



The Committee on Saint Paul's
Report to the Board of Trustees
March 16, 2023

Letter from the Co-Chairs

Dear Mayor Veneziale, Members of the Board of Trustees, Village Department Heads, and Garden City Residents:

Attached please find the Report of the Mayor's Committee on St. Paul's for your review and comment.

The Committee began its work in January 2022 in response to the For a Better Garden City Platform (FABGC) and the Board of Trustees promise to review the St. Paul's Campus Project. The Committee's role was to communicate and educate the G.C. Village residents concerning the status of the main buildings and grounds. The Committee's task was to determine and report the feasibility and cost of two options for the main building, Demolition or Renovation. These two options were to be presented to Village residents in a non-binding Village-wide vote. The goal was to resolve the future of the St. Paul's Campus and Buildings after thirty years of ownership and debate.

The Committee's work over the past fifteen months has involved hundreds of hours of effort by volunteer professionals each recognized for their decades of experience in their respective fields. Specific expertise was secured in the critical areas of accounting, architecture, construction, demolition, engineering, finance, historical preservation, legal, rating agencies, salvage value and engineering/construction practices. The Committee organized itself into Sub-committees according to the Project's most pressing issues.

The respective sub-committees included:

- I. Architecture & Engineering
- II. Economic Analysis & Historic Preservation
- III. Finance
- IV. Legal
- V. Programmatic Use
- VI. Resident Outreach & Communications

The Committee held monthly meetings with the Co-chairs and often weekly meetings with the sub-committee members. The sub-committees held more than 50 Open Public Meetings throughout 2022 and 2023. Also, six Village-wide Town Halls were held to apprise Village residents of the Committee's progress. Fifty community organizations and affiliate groups engaged with the Committee describing their programmatic needs. The Committee thanks those Trustees who attended the weekly meetings and / or the 6 Town Halls. Two private sessions were held at the request of three trustees who did not attend one or more Town Hall sessions or who had follow-up questions.

This Report contains the Report of Westerman Construction Company, Inc. who at the Trustee's request conducted a detailed study of the costs associated with various uses of the St. Paul's buildings and campus. Specific uses and related costs for scenarios including Demolition, Facadism, and a Community Center were considered and evaluated.

The Committee was mindful that the Board of Trustees ("BoT") would vote on the future of St Paul's main building. Consequently, BoT requests for information and economic/financial analysis

were given an immediate and high priority in the Committee's deliberations. Various members of the BoT specifically requested in public and private meetings:

1. an analysis of simple demolition as well as "architectural" demolition;
2. a new building behind the south façade and demolition of all three wings of the building as suggested by the 2012 Erwin & Bielinski Engineering Report;
3. a sports facility covered by a "Moynihan Station Roof" as well as a Performing Arts facility behind the south façade with all three wings being demolished;
4. A Community Center which would accommodate a range of "Permitted Uses" at the most "Minimal/Affordable" cost utilizing the South facing front wing of the main building as well as the central knave of the building including the Chapel and associated spaces. Adjacent wings and spaces would be secured for fire and safety reasons but otherwise preserved for future consideration by residents.

These Trustee requests were evaluated, included herein and incorporated into the Westermann Report.

A small and active group ("FDEM" / **For Demolition**) of senior residents advocated for the total demolition of the St. Paul's building. FDEM advocates were cordially invited publicly and privately by the Committee to participate in our work. The Committee also offered to assist FDEM with financial or technical assistance to facilitate their review of the Demolition option. FDEM rejected all of the Committee's offers and stated that they would present their own analysis of Demolition. Finally, FDEM was invited to participate in our Committee's Town Hall which specifically discussed Demolition. FDEM declined and stated they would hold their own Town Hall. The Committee is unaware of any Town Hall or any specific material developed by FDEM concerning Demolition as an option for St. Paul's. Consequently, no FDEM report could be incorporated in this report.

Members of the FDEM Group were divided regarding what would replace the site of the demolished building. Some requested a pond, some log cabins, some a Central Park like landscaping. Others requested the minimum use of ".. a few bags of Scotts grass seed."

The Committee decided to offer for the residents' consideration a landscaped park suitable for the central part of our Village. That more formal park was designed by a nationally recognized landscape architect and priced by local landscape firms.

Importantly, all of the options, alternatives and development scenarios considered by the Committee were those suggested by the BoT or by residents. NONE of the options evaluated, considered or included in this Report or the Westerman Report were initiated by the Committee members.

This Report reflects comments received by the Committee at the 6th Town Hall held March 13, 2023.

Very truly yours,

Brian Deveney and Robert Schoelle
Co-Chairs

Letter from The Mayor

Dear Village Residents:

The extraordinary efforts of our neighbors who voluntarily provided their decades of professional and subject matter expertise has resulted in the most comprehensive evaluation of the issues regarding St. Paul's since its purchase by the Village of Garden City in 1992. An enormous debt of gratitude is owed to all the resident volunteers and their families who gave of their time and expertise.

As your Mayor, and as a licensed registered Architect, I formed the Committee and requested volunteers to provide unbiased and balanced information to residents so an informed vote could be held to determine the fate of St. Paul's main building.

Residents with experience in Law, Finance, Architecture, Engineering, History and Communications responded to the call to volunteer. No volunteers were excluded. Subcommittees were formed and thousands of hours spent conducting research, analysis, outreach and public presentations to determine the potential renovation or demolition of St. Paul's Main Building.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees and all residents, Thank You!

Mayor Cosmo Veneziale

The Mayors Committee on St. Paul's

The following professionals and subject matter experts of varying opinions and points of view were recruited by the Mayor and volunteered their time to achieve his goal of an arm's length, unbiased, balanced, and objective evaluation of the future use of the St Paul's building and campus by Village residents.

Brian Deveney - Chair

Former Mayor & Village Justice. Negotiated purchase of St. Paul's as Mayor in 1992.

Chair of original Mayor's Committee on St. Paul's, 1993-96.

Robert Schoelle - Vice Chair

Former Village Administrator. Member of original Mayor's Committee on St. Paul's.

Historic Research Sub-Committee

Bill Garry - Chair - *President of The GC Historical Society. A Commissioner of GC Village Recreation & Cultural Affairs. Son & family, 3 grandkids live in GC.*

Brian Pinnola - *A preservationist since 1984. Past President and a current Director of The Garden City Historical Society and Preservation Long Island.*

Catherine O'Connor Schmidt - *MD/Executive, finance, investments at major financial institutions. Experience in municipal finance, foundations, conservancies, public and private grants. A Director, TGCHS.*

Programmatic Use Sub-Committee

Frank McDonough, Chair - *Managing Partner, Lightower Capital Partners, LLC. Nationally recognized expert in project finance, infrastructure and Public Private Partnerships, working with governments and the private sector. Previously responsible for Public Private Partnerships at Goldman Sachs & Co. Chair of Mayor's St. Paul's Committee, 1996-2000.*

Betsy Andromidas - *Lifelong resident, retired teacher, former POA Director, passionate community activist and volunteer leader.*

Michele Beach Harrington - *MD at major investment banks. Experienced GC as a child, student, parent of three scholar-athletes; active participant, volunteer, leader in many community organizations.*

Jonathan Martin - *Finance and NYSE Regulation professional. GC Graduate; daughters in Middle and High School.*

Francine Ryan - *A Director, TGCHS. Utilizing marketing, advertising, media, public relations skills to communicate ideas, facts with transparency to residents.*

Mark Ryan - *Executive Creative Director with 40+ years experience working for major advertising agencies on high profile national accounts.*

George Salem - *Former Financial Analyst. Serious student of the St. Paul's challenge for 20+ years. Opinion gatherer among residents, legal experts.*

Kathie Brennan Wysocki - *Former IBM Systems Engineer Manager. Using those skills to organize St. Paul's committees' information to educate the GC community.*

Budget & Finance Sub-Committee

Ryan Mulrooney - Chair - *Municipal Finance professional. The Finance Committee will ensure all projected costs, expenditures in St. Paul's proposals are accurately stated and accounted for.*

Robert Davis - *Fifty years experience in Urban Planning, Real Estate Research, Real Estate Investment Banking. On two previous St. Paul's committees (1995-2008).*

Kurt Ehrig - *Technology expert in finance sector. Will use his MIT Sustainability Certification and MBA, technology acumen, to drive the best solution for residents.*

Nicholas Eliopoulos - *Construction Industry executive for 45+ years; responsible for finance, administration and Owner's representative for new building construction, major renovations.*

Stephen Fereance - *Expert in finance, construction, project management, project bids, contract management. Will assist in the transition from design phase to implementation.*

George Kane - *57 years of financial experience, including auditing and financial management. Will contribute financial responsibility to the committee's plans.*

Robert Orosz - *Former director of the EPOA and the Nassau County Assessment Reform Team. Long-time taxpayer, consumer advocate.*

Thomas Ryan - *Project Management experience in finance, accounting, financial services, due diligence, internal audit, internal controls, business process reengineering, regulatory, technology, sustainability.*

Legal & Zoning Sub-Committee

J. Peter Coll - Chair – *A nationally recognized litigator. Former Senior Partner at Orrick Herrington, and at Donovan & Leisure in New York City. Extensive experience with complex commercial litigation involving corporate and community parties. A fifty-year resident of Garden City. His children attended Garden City Schools and were active in Village programs.*

Remy Bernardo - *Public finance and real estate attorney at the New York State Housing Finance Agency. WPOA Director.*

Jason Danisi - *An attorney with Rosenblum and Bianco, LLP, Rockville Centre.*

Edward T. Finneran - *Former prosecutor and litigator. Also worked in the finance industry. Active in POAs; addressed issues of importance to our neighbors.*

Keith Galanti - *A Certified Financial Planner for Morgan Stanley in Garden City for over 20 years. Member of the Village Planning Commission.*

Tom Lamberti - *A former Village Attorney, Counsel to the School District, CPOA Director & Officer, Trustee. Chair of 2008 St. Paul's Mayor's Committee Report.*

Design & Engineering Sub-Committee

William Alisse - Chair - RA AIA: Former head of international architectural practice in London. Extensive domestic and international experience. Member of the ADRB.

Paul Capece - Licensed architect with 20+ years experience designing renovations to, enlargements of, historic buildings in historic districts. Member of the ADRB.

Brian Gemmell - Senior Construction Manager. Will review all construction plans, planning and budgets from a value engineering, cost, and physical build standpoint.

Joseph A. Jabour - Professional Engineer for 40 years in multiple states, specializing in structural forensics, building restoration and new construction.

William Kuhl - Landscape Architect. Designed all the Streetscapes in G.C. Will assist in the development of a viable design and financial strategy.

Joe Plati - Building and Fire Code Compliance expert for safe, cost effective design and construction on complex, historic, landmarked structures.

Richard Redmond - 42 years of Civil Engineering, heavy construction, construction cost estimating experience.

William Sollin - Retired FDNY. The Life Safety Officer of Hofstra University, overseeing OSHA/Environmental/ Building Codes Compliance.

Outreach and Communication Sub-Committee

Betsy Andromidas - Lifelong resident, retired teacher, former POA Director, passionate community activist and volunteer leader.

Michele Beach Harrington - MD at major investment banks. Experienced GC as a child, student, parent of three scholar-athletes; active participant, volunteer, leader in many community organizations.

Francine Ryan - A Director, TGCHS. Utilizing marketing, advertising, media, public relations skills to communicate ideas, facts with transparency to residents

Mark Ryan - Executive Creative Director with 40+ years experience working for major advertising agencies on high profile national accounts.

INTRODUCTION

Why did You Move to Garden City?

Garden City is a unique destination for generations of young families. Why do so many couples work to buy homes in our community? Why do so many of their children return to their root's here generation after generation?

The ***Atlantic*** Magazine April 2022 article, “***The One Parenting Decision That Really Matters?***” suggests an answer.....

*“We find that one factor about a home—**its location**—accounts for a significant fraction of the total effect of that home. In fact, putting together the different numbers, I have estimated that some 25 percent—and possibly more—of the overall effects of a parent are driven by where that parent raises their child. In other words, this one parenting decision has much more impact than many thousands of others.”Seth Stephens-Davidowitz*

Successful Communities with thriving neighborhoods are continuously investing and evolving to make themselves more attractive and successful. How should a community invest in itself and evolve when confronting dynamic social challenges. How does a community avoid stagnation and lose its vibrancy?

Should Garden City invest in a Community Center that appeals and supports the activities and wellbeing of its' residents? Alternatively, why should Garden City offer its residents a multi-generational meeting space? Aren't there sufficient, less expensive ways and places to get together?

If offered the opportunity to invest in its future should a community seize that opportunity? Village residents from 1950s through today converted a landfill / dump into our fabulous Community Pool and Park. Numerous amenities were added over the years, in a phased approach. Should we do so again and *Phase* the development of St. Paul's? The research tells us that continuously successful and economically vibrant communities are those that seize the strategic opportunities to improve the lives of their families, generation after generation.....It Takes a Village!

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The St Paul's Main building is structurally **SOUND** and readily adaptable to renovation and rehabilitation.
- The St Paul's campus and buildings are dedicated ***"Parkland"*** and therefore limited to ***"Permitted Uses."***
- Parkland Uses include recreational and associated activities but excludes private uses such as real estate development.
- Non-Parkland Uses including private use require special "Home Rule" legislation to be approved.
- Thirty years of Resident suggested uses for St Paul's have been identified and categorized. See, Appendix.
- 50 open, public meetings and targeted "Outreach" to 50 affiliated groups such as Girl Scouts and sports organizations over 15 months have identified specific, current resident needs and hopes for St Paul's.
- Residents requested financial and economic analysis of three alternative development options including Demolition, Facadism and Minimal Cost Community Center /Adaptive Re-Use.
- The capital cost and permitted uses of each of the three alternative options are described in the following chart.
- Schedules for Project Development vary with the longest time required for the environmental review of the various demolition options and associated litigation.
- Environmental procedures, litigation possibilities and Construction Time Lines are included at the bottom of the following chart.
- Annual per taxpayer capital costs are also provided.
- *Why Did You Move to Garden City?*
- "The **ONE** parenting decision that really matters is...
 - WHERE your home is ***"Located"***
 - Communities that invest in their residents and their infrastructure remain vibrant and attractive for generations.
- Home Values increase **3-8%** when residents invest in infrastructure that increases local amenities such as parks, schools, performing arts, athletics, senior services, transportation.

Preliminary Cost Analysis for St. Paul's Project Cost Estimation

Project	Demolition/Park Concept	Facade/New Building Concept	Facade/Sports/Theater Facility Concept	Minimal Community Center Concept
Capital Cost	\$32, 678,000	\$106,455,000	\$126,455,000	\$49,526,000
Annual Debt Service	\$3,302,000	\$7,732,000	\$8,820,000	\$2,693,000
Ann. Debt Service per Taxpayer	\$472	\$1,105	\$1260	\$385
Annual Operating And Maintenance Costs	Minimal	TBD	TBD	TBD
Total Annual Costs	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Total Annual Cost per Avg. Taxpayer	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
GRANTS	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	TBD
Philanthropy	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Net Annual Cost	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Net Annual Cost per Avg. Taxpayer	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Analysis / Project / Litigation / Timetable				
SEQRA / EIS Time	12-26 months	12-26 months	12-26 months	9-12 months
Project Construction Time	6-8 months	36-40 months	38-48 months	18-20 months
Time for potential SEQRA / EIS Litigation	3-5 years	3-5 years	3-5 years	0-6 months
BOND ISSUANCE OVERVIEW				
Bond Maturity	10-15 years	10-30 years	10-30 years	30 years
Issuance Type	General Obligation	General Obligation	General Obligation	Lease Appropriation
Purpose / Use	Leisure / outdoor	Department of Recreation. Senior activity rooms/lounge. Community function rooms, meeting rooms, exhibit/catering hall, dining/function room. Arts/crafts studio, science/computer/research labs, robotics/lego rooms, music/dance studio.	Department of Recreation. Indoor fields/courts, weight room, exercise room, locker rooms, Athletic/Club meeting rooms, indoor tracks, storage. Theater, recital/practice rooms, function rooms, storage.	Phase 1: Department of Recreation. Senior activity rooms/lounge. Community function rooms, meeting rooms, exhibit/catering hall, dining/function room. *Athletic rooms/offices/facilities, Aerobics/Exercise

		Aerobics/Exercise Rooms, Athletic rooms/offices/facilities. Teen Center, children rooms, special needs facility/rooms.		Rooms. Arts/crafts studio, science/computer/ research labs, robotics/lego rooms, music/dance studio. Teen Center, children rooms, special needs facility/rooms. <i>*Uses in italics based on available space and community preference</i>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

I. **ECONOMIC ANALYSIS and HISTORIC PRESERVATION / SUB COMMITTEE REPORT** (See: <https://stpaulsreports.org/>)

St. Paul's Buildings & Campus - Economic Investment or Needless Expense?

Infrastructure projects **are investments** which increase residential home values. They are **not expenses**.

Similar style homes located in different neighborhoods often have different resale values. One need only drive south out of Garden City on Cathedral Avenue to see similar single-family homes with identical plot sizes and similar late 19th / early 20th century architectural styles. These architecturally similar homes could easily reside comfortably next to each other in Garden City. Yet why is the Garden City home price greater than the Cathedral Gardens home price?

Home prices reflect various factors including the cost of land and material. Beyond those basic costs more subtle factors impact home prices including real estate taxes for schools and municipal services. Economic research suggests that home prices also reflect access to specific municipal services including schools, churches, shopping, parks, musical, senior, and athletic facilities. Convenience to services and transportation is also a critical driver of increased home values. Establishing and/or increasing availability to these municipal amenities will increase property values.**

The Garden City Community Park, which until the 1950s was the site of a garbage incinerator and dump, is now a complex of three pools, a dining concession, miniature golf, indoor tennis center, a club house, and state of the art fields for various sports. This was all completed in a multi-year phased development approach. The convenience and availability of these type of amenities and services support the higher real estate values in Garden City.**

How often have Garden City residents had to travel to towns and villages near and far to access services and amenities available in those communities but not available in Garden City? Think of indoor sports, high school and college prep classes, music, and dance classes. Why are those amenities not available in our village? Space availability is at a premium in Garden City. The Senior Center's most recent floor collapse and closure is another example of the disappearing availability of space for resident activities. The Village is in dire need of a Community Center.

*Increase the availability and convenience of social, musical, athletic, academic, and senior amenities at a community center and you will **increase home values 3-10+%**.*

ECONOMICS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION* See: <https://stpaulsreports.org/>

“Historic preservation is typically judged to be a sound investment. By most accounts, it is more efficient and profitable to preserve a historic building than to construct a new one. Designating a landmark or district as historical typically maintains if not boosts the value of the property, and as an economic development tool, historic preservation has proved its worth. Nearly any way the effects are measured, be they direct or indirect, historic preservation tends to yield significant benefits to the economy. *“City Studies: Twenty Reasons Why Historic Preservation is Good for Communities*

“Historic preservation is good for cities.... The reasons preservation is great for cities are multiple – aesthetic, symbolic, cultural, social, educational, economic, and others. In recent years these values have been well articulated, notably by Tom Mayes in ***Why Old Places Matter***; Stephanie Meeks in ***The Past and Future City: How Historic Preservation is Reviving America’s Communities; Historic Preservation and the Livable City*** by Eric W. Allison and Lauren Peters; ***The Future of the Past: A Conservation Ethic for Architecture, Urbanism, and Historic Preservation*** by Steven W. Semes; several books by Roberta Gratz, and others. Each makes a convincing case for the importance of historic preservation in American cities.

Architecture’s Contribution to a Community’s Identity and Sense of Self

As our new country’s first *Planned Community*, Garden City has always had an Historic Significance. Viewing the examples of the fabulous McKim Mead & White structures such as the Garden City Hotel and the Village library, or St. Mary’s Girl School, St. Paul’s School for Boys and even the wonderful Cathedral of the Incarnation, Garden City has always set the standard for community identity and self-investment.

Unique Architecture – “*St. Paul’s School is far more than a landmark in Garden City—it is one of the great works of the Gothic Revival in the United States renown locally, regionally, nationally! It remains, as does the Cathedral of the Incarnation as one of the key buildings designed by the American architect John Kellum and the British architect Henry G. Harrison. St. Paul’s is a monumental civic building in the best sense in that it is a work of great architecture built for a public, not a private, purpose, and like all great public architecture it inspires us with the potential of buildings to enhance the idea of community.*

St. Paul’s strengthens the identity of Garden City as a unique place with a unique history. There is no doubt that the phased re-use of a building like St. Paul’s presents a challenge, but it is also a great opportunity for Garden City to create a public facility that will be like none other anywhere, and that will make Garden City an even more special community than it is now.”

.....**Paul Goldberger 28 March 2022**

<p>(Pulitzer Prize winner Paul Goldberger is the New School's Joseph Urban Professor of Design and the former Architecture Critic for both The New Yorker and The New York Times. He is one of our nation's most respected architecture critics.)</p>

St. Paul's School Main Building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978 as part of the A.T. Stewart Era Buildings District. The National Register of Historic Places is the Nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. In addition, in 2003, the Main Building was chosen by the Preservation League of New York State as one of its "**Seven to Save**" significant but endangered properties. St. Paul's and the Cathedral are the only two remaining major buildings commissioned by Cornelia Stewart in the 1880's that speak to Garden City's history and cultural values.

Conclusion: Economic Analysis & Historic Preservation Sub-Committee

Academic research by real estate professionals suggests that the investment of a reasonable and affordable amount of money into the St. Paul's Campus should result an increase in Garden City home values of 3-10%.**

References:

****Measuring the Contribution of Water and Green Space Amenities to Housing Values: An Application and Comparison of Spatially Weighted Hedonic Models*** Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics Vol 31 #3 (December 2006) Choo/ Bowker/ Park *Findings corroborate previous research, establishing that natural and constructed amenities are valuable attributes in housing demand and positively impact sale prices.*
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40987332>

**How Different Infrastructure Projects Can Affect Home Values <https://www.upnest.com/1/post/infrastructure-projects-affect-home-value/>

II. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

Structural and Engineering Issues

The building's structural stability and related concerns have been discussed during the past year during public committee meetings and at 6 Town Halls.

1. The Structural Stability of the building is generally good with localized interior areas that have deteriorated as a result of neglect and water infiltration which require repair.
2. The primary structural systems are still intact and why the building still stands since 1883.
3. The exterior walls of the building are in good condition and require cleaning, repointing of masonry joints where there is decay and an evaluation/inspection of the overall façade to determine if any repairs to the masonry or cast stone is needed. This will be needed for any of the options other than Demolition (See, ***Westerman Report***).
4. The structure is built with wood beams set into the masonry walls and relies on the bond between the beams and the masonry for its strength. It also relies on the shear mass of the components to act together as single structure so any plans to execute the facadism proposal will have to be executed with great care so as not to cause more damage during the process because of the way the building is built.
5. It is important to remember and consider the shape of the building, as was outlined during the Facadism presentation, in which the upper portion of the building leans into the interior to create the Mansard and as such the structural framework to support Facadism will be significant and extend into the structure and require a new foundation. The amount of space needed for this consumes a large part of the interior due to the configuration of the structure. Another important consideration is the disturbing of the remaining structure during the process since it is unknown how the building will react to the eccentric loads and disturbances placed upon during demolition.

Architectural Evaluation

The goal of this committee was to ascertain whether the building was structurally stable, whether it could be saved, or whether it should be demolished.

The Committee's goal was an objective analysis of the building's current state and future potential. Our review was an unbiased and impartial review of facts not myths. The question of whether to save or demolish St. Paul's was always viewed as a village wide, resident decision and not a choice or preference of this committee.

The first visit with this group took place approximately fifteen months ago. The building inspection was visual and thorough, and photographs were taken. Despite all the layers of dust and general disrepair, despite roof leaks and water damage, the beautiful architectural details still were evident. The findings are as follows:

1. The building is a neo-gothic styled edifice from 1880s of significant historical worth.
2. As most buildings of that era, St. Paul's was designed as a masonry load bearing structure. Roughly in the form of a symmetrical "E", it consisted primarily of load bearing outer walls linking into a central load bearing corridor wall artery from approximately twenty feet on either side of the outer walls. This essentially means that the entire weight of the building is primarily supported on these outer and corridor walls and that these cannot readily be demolished without requiring significant structural reinforcement. It was determined the building was structurally sound, with years of useful life. The masonry walls were solid and thick. While the roof had failed in some spots, portions of the flooring underneath the failed roof had also been damaged, the walls themselves were standing strong and very likely to remain that way.
3. The twenty-foot floor beam dimensions extending from the outer walls to the inner corridor walls, ideally, needs to be maintained for structural integrity.
4. ADA requirements need to be integrated to meet new building functions and construction codes.
5. Minimal, if any, evidence of asbestos on the upper floors. The basement has some asbestos which needs to be remediated.
6. The building contains several worthy architecturally historical attributes - carved grillwork over the main stairwell and secondary stairs, a beautiful skylight over the main stairwell, Minton tiles imported from England at the corridors, ornate terra-cotta wall treatments, and a beautiful chapel containing handsome stained glass, carved oak, a rare pipe organ, and carved roof timbers. These can all be saved. Unfortunately, the chandeliers and fireplace mantels in the main rooms may be beyond reasonable repair.
7. In addition to moisture damage, evidence of vandalism was apparent due to the discovery of occasional graffiti and broken windows
8. All upper stories including the clock tower were inspected.

Given the twenty-foot width limitations on most interior corridors and rooms in the building, we realized we would have to start liaising with the Programmatic Use Committee to determine what functions might be accommodated if a decision was made to do an adaptive reuse.

The Committee reviewed the historical record of resident suggestions for the use of St. Paul's as developed by the Programmatic Use Committee. Initial uses suggested by residents consisted of a community center, a home for the Garden City Department of Recreation, and a Pre-K school facility, which was later determined to be questionable given the Parkland rules that now applied to the building. We were asked to create an eatery and restore the kitchen facilities in the basement, and finally to restore the Chapel. Initial plans accommodated a mixed-use concept within the limitations of the building, adding a STEAM / STEM Center and enhanced facilities for the Department of Recreation. These plans have since undergone several refinements.

It was later requested we integrate a Performing Arts Center for the village. The Landmark Performing Arts facility in Port Washington and Adelphi University's Performing Arts Center were visited and reviewed as benchmark examples for high-quality auditorium space (See: <https://portwashington-news.com/the-landmark-port-washingtons-crowning-jewel/>)

Given the twenty-foot clearances, we opted for designing the auditorium in one of the infills of the "E" shape and allocated the second infill to a courtyard facility with an atrium-type roof, which Bill Kuhl helped design.

The Adelphi indoor pool facility and the Chaminade STEM Center were also visited. Finally, I met with the Garden City Department of Education Head, Dr. Kusum Sinha, to discuss the educational facilities, and with Paul Blake of the Garden City Department of Recreation to ascertain their programmatic needs.

The latest schematic layouts are currently on display at the Village Hall and were presented at interim sessions of Village Town Hall Meetings at Cluett Hall, the Middle School, and Garden City High School, in addition to EPOA Meetings and several Board of Trustees review sessions. Additional input was received, and the need for a Senior Center was widely discussed, both in favor and against, as well as the need for a covered pool facility.

We were presented with a ten plus-year-old assessment of the building by **Erwin & Bielinski Engineers** that was delivered to a Trustee from the village Business Office files. The 2012 **Erwin & Bielinski Engineers Report** had long been posted on the Village website. The Committee had previously considered and reviewed thoroughly the **Erwin & Bielinski Report** but discounted it due to the more recent and more comprehensive 2019 **Thornton Tomasetti Report on St. Paul's**. We were then charged with the following options:

1. One highly vocal resident suggested a "more pressing need" for a Synthetic Indoor Turf Field Facility, covered with a "Moynihan-station type roof". This would clearly necessitate full demolition of the building to make way for a synthetic turf field and so, alternative sites were investigated.
2. A Trustee pushed aggressively to explore the **Erwin & Bielinski** Facadism Option whereby the South façade of the building would be retained and a new building would rise behind it accommodating various Permitted Uses and/or athletic and other functions,
3. A Trustee requested a Minimal Use / Least Cost Community Center for basic and most pressing Village needs including Department of Recreation programs and the relocation of the Recreation offices from the cottages. A multifunctional Community Center was the

primary focus of the Minimal Use/ Least Cost plan. Other resident suggested uses including a Performing Arts Center, swimming pool, walking garden and a range of resident suggestions were to be considered after the Initial Phase of Minimal Development. The cottages were to be demolished to allow for parking.

4. The FDEM Demolition option was reviewed including a park designed by nationally recognized landscape architect Bill Kuhl as a mini-Central-Park adaptation to be built on the building site and adjacent land.

Westerman Construction Company, Inc. was selected to analyze construction costs associated with the following alternatives:

1. Two Facadism Options both saving the South façade and including a new building and/or sports or community center behind the façade;
2. Minimal Community Center limited to Dept. of Recreation offices and various Permitted Uses plus a Chapel restoration.
3. Additional Development Options for subsequent development Phases in the outside spaces between the existing wings including:
 - Infill Option 1: Performing Arts Center
 - Infill Option 2: Open Park / Courtyard
 - Infill Option 3: Indoor pool facility
4. Full Demolition with a park replacement.

Conclusion: Architectural and Engineering Sub-Committee

The main building at St. Paul's is structurally sound and available for a range of minimal or substantial renovation/restoration. Demolition and Facadism are also feasible. Renovation/rehabilitation could accommodate at a minimum the **Permitted Uses** as determined by the Legal Committee and as described by the Programmatic Use Committee. See, **Appendix**. The Demolition and Facadism options considered herein include those requested by trustees and residents. NONE of the options evaluated, considered or included in this Report were initiated by the Committee members.

III. LEGAL SUB-COMMITTEE - PARKLAND DESIGNATION AND “PERMITTED USES”

Legal Sub-committee Report

The Village of Garden City has owned the 50-acre St. Paul’s campus, including all structures, since 1992. The property was acquired in a negotiated condemnation proceeding for “public and recreational use”. Village residents have used the 40 acres of playing fields for recreational purposes for three decades. The use of the remaining ten acres of buildings and related structures have been considered from time to time but remains problematic and unresolved.

An early proposed use of the remaining ten acres surrounding the building was to convert the principal building into an assisted senior care facility. That private use was contested in a lawsuit brought by village residents (*Kenny v Board of Trustees of Incorporated Village of Garden City*).* The court found that such proposed use was for a private, profit-making purpose, not for “**public or recreational use**”, and accordingly was prohibited without prior legislative approval. That lower court decision was affirmed on appeal. Proponents of the Senior Assisted Living facility did not thereafter seek Legislative approval. The company proposing the Senior Assisted Living facility, *Care Matrix* entered bankruptcy six months thereafter. [*https://caselaw.findlaw.com/ny-supreme-court/1246002.html](https://caselaw.findlaw.com/ny-supreme-court/1246002.html)

The BoT subsequently designated the St. Paul’s property “**Parkland**” to protect and preserve the St. Paul’s Campus for future Village residents. The BoT Parkland designation further restricted potential uses of the buildings without prior NYS legislative approval. Legislative approval of a non-Parkland use would likely require the Village to acquire and set aside additional and comparable property to replace and substitute for the public lands/parklands which were lost to non-parkland use of the buildings and property and now occupied for non-parkland purposes.

In summary, **Non-Parkland** use of the St. Paul’s buildings and campus requires NYS legislative approval **AND** the acquisition of new, additional parkland to replenish the parkland lost to Non-Parkland use.

The limited uses to which parkland buildings and property can be used without New York State legislative approval required the Legal Subcommittee to review all uses suggested by Village residents since 1992. The Programmatic Use Subcommittee identified and categorized all resident suggested uses since 1992 to assist the Legal Committee’s review and determination of Permitted Uses. The Legal Committee in August 2022 informed the Programmatic Use Committee of what uses suggested by residents would be considered “Permitted Uses”.

St. Paul’s Building Uses as Historically Requested by Village Residents Included: See Appendix

“Permitted Parkland Uses” are not defined by statute but have been developed over time by court decisions. The court developed approach to appropriate Parkland uses focuses on recreation and accompanying uses that enhance the enjoyment of recreational use. The Legal Subcommittee has considered all of the suggested uses advanced by Village residents and the Programmatic Uses Subcommittee for the building, such uses including a school, a library, and a village hall. Although all such uses are obviously public uses, they do not satisfy the restrictions created by the designation of **“Parkland”**. They are neither recreational nor do they enhance the enjoyment of recreational activities.

The currently proposed Programmatic Uses which have been approved by the Legal Sub-committee have been submitted to Westerman Construction Company, Inc. for cost estimation. The uses evaluated by the Programmatic Use Sub-committee whether in a rehabilitated Community Center building or in a new structure which incorporates the building's facade, are all permissible.

Our analysis has included consideration of the case law, consultation with New York Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation and meetings with our local legislators should the Village wish to recommend enabling legislation regarding future programmatic uses which may be ambiguous or for non-parkland use.

Permitted Development Options Approved by The Legal Subcommittee

1. **Demolition:** Removal of all or parts of the buildings or structures does not avoid an analysis of the applicability of Parkland issues because any action taken with respect to the building must be consistent with recreational improvement and/or enhancement of recreational activities. Demolition will require the improvement of the resulting demolition pit. Residents will not tolerate another decade of a 15 acre, unattended and unsightly sand pit similar to the site left after the demolition of the Garden City Hotel.

2. **Facadism:** Removal of segments of the building and the re-construction of a new structure behind a preserved portion of the original building's facade such as a new building and/or a covered sports stadium which would provide enclosed space for athletic activities, as well as performing arts space for theater, dance, and music.

3. **Minimum Renovation of the Existing Building / Community Center:** The main building would be repurposed as a Community Center focused on recreation and related activities that include art, music, dance, athletics, environmental, scientific, and personal skills enhancement.

Conclusion of Legal Sub-Committee Report

The three proposed development options for St Paul's: Demolition, Façade-New Building, Façade – Sports Facility and Minimal Cost Community Center are all **“Permitted Uses”** and may be pursued by Garden City without concern re Parkland Designation issues.

IV. PROGRAMMATIC USE COMMITTEE

Purpose

The Programmatic Use Committee convened initially in January 2022. The Committee met almost weekly and sometimes twice or three times weekly thereafter to address the Board of Trustee request to identify the range of “**Permitted Uses**” for the buildings and campus at St. Paul’s. Additionally, the Committee was asked to evaluate the cost and circumstances surrounding any demolition of St. Paul’s. The Committee’s role, therefore was to help the Board of Trustees fulfill the commitment to provide Village residents with a thoughtful and complete evaluation of the benefits and costs associated with the demolition of St. Paul’s and/or the rehabilitation of St. Paul’s. The BOT could then determine if a Village-wide Referendum would be held to advise the BOT whether or not residents wanted to pursue renovation or demolition of St. Paul’s main building.

The Two Alternatives: Renovation or Demolition

Demolition – The Committee began the evaluation of the Demolition Alternative at its inaugural January 2022 meeting. One Committee member in particular indicated that he had already determined that Demolition was the **ONLY** feasible alternative. The Committee asked that member multiple times publicly and privately to lead the effort to describe and analyze the Demolition alternative. The Committee also offered numerous times to assist the FDEM group of senior men to assist their Demolition evaluation by providing economic/financial support and research, printing or ancillary cost support.

Neither the Committee Member nor FDEM have provided the Committee with any information nor analysis supporting or rejecting Demolition as an appropriate alternative for the BOT to consider. Consequently, the Committee’s offer to include any FDEM or Committee member comments or report regarding Demolition in this Report is not possible.

Absent the contribution of the FDEM group or one senior Committee member, the Committee began evaluating the Demolition alternative in the winter of 2022 and continued to do so until the Demolition Alternative was fully vetted at a Town Hall meeting. The Committee incorporated any FDEM comments and concerns expressed in public meetings into this evaluation of the Demolition Alternative.

The following critical elements of the Demolition alternative should be considered and evaluated:

1. The Demolition Alternative will require an **environmental review** under the NYS SEQRA statute as well as under federal statutes requiring an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).
2. Any **environmental review process** can require months if not years of debate and potential litigation prior to the final adoption of that review.
3. Demolition experts advised the Committee and stated at the Town Hall meeting on Demolition that the average time period to complete the Demolition environmental review process could take 3-5 years, i.e., 2026-2028.

4. Legal experts advised the Committee that a prior EIS previously prepared for St. Paul's would not be accepted as satisfying current EIS requirements and that a new EIS would be required even if the new EIS could include some of the prior EIS material.
5. The actual demolition would require approximately 4-6 months depending upon the conditions imposed by NYS officials who would be involved in the environmental review process due among other reasons to the historical significance of the building.
6. Demolition experts indicated that significant truck traffic and on-site machine activity could be expected from demolition of such a large structure. No evaluation of the impact on traffic congestion surrounding the GCMS was made. The Committee recommends that the BoT consider incorporating a traffic expert's opinion in this report.
7. No Demolition expert would indicate the extent, if any, that truck traffic and on-site machine activity might have on the availability and usefulness of the adjacent fields at St. Paul's and the GC Middle School. One resident stated that in her experience the airborne particulate issue could be dramatic/deadly.
8. All demolition experts indicated that to the extent that there would be significant dust and airbourne material, they thought such material might be properly managed by constant hosing of the demolition site.
9. The Demolition site would require remediation with the use of clean fill to return the surface ground area into a stable area suitable for resident foot traffic.
10. Assuming the non-binding Resident Referendum and subsequent BoT vote approved the Demolition Alternative, residents must await the conclusion of the multi-year environmental process and potential associated litigation. Then the residents would have to vote for the increase in their taxes to support the General Obligation Bond issue which would be used to finance the cost of the Demolition, i.e., 2026-2028.
11. A defeat of the General Obligation Bond issue would mean that the Demolition Alternative would not be funded and could not proceed.

The Committee also required the evaluation of what would replace the demolished building and site restoration. The Committee was mindful that after the GC Hotel was demolished that that site was stripped of its vegetation and top soil and left as an open sand pit for almost a decade. The Committee sought to avoid a similar unseemly eye sore that demolition would create by investigating the replacement of the Demolition site with a park setting. FDEM initially suggested that a Village Park would be an appropriate use of the Demolition site. FDEM subsequently suggested that the site be covered with grass seed only. The Committee accepted the initial FDEM recommendation for a well landscaped park and requested that the Demolition Alternative include a Landscaped Park suitable for its critical role in the Village center.

The Westerman Report was requested to include a full description of the time line and total costs of the Demolition Alternative including the Landscaped Park renovation of the demolition site.

Renovation

The Renovation Alternative includes two options:

1. **Facadism** – *Facadism - New Building* option was suggested by a Trustee; *Facadism – Athletic Facility* option was suggested by a resident; *Minimal Cost Renovation - Community Center* option was suggested by a Trustee.

Facadism-New Building – Trustee Request

A Trustee indicated in several public BoT sessions as well as private sessions with the Architectural Committee representative, enthusiasm for the design suggestions and ideas as described in the dated 2012 **Erwin & Bielinski, PLLC** Engineering Report. The Committee therefore determined that the Trustee's interest required that the 2012 **Erwin & Bielinski, PLLC** Engineering Report should be included in the Committee Report and the Westerman Cost Analysis. The Trustee wanted the Committee to evaluate the **Erwin & Bielinski**, proposal to remove the three wings to the side and behind the main south facing part of the building and replace them with a new building that could be used by residents in a manner similar to the uses in the Renovation - Community Center scenario so long as the uses satisfied the Legal Committee's restrictions for "**Permitted Uses**".

Facadism-Covered Athletic Facility – Resident Proposal

A resident indicated in public Committee meetings on several occasions as well as in private sessions with Committee Architect an interest to evaluate the demolition of all but the south facing façade of the structure and build a Moynihan Station Roof covered athletic facility behind the St. Paul's façade. The resident also questioned whether a Performing Arts Facility could be added to the structure. The resident's interest, similar to the Trustee's interest has been discussed by residents for many years and is a variation of a prior suggested use for an ice hockey / soccer facility. The Committee determined that the resident and Trustee requests should be included in this Report as well as evaluated by Westerman.

2. Renovation - Community Center. This is a minimalist, low-cost renovation using only the existing building and only so much of that structure to include a minimal number of Community Center / public uses. **Renovation- Community Center** also does NOT include any renovation of the open outdoor space between the three building wings.

Minimal Cost Permitted Use Renovation - Community Center – Trustee Proposal

A Trustee indicated in a private session with the Committee an interest to evaluate a minimal / least cost renovation. The Trustee suggested renovation specifically excluded any expanded use in the current vacant outside space between the three wings. The *Minimal Cost/ Permitted Use Renovation - Community Center* alternative like the Community Pool, would permit **Phased Development** and expansion in later decades **to minimize costs**, while immediately providing requested Community space and services.

In contrast, the two Façade Alternatives ***cannot be phased in over time*** and must be completed to 100% of their design specifications. The Committee determined that the Trustee interest in evaluating a Minimum Cost Renovation - Community Center alternative be included in this Report as well as evaluated by Westerman.

Permitted Uses

The Programmatic Use Committee received the controlling definition of “***Permitted Uses***” agreed upon by the Legal Committee and conveyed to the Programmatic Use Committee in August 2022. (See Appendix for Listing).

The Programmatic Use Committee used those initial eight months during the deliberations of the Legal Committee to accomplish two critical objectives. First, the Committee researched and reviewed all thirty (30) years of files, reports and public news articles in the Village Offices to identify every potential use suggested by Village residents over the past three decades. The goal was to be certain that every resident had their voice heard by the Committee. Those 30 years of suggested uses were then categorized by type of activity, i.e., private or public; recreational, public use or other use. Second, all the resident uses, that were clearly “Private” such as real estate development, were rejected due to controlling legal opinions and prohibitions.

All the remaining “Public” uses were assembled into an architectural plan to demonstrate that all prior resident opinion had been evaluated by the Committee. The compendium of three decades of resident opinions were then presented to the residents at the first Town Hall in June 2022. Importantly, this initial Town Hall presentation was not intended to be an Architectural Plan being recommended by the Committee, but rather an architectural compendium used to demonstrate that the Committee had heard all resident requests and ideas. The June Town Hall also established a Base Line of all the suggestions that the Committee would evaluate with the Legal Committee to determine if the uses were “***Permitted Uses***” and able to be included in the St. Paul’s building (See Appendix for Listing)

The several months after the June 2022 Town Hall were used to attract additional resident opinion. Every Tuesday evening from July 2022 to this past February 2023 the Committee held open public meetings to encourage resident participation in the Committee’s work. Resident comments helped guide the Committee and spurred the Committee to consider Public Uses including Special needs, Senior amenities, Art classes, swimming pool, STEAM enrichment and numerous other Public Uses.

The Committee had requested funding for a Resident Survey to supplement the Public Meeting information but that request was not acted on by the BoT.

The Committee also reached out to fifty (50) Affiliate Groups such as the Volunteer Firemen, SEPTA, the Library, multiple athletic groups, music and performing arts groups, local universities and nearby villages to determine the Best Practices for Community Centers.

Finally, the Committee reached out to the BoT through continuing invitations to join the 6 Town Halls and Open Public meetings to share their thoughts and help contribute to the Committee’s

deliberations and evaluations. Private sessions were also held for those trustees who did not attend the Town Halls or who had additional questions and/or concerns.

Town Halls

The Committee has held five (5) Town Halls:

1. June 2022 **Town Hall 1** - *Describe the Historical Resident Suggestions for the Use of St. Paul's. Create a Base Line of Resident preferences for St. Paul's;*
2. October 12, 2022 **Town Hall 2** - *The Future of St. Paul's*
3. October 26, 2022 **Town Hall 3** - *Facadism*
4. November 2, 2022 **Town Hall 4** - *Demolition*
5. November 16, 2022 **Town Hall 5** - *A Path Forward for St. Paul's*
6. March 13, 2023 **Town Hall 6** – *Westerman Cost Analysis Report Presentation*

The 6th Town Hall allowed residents to questions the Committee and Westerman. This Report reflects those resident questions and comments.

Historical Resident Suggested Uses & “Permitted Uses”: See Appendix

Conclusion of Programmatic Uses:

The Programmatic Use Committee has compiled over 15 months and countless meetings with residents a historically based and currently requested range of ***Permitted Uses*** for the residents' consideration. Demolition was evaluated and presented to residents free of the numerous myths and misconceptions that have surrounded that topic for thirty years. The most ardent proponents of demolition, FDEM have had their unvarnished opinions included in this Report without revision or editing.

Renovation in its various forms is also included as requested by the Trustees. The information presented represents the voices of Village residents heard over thirty years and more recently over the past 15 months.

All of the Alternatives for the main building have been reviewed and approved by the Legal Committee as ***“Permitted Development Options and Permitted Uses”***. Uses that were marginally “Permitted” have been removed from this Report and can be considered at a future time by future Boards and residents.

The Committee's analysis of the various Alternatives was presented to Westerman for its review and cost estimates.

V. FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

Introduction

The St. Paul's Finance sub-committee first convened in January 2022. We have met with members of the Board of Trustees, Village Treasurer Irene Woo, several dozen civic and Affiliation groups. Additionally, scores of residents provided their insights regarding the scope of the project, financing of project and use/purpose of project. We have obtained, gathered and reviewed information associated with the costs and financing of three proposed uses for St. Paul's guided by the directives of the Board of Trustees and the broader community of Garden City.

Development Options

Our focus was on three uses for the St. Paul's Campus and buildings.

1. **Demolition** of St. Paul's as suggested by FDEM civic group
2. **Facadism**
 - Facadism / 1.0** - including partial demolition of the current building and construction of new building structure(s) as proposed by a Trustee;
 - Facadism / 2.0** - including both partial demolition and construction of new athletic facility structure(s) as proposed by a resident;
3. **Community Center** – Minimal restoration of the existing building for a Community Center with no expansion or rehabilitation outside the existing building footprint as suggested by a Trustee.

Public Finance Plans

The committee has studied and discussed potential public finance plans best suited for each proposal. Our deliberations were guided by both New York State law and the ultimate goal of providing both a credible and affordable solution for residents. This work has included research on the several topics/options including:

1. Bond Structure: Serial Bonds, Term Bonds, Term Bonds with Sink Schedule (optional redemptions)
2. Bond Issuer: Village of Garden City or an Industrial Development Agency such as Nassau County IDA or Town of Hempstead IDA.
3. Security or Credit Type: Unlimited/Limited General Obligation, Tax Allocation, Lease Revenue.

The potential financial structure of a financing plan has been discussed with nationally recognized Municipal Bond Counsel, their respective tax professionals, and potential underwriters.

Market Volatility & Increasing Interest Rates

The Committee continues to monitor credit and tax spreads in the municipal bond market on a weekly basis to assist us in determining a public finance plan for each proposal resulting in most beneficial rate and terms. For example:

1. AAA/AA/A credit spreads when considering Issuance Type
2. Taxable/Tax-Exempt credit spreads when considering Tax Status of Issuer

The Committee is highly sensitive to the current market environment of ever-increasing interest rates. The Committee also recognizes that the financing of any of the three proposed development options will not likely occur for several years due to the need for various environmental proceeding, local hearings, architectural and engineering plans and a potential General Obligation referendum. Consequently, we are less concerned about current high interest rates and more concerned that we properly provide financial data which describes the Relative Costs associated with financings the three proposed development options.

Members of committee have also met with resident groups interested in securing federal, NY State or local **grants**. We have also discussed using a private non-for-profit tax-exempt organizations under Sector 501(c)(3) of the IRS to attract **philanthropic support** for the proposals.

The committee has requested and collected operating and maintenance costs for public buildings and facilities in both the Village of Garden City and Nassau County, as well as privately owned facilities which provide relevant equivalent services. These costs will be scaled and applied to the final three proposals and their unique Use and Purpose specifications to help estimate the annual operating and maintenance costs of each option.

Resident Annual Cost Analysis

Now that the Committee has received the Westerman cost estimation report, we will work with the Village Treasurer and Finance and Audit Committee to present a public finance and cost analysis plan for each of the final three proposals. After our report is completed a public town hall will be scheduled where the Finance Committee will present the three finance plans and cost analysis and take questions and comments from residents. All comments and concerns from residents will be reviewed and considered. The finance committee will then meet to determine if any revisions need to be made and a final plan for each proposal will then be presented to the Board of Trustees.

SEE APPENDIX FOR Summary of Project Costs and Taxpayer Assessments

SEE Executive Summary For Project Costs and associated benefits/programs made available to residents for the costs identified.

VI. COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION SUB-COMMITTEE

The Communications Committee had three Goals:

1. Inform residents, Trustees and consultants on the current status of the St. Paul's Campus and Committee activities
2. Correct decades of mis/dis- information concerning St. Paul's
3. Establish an agreed Baseline of Data from which thoughtful and responsible decisions could be made by residents and the Board of Trustees

The Communications Strategy targeted traditional and current technologies to capture resident opinion and disseminate significant information including:

1. Traditional print media i.e., The Garden City News
2. Create a new St. Paul's Website // <https://stpaulsreports.org/>
3. Social Media – Instagram, Twitter, Facebook etc.
4. Video conferencing, Zoom
5. Personal contact through open meetings and Town Halls

The Committee used print, social media, and personal outreach to invite residents and Trustees to more than 50 Open Working-Meetings, Five Town Halls and three private committee-seminars for those Trustees unable to attend the Open Meetings or Town Halls. All Town Halls were captured on video and posted on the St. Paul's and Village Website.

The Committee's efforts reached hundreds of residents, all the Trustees and Village staff, St. Paul's Alumni and a wide range of public and private interested parties and affiliated groups.

The Committee's work was prioritized to accomplish the following results:

1. ***Establish an Agreed Baseline of reliable data*** – the Committee published the Programmatic Use Committee's review of all thirty (30) years of files held by the Village Administrator to establish the history of all resident suggestions and opinions for the use of the St. Paul's Campus and buildings
2. ***Clarify the legal limitations on permitted uses at the St. Paul's campus*** – Highlight the various court decisions which restricted the use of St. Paul's to recreational and similar public uses
3. ***Debunk and dissemble the "Myths" surrounding St Paul's*** – Distribute the various engineering and construction analysis and appropriate updates demonstrating that the structural integrity of St. Paul's was "**Sound**", available for re-use and not obsolete and falling down
4. ***Public Outreach and Listening Meetings*** – Connecting with fifty (50) Village Affinity Groups including athletes, musicians, educators, parents, thought leaders to get direct feedback and opinions regarding group needs and uses for St. Paul's.

Findings from Town Hall meetings:

- Hundreds of residents reached out during Town Hall meetings, our weekly meetings, email through Village Hall, social media, and to committee members personally.
- The website and social media continues to drive traffic to the website and we've had several thousand "hits" with some engagement across all platforms.
- Twitter was not as popular as Instagram and Facebook so we stopped posting on Twitter.

- We are getting a number of new faces at our meetings and interest is spreading across Long Island.
- We need space – The Village needs a Garden City Community Center to service all ages and all activities. The number one question/request from all residents. WE NEED SPACE for Village activities. As more people return to work – they do not want to drive their kids and themselves out of town for activities that should be offered in GC.
- Each *Informational Town Hall* on the future of Saint Paul's that is presented to our residents draws more and more people, with lots of enthusiasm to see something happen soon!

VII. **CONCLUSION:**

The Committee organized itself as best as possible, in a relatively short time, to be fair and inclusive throughout the process, though several roadblocks needed to be overcome along the way. It has always been the intention of this Committee that the findings will enable residents to have relevant facts that can inform their decision-making and best prepare them for the important community-wide voting process that will take place regarding the future of this landmark building. Many thanks go out to all of the residents who have devoted their time to bring their findings to the public.

APPENDIX – Historically Proposed & Permitted Uses

Community Center Uses for St. Paul's

Below are lists of activities GATHERED OVER 30 YEARS from residents and community groups. Some from surveys, some from meetings. Many of these programs already exist, but they need more space to expand their activities.

<u>Community Center</u> Multipurpose Flex Space Meeting Rooms Exhibition Space Reception/Event Space Coat Room/Security Teen Center Chapel: non-denominational Culinary Space Play Space Quiet Room Garden City Research Area	<u>Athletics Programs</u> Weight Training Room Cardio Training Room Exercise Rooms Yoga Room Pickle Ball Courts Storage Room Indoor Sports Space Indoor Tennis Court(s) Locker / Shower Rooms Outdoor / covered Synth. Turf Field Sports Office Sports Assembly Room
<u>Performing Arts Center</u> Theater 300+ seats (Option) Accommodating performances in dance, music, lectures, recitals, plays/musicals. Sound / Lighting / Storage	<u>Children's Center</u> Admin Offices Children's Rooms Special Needs Room Dance Room Music Room Indoor Play Area Staff Space Computer Stations
<u>Performing Arts Center</u> Theater Storage/ Stagecraft Ticket Booth Green Room	

<p>Locker Rooms**</p> <p>**Shared space with Athletics</p>	
<p><u>Department of Recreation</u></p> <p>Admin /Reception Arts / Crafts Studio Painting Studios Sculpture Studio Science /Computer Labs Robotics and Lego Rooms Teen Game Room Music Studios Aerobic Studio Dance / Movement Studios Photography Studio Filmmaking Studio</p>	<p><u>Events Garden Courtyard</u></p>
<p><u>Shared Facilities:</u></p> <p>Mechanical, Electrical, Info Tech, Bathrooms, Elevators, Storage, Ancillary, Culinary Support, Office of Emergency Management (OEM), Area for Ambulance Staff Space and Support Space During Village-wide Emergencies.</p>	
<p>UNACCEPTABLE USES Not allowed by NYS law Under Parkland Designation</p> <p>APARTMENTS / CO-OPS; ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY; COMMERCIAL RENTAL SPACE; HOTEL; HOUSING; MEDICAL FACILITY; PRIVATE USE: BUSINESSES; SHARED RESPONSIBILITY; SCHOOLS</p>	