housing and safety
 - c. Infrastructure and railroad
 - d. Open space, parking and park
6. The Commissioner of Public Works answered questions regarding location of maintenance facilities

Meeting adjourned at 8:45PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 5th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the Employee Lounge of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Sue Baker, Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), Harry LeBien, John Nelson, Dick Kriskey, Art Norton, Karen Sadik-Kahn, Michael Carter, Chris von Keyserling

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:10 PM.
2. Minutes of the 6-24-2010 meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. The chair called for Sub Committee Reports.
4. Open discussion about Sub-Committee goals – Meeting dates and department head attendance required.
5. Distributed and discussed Town Property GIS maps.
6. Discussed TPC status e-mail sent to First Selectman and POCD - Implementation Committee
7. First draft of Town Property Audit submitted. Edits discussed and will be ready for presentation at October meeting.
8. Next meeting will be held October 26, 2010.

Meeting adjourned at 8:25PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 6th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Tuesday, October 26, 2010 at 6:30 PM in the Employee Lounge of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Sue Baker, Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), Harry LeBien, John Nelson, Ginny Gwynn, Bill Galvin, Joe Tranfo, Dick Kriskey, Art Norton, Karen Sadik-Kahn, Michael Carter, Denise Savageue, Gordon Ennis, Robert Maddux, Chris von Keyserling

1. Meeting is called to order at 6:40 PM.
2. Minutes of the 9-29-2010 meeting were reviewed and approved
3. The chair called for Sub Committee Reports
4. Open Space Sub-Committee would like P&Z to present all Open Space Reports and delineate what has been implemented and what has been deferred
5. Town Attorney Whetmore who was primary guest was not able to attend due to illness – Primary agenda was to discuss Town Leases, Easements, Right of Ways, and Communal Property
6. Committee Case Study about Greenwich Arts Council Lease is presented by Gordon Innis and Robert Maddux from the RTM Finance Committee
7. Q&A - RTM Finance Committee and First Selectmen's SOMR
8. Next meeting will be decided by Chairperson after discussing scheduling with Town Attorney Whetmore

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 7th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, November 18, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the Employee Lounge of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Sue Baker, Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), Harry LeBien, Dick Kriskey, Art Norton, Chris von Keyserling, John Wetmore, Peter Berg, Scott Johnson, Mike Bodson

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:15 PM.
2. Minutes of the 10-26-10 meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. The chair called for Sub Committee Reports.
4. Infrastructure has finalized meetings with DPW and has come to some conclusions to be discussed at next meeting.
5. Town Attorney Wetmore was primary guest and discussed Town Leases and procedure and history of buying and selling Town properties.
6. Next meeting will be decided by Chairperson after the New Year to meet with Town Attorney Whetmore again to discuss Easements, Right of Ways, and Communal Property. We will also be scheduling joint meeting with other POCD committees – Transportation, Affordable housing, Downtown.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 9th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, April 28, 2011 at 7:00 PM in the Mazza Room of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Aubrey Mead Jr. (Vice-Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), Dick Kriskey, Art Norton, Chris von Keyserling, Scott Johnson, Ginny Gwynn, David Berk

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:00 PM.
2. Minutes of the previous meeting with the Downtown Committee were reviewed and approved.
3. Committee would like to move forward to speak with the other POCD Committees: Affordable Housing and Transportation. Meeting dates pending.
4. The chair called for Sub Committee Reports. Open Space Sub-Committee completed their preliminary written report and will be disseminated to all TPC members before the next meeting.
5. Comments made by Committee members who attended the DPW/P&Z Drainage Workshop – TPC Drainage Sub-Committee will be formed.
6. Discussion with David Berk, Property Manager for Tishman Speyer ; topics included:
 - Tishman Speyer Properties and RE Management
 - Disclaimer – He was here to share best practices from private industry. Some may apply to Town of Greenwich and some may not.
 - Various Departments
 - Additional Departments / Tools Used
 - Communication (depends on the audience and the message)
 - How Tishman Speyer Views Things?
 - How Do We Purchase Items?
 - Long Term Budgeting
 - Taking Care of the Building/Properties – Work smarter not harder
 - Two RE Strategies – Long Term (Buy and Hold) vs. Short Term
 - Looking Toward the Future
7. Next meeting will be May 26 – Discussion about Open Space Sub-Committee Report and John Craine’s Committee Report on Waterfront Properties.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 10th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, May 26, 2011 at 7:00 PM in the Mazza Room of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), John Nelson, Art Norton, Scott Johnson, Sue Baker, Art Norton, Denise Savageau, John Craine

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:15 PM.
2. Minutes of the previous meeting held April 28, 2011 were reviewed and approved.
3. Committee would like to move forward to speak with the other POCD- Transportation. Meeting dates still pending.
4. The chair called for Sub Committee Reports. Open Space Sub-Committee completed their preliminary written report and discussion ensued. They gave a background on how the Committee came to their conclusions and follow up steps were discussed.
5. Chair of the Committee will disseminate past notes on Town procedures for buying and selling Town properties. Other Open Space notes taken from past meetings will also be sent to Open Space Sub-Committee for review.
6. It was decided that future TPC guidance to Town should take into account financial impact and feasibility.
7. Concerns were addressed that Committee members strongly urge the Town to implement a permanent process to make sure Town assets are managed in the best interest of it's citizens. A majority believed a standing Town Property Oversight Committee reporting to the Selectmen's office would be the best way to ensure the public interest would be maintained.
8. John Craine's Coastal Resources Advisory Committee Report on Waterfront Properties. Discussion included issues facing the future of Town waterfront properties, State and Harbor Management Plan, Long Range Vision, Mooring on-line management software system to provide transparency for who is on the waiting list.
9. Next meeting will be TBD – Discussion with Paul Settlemyer's POCD Transportation Committee.
10. Meeting adjourned at 8:50PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The 11th meeting of the Town Properties was held on Thursday, June 23, 2011 at 7:00 PM in the Mazza Room of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), John Nelson, Art Norton, Scott Johnson, Sue Baker, Art Norton, Denise Savageau, Richard Bay, John Toner, Paul Settlemyer, Michael Bodson, Ginny Gwynn, Chris Von Keyserling

1. Meeting is called to order at 7:15 PM.
2. Minutes of the previous meeting held May 26, 2011 were reviewed and approved.
3. Committee reports were given and much discussion took place about the status of current sub-committees. Chairman agreed to poll sub-committees and obtain first drafts of work completed. Information will be obtained and disseminated to Committee by late July. Edits and questions by committee will be submitted by Mid August.
4. TPC hosted representatives from POCD – Transportation Committee: Richard Bay, John Toner, Paul Settlemyer
5. Discussion included comments about: Bicycle Master Plan, Bicycle Right of Ways, Pedestrian Safety, Maps detailing neighborhood plans, Parking implications, Development around various railroad stations, Interconnectivity of Public Parks, Transit-oriented development, Multi-modal development, Peak-time optimization, Density issues related to development, Parking garage expansion, Better Town Property utilization, 30 Year Plan for bus routes
6. Comments about recent draft of POCD – Transportation Report – January 14, 2011 and SWRPA Report – March 24, 2011. Concepts discussed: “Fix it first”, Branch lines, Rail Parking and Stations, Transit Station Access, Interregional Bus Transit, Transportation and Land Use Connection, and Transportation for Senior and Special Needs Travelers.
7. Discussion regarding redevelopment of Pathway to Greenwich/New England – US1 entrance into Connecticut. Fate of Historic Lyons House discussed. Widening of Post Road will further encroach on Lyon House property. Possible plans to re-locate Lyons House near Hamill Skating Rink location with adequate parking. State redevelopment plan might help financially subsidize re-location.
8. Next meeting will be TBD in September – To discuss and review first draft of Final Committee Report
9. Meeting adjourned at 8:45PM.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
2009 PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

The last meeting of the POCD - Town Properties Committee was held on Tuesday, March 27, 2012 at 6:00 PM in the Mazza Room of Town Hall.

Attendance

John Lucarelli (Chair), Michael Carter (Secretary), John Nelson, Art Norton, Scott Johnson, Sue Baker, Karen Sadik-Khan, Ginny Gwynn, Harry LeBien, Dick Kriskey, Peter Tesei, Dustin Anderson (Absent: Aubrey Mead, Bill Galvin, Mike Bodson)

1. Meeting is called to order at 6:15 PM.
2. Chairman's report on the Final TPC Report
3. Chairman submits Motion to accept the Open Space Sub-Committee's Report originally submitted October 24, 2011 and add the report to the Final TPC Report on Page 21 (errata). No second on the motion.
4. Discussion involving Sub-Committee reports, Sub-Committee's jurisdictions, and the idea of changing the final TPC Report to be explicitly a POCD - Town Properties Committee Chairman's report.
5. Remarks by the First Selectman about the TPC's progress and why the TPC's effort was so important.
6. Chairman submits a final Motion to accept the POCD – Town Properties Committee Final Report as a POCD – Town Properties Committee Chairman's Report (pages 1-37 and corresponding appendices) with specific Sub-Committee Reports submitted, endorsed by the TPC members involved with their respective Sub-Committees, and attached to the POCD-TPC Final Report by those Sub-Committee's respectively.
7. Chairman's Motion is adopted by a vote of 10 in favor, No opposed, No abstentions, and 3 voting members absent.
8. Meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Appendix XVII. – GREENWICH - PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT (POCD) - TOWN PROPERTIES COMMITTEE (TPC)

COMMITTEE DEVELOPED MISSION STATEMENT:

To develop a long-term plan for the preservation, maintenance, enhancement and stewardship of Greenwich Town properties, for the prosperity of our town and the enjoyment and benefit of all its residents.

POCD ACTION ITEMS REVIEWED BY COMMITTEE TO ASSESS TOWN'S LONG TERM PROPERTY

MANAGEMENT NEEDS:

Overall Town Property Management: 1.26, 1.34, 1.36, 1.46, 1.47, 1.48, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.5, 5.10, 6.10, 6.14, 6.15, 6.16, 6.16, 6.18, 6.23, 6.24

Public Safety, Affordable Housing and Administration Properties: 3.4, 3.7, 3.8, 4.27, 4.31, 6.7, 6.8, 6.27, 6.29, 6.30 – Committee: Michael Carter, Dick Kriskey, Ellen Avellino, John Lucarelli

Open Space and Park Properties: 1.8, 1.9, 1.38, 1.40, 1.41, 1.42, 1.47, 1.49, 1.51, 4.7, 4.8, 4.25, 6.6 – Committee: Scott Johnson, John Nelson, Ginny Gwynn, Karen Sadik-Khan, Denise Savageau, John Lucarelli

Education, Library and Museum Properties: 6.17, 6.21, 6.26, 6.28 – Mike Bodson, Art Norton, William Galvin, John Lucarelli

Infrastructure and Railroad Properties: 1.3, 1.4, 2.7, 2.8, 4.9, 4.15, 4.16, 4.28, 5.9, 5.11, 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 6.9, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13 – Committee: Aubrey Mead, Lexi Tanner, Sue Baker, Harry LeBien, John Lucarelli

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John M. Lucarelli (Chair), Aubrey Mead (Vice Chairperson), Ellen Avellino, Sue H. Baker, Mike Bodson, Michael Carter, Bill Galvin, Ginny Gwynn, Scott Johnson, Dick Kriskey, Harry LeBien, John Nelson, Arthur Norton (BET Representative), Karen Sadik-Khan, Lexi Tanner (Secretary), Denise Savageau (Conservation Commission), Peter Tesei (First Selectman), Chris Von Keyserling (POCD Implementation Committee)

Appendix XVIII. - Committee Member Biographies

Chair - John M. Lucarelli – District 10 – Four Term RTM Representative from District 10 and RTC Associate. Serve as past/current board member on various Town Boards including: Greenwich Boy Scouts, Round Hill Association, Greenwich Community and Police Partnership, and Yale Alumni Association of Greenwich. Former real estate banker. Currently employed as managing partner and founder of Round Hill Design, LLC, a responsible Greenwich property development and management company. Resident of Greenwich since 2000.

Vice Chair - Aubrey E. Mead, Jr. – District 8 - B.S.& M.S. Civil Engineering, Licensed Professional Engineer with Redniss & Mead, Inc., Greenwich Flood & Erosion Control Board member & Cos Cob Fire Police Patrol, experienced in working with foresters to determine goals for undeveloped land such as wildlife habitat, runoff quality protection, other uses and seeking federal funding to carry out practices.

Secretary - Michael Carter - District 6 - Licensed Architect, Worked 8 years in zoning, planning and development and 22 years in real estate finance. Extensive experience in methods of property valuation. Hold both a Masters in Architecture and a Masters in Business. First moved to Greenwich in 1970. Children attend Greenwich Public Schools.

Lexy Tanner – District 2 - Raised a stone's throw from Bruce Park, now lives with her family in Old Greenwich. Lexy brings over 25 years of strategic planning and communications experience to the Town Properties Committee, as well as a deep and abiding love for town. Lexy is responsible for corporate communications at Betteridge Jewelers, where she also works directly for long-time town resident and advocate, Terry Betteridge.

Ellen Avellino – District 1 – 25 year Town resident, married with two daughters and two grandsons, has practiced law in Greenwich since 1994 with a strong emphasis on Trusts and Estates and Private Foundations. Have served on many boards and committees including Garden Education Center, Bruce Museum, Red Cross, Audubon, Greenwich Antiques Society, Greenwich Exchange for Women's Work, Greenwich Junior League, Tomes Higgins Restoration Project and the Historic Preservation Trust. Currently serves as an alternate commissioner on Planning and Zoning Commission.

Sue Baker – District 5 - Greenwich resident for over 40 years and raised 3 children. Served on many not-for-profit Boards in the past. Trained as a Marine biologist/oceanographer. Retired after teaching at Greenwich HS, EJHS, and The Whitby School. Currently serves on the Town of Greenwich Shellfish Commission, Town of Greenwich Conservation Commission, and Town Committee for Artificial Turf.

Mike Bodson – District 11 - Executive Managing Director at DTCC, a financial industry owned utility. Spent 20 years at Morgan Stanley, including 9 years in Asia, with his last position as Managing Director-Global Head of Operations. Serves on Greenwich Board of Education - Secretary to Board and Chairman of Policy Governance Committee. Previously served on both Hamilton Avenue School and Glenville School Building Committees as well as Facilities Review Committee.

William W. Galvin III – District 7 - First moved to Riverside in 1972 and was on the Board of Social Services for a 5-year period in the late 1970's. Currently serve on Inland Wetlands and Watercourses

Agency and was recently elected to the RTM District 7. After a BA from Yale University and an MBA from Columbia University, had a 40 year career in corporate and marketing communications consulting including his own business for 18 years following 5 years at First Boston as head of corporate communications.

Ginny Gwynn – District 8 - Currently Executive Director of the Greenwich Land Trust and a member of the Town's Open Space Committee. She has served on the Greenwich Board of Education and the Downtown Study Group. Her professional background is in finance, marketing and fundraising.

Scott Johnson – District 11 - 10 year member Board of Parks and Recreation. Serve on various Town committees including: Selectman's Committee on Artificial Turf Fields, Parks and Recreation Subcommittee on Plan of Conservation, Corefans Selectman's Committee, CT Bar Association Environmental Law, Sub-committee on Waterfront Management. Managing member Greenwich law firm.

Karen Sadik-Kahn – District 6 - Serving on RTM(14 years) for District 6; Chairman of RTM Parks and Recreation Committee (6 years); Board Member Greenwich Tree Conservancy; President of Garden Education Center of Greenwich; Member of Conservation Commission's Open Space Committee.

Dick Kriskey – District 2 - Greenwich native, Managing Partner Livingston Builders, LLC, Board of Estimate and Taxation (Former Chairman), Board of Education Facilities (Former Chairman), Current Member Board of Assessment Appeals (8 years). Previously served on many Town Boards including: Greenwich Library, Boy Scouts of America, Greenwich Teen Center Facility Search Committee and Advisory Board, Bruce Museum, Greenwich Emergency Medical Service (Facilities Chairman and Treasurer). Former Representative Town Meeting Member.

Harry LeBien – District 11 - Retired attorney. Greenwich resident since 1976. Former member Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals. Former member and Chairman Planning and Zoning Commission. Currently District 11 representative on the RTM Land Use Committee.

John Nelson – District 8 – Retired international lawyer specializing in ship financing and international transactions. Co-Chairman of New York State Bar Association Admiralty Committee, Chairman of Association of the Bar City of New York Admiralty Committee. Greenwich resident since 1971. Previously served on community boards including: First Presbyterian Church, Mead School, Mead Foundation, St. Barnabas Church, Soundwaters (Chairman of Marine Committee); Greenwich Land Trust (Vice President and Co-Chairman of Land Stewardship Committee), and Greenwich Historical Society Advisory Board.

Arthur Norton - District 9 - Greenwich resident for forty two years. Four children, two Greenwich born, went K-12 in Greenwich schools, one grandchild at North Mianus School. Fourteen terms RTM, District 12 Chair 1980-1992, District 9 Chair 2000-2004, President Western Greenwich Civic Center Foundation, Inc. and Chair of the Committee to Rehabilitate the Bendheim Western Greenwich Civic Center, Member of the Greenwich BET (2006 to present) - Audit and Investment Advisory Committees. BET voting member to the Glenville School Building Committee. Registered Investment Advisor, Managing Director, Araglan Capital Management, LLC and President, Business and Financial Services, Inc.

Appendix XIX. - Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Green Building Policy Resolutions

Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Artificial Turf fields Resolution adopted April 16, 2009

WHEREAS, the Board of Selectmen's Environmental Action Task Force ("Task Force") has been established to recommend policy to the Board of Selectmen with regard to making town government operations environmentally sustainable;

WHEREAS, the Town aspires to lead among municipalities in providing safe, healthful, environmentally responsible and financially prudent recreational facilities;

WHEREAS, the Town provides athletic fields for the conduct and support of organized athletics for its children;

WHEREAS, artificial turf athletic fields made of various plastics and other polymers rather than natural grass have been put forward as a means of meeting the Town's aspirations;

WHEREAS, the Task Force studied available scientific, health, government, environmental and industry literature, hosted presentations from alternative technologies and reviewed available Town records relative to these technologies;

WHEREAS, the Task Force raised questions about potential health, environmental and financial concerns relating to the choice between artificial turf and natural grass fields discussed in the accompanying report to the Selectmen.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Selectmen establish an Artificial Turf Working Group, to include Board of Education, Department of Parks & Recreation, Conservation Commission and Department of Health representatives, to review the initiatives set forth herein and to periodically advise the Board of Selectmen and other appointing authorities on progress to achieve the aspirations herein and any updates necessitated by changed conditions and good practice in the following areas:

Evaluation of proposed investments to replace natural grass fields with new artificial fields or renovate existing artificial turf fields with consideration to health, environmental, and cost/benefit issues;

Identification of funding and thresholds for: a) sampling current artificial turf fields and infill, and b) using an independent testing laboratory and government accepted testing protocols to evaluate the presence of and risk posed by any chemicals of concern;

Consideration of recommendations such as those from the Center for Disease Control, other Federal and State agencies and professional organizations to develop protocols and to

monitor field temperatures, develop methodologies to issue appropriate advisories and establish temperature safety standards for Town artificial turf fields;

Development of artificial turf field user and maintenance standards to assist and better regulate any identified post-construction usage and maintenance concerns, in compliance with the manufacturer's warranty;

Consideration of life-cycle costs in the financial analysis of any artificial turf field acquisition decision;

Development of new artificial turf project specifications, requiring best available technology employment with cost efficient and proper consideration to health, safety and environmental compliance regulations.

TOWN OF GREENWICH
POLICY FOR USE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE CLEANING AND SANITIZING PRODUCTS

WHEREAS, the Town of Greenwich Environmental Action Task Force has been established to recommend policy to the Board of Selectmen with regard to making all Town government operations environmentally sustainable; and

WHEREAS, the Connecticut General Assembly has passed Public Act No. 08-186 requiring that on or after October 1, 2007 “no person shall use a cleaning product inside a building owned by the state unless such cleaning product meets guidelines or environmental standards set by a national or international environmental certification program...Only certified Environmentally Preferred Products (EPP), cleaning products that are labeled “Green Seal Certified or EcoLogo” shall be used in state owned or leased facilities.”; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Greenwich seeks to protect the health of its residents and employees by limiting unnecessary exposure to harmful chemicals and limit the harmful effects of hazardous chemicals in the waste stream; and

WHEREAS, the dollar cost of environmentally preferable products (EPPs) is no greater than non-EPPs and the use of such EPP’s often leads to a reduction in the number of products in use,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that no person shall use a cleaning product inside a building owned and/or operated by the Town of Greenwich unless such cleaning product has been certified by and labeled as Green Seal Certified or EcoLogo. Categories of cleaning products not included in this requirement are disinfectants, disinfecting cleaners, sanitizers or any other antimicrobial products regulated by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, 7 USC 136 et seq. and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that implementation of this policy shall allow time for the depletion of existing supplies and the establishment of supply chains for environmentally preferable products and training of personnel in proper use, and

FURTHER RESOLVED that vendors contracted by the Town to perform janitorial and custodial services shall also use Green Seal Certified or EcoLogo labeled products in the execution of their contractual obligations to the Town (with the above exception).

THEREFORE, we request the Board and Town purchasers adopt these standards of for the Town of Greenwich.

**Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Energy Policy Resolution adopted
August 14, 2008**

WHEREAS, the Town of Greenwich aspires to lead among municipalities and, by example, its Citizens in improving energy management policies; and

WHEREAS, the Town aspires to reduce the adverse impact of rising energy costs on the Operating Budget; and

WHEREAS, the Town aspires to reduce the carbon dioxide (CO₂) load on the environment due to the Town's use of fossil energy.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the First Selectman appoint an Energy Management Team to improve the Town's energy management by identifying ways to improve energy usage, continuously monitoring performance, and recognizing achievement, and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town establish its energy use in a baseline year and set targets for reducing energy use, energy costs, and CO₂ emissions, and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town evaluate its operations to identify unnecessary energy consuming activities and eliminate these; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town identify the most economical and environmentally efficient available technologies to conduct its operations, develop implementation plans and budgets, and incorporate these plans into department operating plans and in the Town's Annual Budget; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town incorporate total life cycle costs into purchasing and capital acquisition decisions that consider fuel costs, CO₂ emissions and ongoing maintenance costs in addition to initial purchase price; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town make use of grants, incentives, and rebates that may be available when energy efficient technologies are utilized.

**Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Green Building Policy Resolution
adopted March 26, 2009**

WHEREAS, the Selectmen's Environmental Action Task Force (EATF) has been established to recommend policy to the Board of Selectmen with the goal of making all Town government operations environmentally sustainable and cost efficient; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Greenwich desires to serve as a model for energy efficient and sustainable building design and maintenance in its own facilities,

WHEREAS, the EATF has concluded that green building standards applied to the design, construction, operation and maintenance of Town buildings can further the following goals:

1. Reduce energy use and CO₂ emissions
2. Reduce water consumption
3. Protect the health and productivity of residents, workers and visitors in the Town's buildings
4. Conserve valuable resources used to build, furnish and maintain buildings
5. Save taxpayer dollars by reducing costs of energy, water, materials and waste removal; and

WHEREAS Public Act 07- 242 Section 78 requires that the State Building Inspector (Inspector) and the Codes and Standards Committee revise the State Building Code (Code) to require that any (1) building, except a residential building with no more than four units, constructed after January 1, 2009, that is projected to cost not less than five million dollars and (2) renovation to any building, except a residential building with no more than four units, started after January 1, 2010, that is projected to cost not less than two million dollars shall be built or renovated using building construction standards consistent with or exceeding the silver building rating of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design's (LEED) rating system for new commercial construction and major renovation projects, as established by the US Green Building Council, or an equivalent standard, including, but not limited to, a two globe rating in the Green Globes USA design program. The inspector and the committee shall provide for an exemption for any building if the Institute for Sustainable Energy finds, in a written analysis, that the cost of such compliance significantly outweighs the benefits; and

WHEREAS Public Act 07-242 will require a green building standard for all private buildings in the State, except residential construction of four units or less, above a certain size and /or cost, the law will not be effective until the Code is revised.

WHEREAS Public Act 07-242 Section 10 requires that after January 1, 2009 new public school facilities exceeding \$5 million and renovations to public school facilities exceeding \$2 million, where the state funds \$2 million or more, are required to meet the above requirement; and

WHEREAS the Board of Selectmen has established the Energy Management Task Force to review the Town's energy management of its facilities by identifying ways to reduce energy usage, continuously monitor performance and recognize achievement; and

WHEREAS the current draft of the 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development calls for the Town "to create green municipal facilities...protect the environment..." and to reduce energy and water requirements and for incentives for private conservation of resources; and

WHEREAS studies have shown that the cost of building new buildings to LEED® or similar standards results in savings to taxpayers over the life of the building and that green building maintenance practices are rapidly becoming the industry standard and are possible to implement without negative cost implications,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Board of Selectmen hereby adopts the following as the Green Building Policy of the Town of Greenwich:

A. All new building and renovation of Town owned and operated buildings or buildings for which the Town provides the major source of operation and maintenance funds, beginning January 1, 2010, that are not covered by State requirements shall be built or renovated using building construction standards consistent with or exceeding LEED® Silver standards or recognized equivalent, provided that the projected savings over the life of the building will offset any additional costs.

B. All Town of Greenwich buildings, including all Greenwich Public Schools buildings, will be operated and maintained to achieve the following goals:

1. Increased use of sustainable materials and waste reduction
 - a. All new materials selected for building, furnishing and maintenance of building will be chosen for durability
 - b. Preference will be given to materials with recycled and recyclable content
2. Reduction of water use
 - a. All new plumbing fixtures will be certified by WaterSense (EPA)
 - b. Landscape design and maintenance will be guided by practices established by The Sustainable Sites Initiative or EPA's GreenScapes program.
3. Improvement of indoor air quality
 - a. Green cleaning policy (Resolution adopted January 29, 2009)
 - b. Zero VOC's in interior paints, finishes and carpets and adhesives as certified by Green Seal or Green Label programs
 - c. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs will be established according to EPA guidelines for building interiors
4. Reduction of energy use and CO2 emissions;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, *implementation of this policy shall allow time for the depletion of existing supplies and the establishment of supply chains for environmentally preferable products and training of personnel.*

**Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Pesticide Application Policy
Resolution adopted March 27, 2008**

March 27, 2008

To: Peter Tesei, First Selectman
Peter Crumbine, Selectman
Lin Lavery, Selectman

Re: Routine application of pesticides to Town athletic fields

At our March 26, 2008 meeting, the Greenwich Environmental Action Task Force discussed the issue of routine pesticide application to municipal properties, specifically the athletic fields, and the apparent threat to the health of our children and to the environment.

As you may be aware, the State of Connecticut has mandated that all towns cease the routine application of pesticides on K through 8 school properties by the summer of 2009. The Town of Greenwich is in a unique position to take the lead in this area, as the Town has already trialed a successful IPM program, which does not utilize routine pesticide applications. The Department of Parks and Recreation Division of Parks and Trees should be commended for their foresight and efforts.

In keeping with this success, we do not believe that the yearly application of pesticides to our athletic fields for the pre-emergent treatment of crab grass should continue. Despite the fact that the Town is clearly staying within the 'letter of the law', we strongly feel that putting the health of our children at risk for these final applications is unnecessary. Although fields that are not on school grounds are not covered by this mandate, we believe that all fields should be pesticide free.

Recognizing the pressing need for an appropriate Town response, the Task Force unanimously voted to ask that the Board of Selectmen adopt the following resolution:

Whereas there is sufficient and compelling data to support that any exposure of pesticides to our children represents a significant health risk, and

Whereas the State of Connecticut has passed HB 5234 which bans the routine application of pesticides to all schools K through 8 beginning 2009, and

Whereas the Conservation Commission passed a resolution in 2004 asking the Board of Selectmen to adopt a town-wide policy on pesticide use, and

Whereas the Greenwich Department of Parks and Recreation Division of Parks and Trees has developed an effective Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program without pesticide use at the North Street Elementary School athletic field, and now utilizes many of these same strategies at all municipal athletic fields, but continues to routinely apply pre-emergent crab grass pesticide each Spring to these other fields;

Therefore, the Greenwich Environmental Action Task Force recommends to the Board of Selectman, that the Town of Greenwich through the Department of Parks and Recreation Division of Parks and Trees take

a leadership role and immediately cease routine application of pesticides to our municipal athletic fields including the planned application on April 14, 2008.

There has been growing concern about the indiscriminant use of pesticides in our society. Locally, residents are expressing their concern by sponsoring educational forums, writing letters to the editor, and in their communications to the Town staff. Compelling data now point to the significant human health risk, particularly to children, and to the growing environmental contamination associated with pesticide use.

Thank you for your consideration of our resolution. The Task Force hopes to assist in the development of a comprehensive Town policy regarding pesticide use, however feels there is now an opportunity and need for the Town to act quickly and place the health of our children and environment ahead of the current practice of routinely applying pesticides to our athletic fields. Why wait for the 2009 State mandate when the Town is perfectly poised to change now, especially when the change is the right thing to do? Please don't hesitate to contact me at 863-3115 or Denise Savageau, Conservation Director for more information. We look forward to working with you on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Michael J Franco, MD
Chairman, Pesticide Subcommittee
Greenwich Environmental Action Task Force

Cc: Caroline Baisley, Director Department of Health
Michael Long, Director Department of Health, Division of Environmental Services
Denise Savageau, Director Conservation Commission
Joseph Siciliano, Director Department of Parks and Recreation
Bruce Spaman, Superintendent Department of Parks and Recreation Division of Parks and Trees

**Town of Greenwich Board of Selectmen's Environmental Task Force Public School Busing Resolution
adopted February 26, 2009**

WHEREAS, the Town of Greenwich provides transportation funding for public and private school students living in town; and

WHEREAS, many eligible students do not take the school bus but rather are driven to school by a parent or caregiver, for a variety of reasons; and

WHEREAS, cars carrying children to school leave a large carbon footprint on our town, while also contributing to traffic congestion, accidents, and a variety of less obvious costs such as road maintenance, traffic officers, engineering and construction of student drop-off/pickup spots, road-rage, missed train commutes; and

WHEREAS, cars taking children to school make our roads more hazardous to pedestrians and bicycles, causing parents greater concern about letting their children walk or bike to school, despite the obvious health benefits of walking and biking.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the BOS work with the BOE to assist middle schools in decreasing the use of automobiles to transport children to and from schools including but not limited to (i) changing the eligibility for bus transportation to include consideration of pedestrian safety, (ii) changing and/or adding routes to reduce transit time, (iii) altering afternoon schedules to provide bus transport to students' points of interest, (iv) coordinating school start times and (v) providing better bicycle racking and security.

In order to achieve these goals we recommend but are not limited to, the following actions:

- 1) The Parent Teacher Associations (PTA's) call on all parents and caregivers to avoid, when possible, driving children to or from school, especially with just one child per car; and
- 2) Student governments and student organizations encourage their members to use school buses whenever possible, to benefit our environment; and
- 3) The PTA and student organizations seek ways to recognize and/or create incentives to students who consistently get to school by bus or bike or foot rather than by private automobile; and
- 4) Encourage educators to identify and capitalize on opportunities for students to learn firsthand about the impact of conserving resources through real life experiences such as calculating the carbon footprint; and
- 5) Encourage parents and students to form car pools for extra-curricular events that are outside school bus hours, devising e-mail and/or website solutions to facilitate car-pooling; and
- 6) Eliminate barriers which may be preventing students from biking to school, such as assuring there are sufficient bicycle racks and bicycle security at schools; and

- 7) The BOE explore the possibility of increasing access, based on capacity, to bus transportation by students who are not otherwise eligible; and
- 8) The school administration update the 2004 automobile/pedestrian study prepared by Fuss & O'Neill for the Central Cluster and replicate the study for the Eastern and Western Clusters, to ensure a uniform standard is used to respond to requests for student transportation from families who live within the Board approved mileage eligibility limits; and
- 9) Encourage the school administration to optimize routes in ways that improve access and remove barriers; including but not limited to reducing student travel times and exploring different route structures such as the use of transportation hubs or integrating public and private school routes; and
- 10) Encourage the acceleration of replacing the buses before 2012, and if renegotiating the contract require a new model bus clause; and
- 11) The Town continue to implement sidewalk improvements and new sidewalk construction, Safe-Routes-to-School, the Bicycle Master Plan and traffic-calming recommendations; and
- 12) The Town support funding of a Transportation Planner as recommended in the draft Plan of Conservation and Development who will assist all transportation providers (TAG, student transportation, etc.) with efforts to maximize resources, improve access, and conserve resources; and
- 13) The recommendations in this resolution be incorporated into the Plan of Conservation and Development; and
- 14.) The school administration build on the experiences learned in reconfiguring middle school student transportation and extend best practices and lessons learned to the elementary and high schools.

Respectfully submitted, Environmental Action Task Force and The Public Transportation Committee

Jonathan Bates
JoAnn Messina, Chair
Peter Berg
Peter Moss
Jen Donnalley
Sara Wolfe
Hannah Keohane