

Police Station Committee Final Report

Recommended Course of Action

**Scott Camassar, David Eggleston, Susan Fiegel, Andrew Harvey, Dennis Jenkins,
Larry Kendall, Robin Lawson, Karen Neeley, Keith Ripley, Derell Wilson, David Winkler**

March 27, 2014

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	4
Problems with Current Police Station.....	5
Problems with Current Police Station (continued).....	6
Subcommittees Formed	7
Work Done by the Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee:.....	8
Work Done by the Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee: (continued).....	9
Work Done By the Site Inventory List Subcommittee	10
Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee	11
Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued).....	12
Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued).....	13
Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued).....	14
Financing Options	15
Recommended Course of Action	16
Appendix A - Previous Project Documents Reviewed by Committee.....	17
Appendix B-Committee Educational Documents	18
Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414	19
Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414 (continued).....	20
Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414 (continued).....	21
Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Total	22
Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Location.....	23
Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Community Benefit.....	24
Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Site Geometry	25
Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Cost	26

Executive Summary

The Police Station Committee considers the development and implementation of a dynamic communication plan, which educates and engages the public on the need for the new police station, to be equally as important as determining a new police station site and facility size. It is essential that the public be given thorough, factual information so they understand the modern requirements that drive an increase in the police station size over the current police station.

The Police Station Committee recommends that the City of Norwich build an approximately 51,000 square foot police station on the former Buckingham School site using the space needs assessment revised by the Committee as the basis for the design. The details of how the City accomplishes this depend on how the City chooses to finance the project. The Committee unanimously supports building a new police station. The facts the Committee collected and the assessments the Committee performed led to this unambiguous conclusion.

The Police Station Committee was formed to:

- Review previous police station project information
- Identify sites and scope information, including any potential new sites, suitable for development as a police station to meet the needs and the mission of the police department
- Rank, in order of priority, which sites (including any potential new sites) meet the needs and the mission of the police department
- Recommend a course of action in a written report to be submitted to the Council by the first meeting of the Council in September 2013.

The Committee was not ready to deliver a final report in September of 2013. Roughly six additional months were needed to complete the mission of the Committee. This report completes the mission of the Committee.

The previous project information the Committee reviewed consisted of five documents dating from 2006 to 2012. The Committee reviewed additional documents not part of previous project information but relevant to the mission of the Committee. Seven different sites had been considered for a police station previously. This Committee identified 23 additional sites, some of which were suggested by members of the public. The final site ranking exercise combined some of the properties on the list for a total of 27 ranked sites. Many of the sites were deemed unsuitable for development as a police station because of two key attributes: 1) they were located in the 100 year flood zone, or 2) they were too small to build a practical, affordable police station on them.

The Committee determined that the minimum site size should be 2.72 acres. This size allows for a police station that has all the required functions on its main floor and a ground level 190 car parking lot on site. This combination of lot size, building layout, and parking is the lowest cost solution envisioned by the Committee that meets all the needs of the Norwich Police Department.

The needs of the Police Department were determined by reevaluating and revising the 2007 space needs assessment. The Committee consulted with architect Brian Humes of Jacunski Humes LLC, benchmarked against police stations in other communities, consulted the Police Department, and considered the previous project information. The Committee reduced the sizes of spaces and the scope of the facility to arrive at an approximately 51,000 square foot space needs assessment with the full agreement of the Police Department.

The criteria used to rank the sites consist of 10 attributes grouped into four categories: location, community benefit, site geometry, and cost. The ideal site is centrally located relative to population centers and major roadways, conspicuously improves the health and appearance of the selected site, is an efficient and cost effective use of land, and is the lowest reasonable cost. No sites scored exceptionally high on all of the criteria.

Background

The Police Station Project Committee was created by the Norwich City Council with a resolution passed on March 18, 2013. Thirteen Norwich residents were appointed to the Committee.

Scott Camassar
David Eggleston
Susan Fiegel
Andrew Harvey
Dennis Jenkins
Larry Kendall
William Kenny*

Robin Lawson
Karen Neeley
Keith Ripley
Martin Shapiro*
Derrell Wilson
David Winkler

**Member resigned before the Committee completed its mission.*

When the Committee first met, member opinions were divided on the need for a new police station. After completing the work, the Committee members unanimously support building a new police station. The facts collected and the assessments performed led the Committee to this unambiguous conclusion.

The Committee's mission was set by the City Council as follows:

- Review previous project information
- Identify sites and scope information, including any potential new sites, suitable for development as a police station to meet the needs and the mission of the police department
- Rank, in order of priority, which sites (including any potential new sites) meet the needs and the mission of the police department
- Recommend a course of action in a written report to be submitted to the Council by the first meeting of the Council in September 2013.

The Committee began its work by taking a tour of the current Norwich Police Station. The tour of the current station was eye-opening. The Committee learned how the Police Department administration and officers adapted and re-purposed many spaces in the current police station to accommodate the needs of a police force that pushed the facility to its limits upon moving in nearly 35 years ago.

The entire Committee then undertook a comprehensive review of all previous documents obtained from the Norwich Police Department and City Manager's Office. (Appendix A). In addition, the Committee added documents that increased the knowledge base of Committee members, and further explained design and funding philosophies in the previous attempts at construction of a facility. (Appendix B)

The Committee also invited professionals to its meetings; gathering information from subject matter experts in the areas of architectural design, real estate, brownfields, economic development and finance.

Problems with Current Police Station

The Norwich Police Department has by necessity adapted and repurposed many spaces and equipment in its building and grounds over the nearly 35 years since relocating to the current police station. This was necessary due to the lack of future planning for the growth of the Department over time. The Police Department is now at a near untenable situation due to overcrowding, a gross lack of available office and work space, and adequate parking at the facility.

- The original public lobby had to be reduced in size to enable the Department to enlarge the dispatch center to accommodate the enhanced 911 emergency call system and a small office for the shift supervisor. This was achieved by moving the dispatch/lobby wall outward into the public lobby space four feet +/- into the lobby. The Public Parking Commission office was relocated, out of the building, to 307 Main Street, in order to enlarge the police dispatch center into that office space on the southwest corner of the building as well. This allowed the Department to expand from one dispatch position, that was the original design of the building, to a total three dispatch positions necessary due to the Police Department being given the added duties and responsibilities of Fire and Emergency Medical Service (EMS) dispatch as well as being the City's Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) for the E-911 system.
- The Department has had to add additional heating and cooling units to the roof above the records office, dispatch, and the equipment room for dispatch in order to increase the cooling/heating capacity of the facility because of the need to add electronics, video monitors, and computer systems, and technology that did not exist when the original building was constructed. The heating/cooling systems continue to be inadequate.
- It became necessary to repurpose the original three patrol interview rooms on the top floor into crowded office space for 1) the victim advocate, domestic violence officer, and court/evidence officer, 2) the admin lieutenant, and 3) the records service division lieutenant, none of which existed when the building was originally designed in the mid 1970's.
- The training office was converted from a designed one person office into a three person office, which also causes an overcrowded situation. File cabinets are located outside the office in the hallway because of a space shortage in that office.
- The juvenile office that was originally designed as a one person office with space and a table for interviewing parents and/or a youngster now has two SROs and two DARE officers using it.
- A lack of adequate parking has been an issue since relocating to 70 Thames Street. There is no on-street parking nearby. A month-to-month agreement was acquired with the owner of the small lot across from the front door in order to add approximately ten to twelve spaces for parking. That use agreement can be broken and lost at any time. Curbs in the employee parking lots have been moved, grass islands have been taken out, and the gasoline filling station was removed. The northern driveway was widened to add as many additional parking spaces as possible because of the shortage of parking. However, the parking is still inadequate.
- The current building had none of the computer or fiber optic wiring necessary to accommodate any of the many computer servers and systems, or the modern technologies that are utilized twenty-four a day, all year long that have been installed since 1979.

Problems with Current Police Station (continued)

- A storage closet on first floor is being converted to accommodate the various computer servers in a renovated small separate climate controlled room so that they can be removed from the make-shift location in the records office to a controlled and secure space. This move also makes room for an additional law enforcement COLLECT terminal necessary for the use of records office personnel.
- Lockers have been added in nearly every nook and cranny in the building to help with the shortage of lockers for personnel added over the nearly four decades since 1979. There is still a shortage of lockers for our current authorized complement of police officers and staff.
- The original photo lab was converted to a temporary evidence storage room because of a lack of secure evidence storage.
- Files are kept in the mechanical room and building supplies and items are stored off the boiler room for lack of any other space for such items.
- File storage cabinets have been added to the Chief's, Deputy Chief's, Executive Secretary's offices, and the Chief's conference room because no suitable provision for administrative file storage was ever designed into the facility.
- The Lieutenant and Sergeant's locker room was designed as both a locker room and office for supervisors. It has proven to be inadequate since the beginning. It affords the supervisors no privacy to interact with their personnel. There was no provision made for a female supervisor's locker room and the Department has had to improvise by putting a locker into one of the Detective interview rooms in the past when it had a female supervisor. There are no shower facilities or other plumbing for their use. The community policing sergeant/coordinator has had to use the Lieutenant's and Sergeants locker room for his office space.
- The range and range office has by necessity been utilized for general storage and patrol bicycle storage that must be moved out into the hallway whenever the range is used for firearms training.
- The range office is also being used for the additional dual purposes of the Community Policing Officers office and meeting room.
- The classroom has also been put to multi-use as a classroom, report writing area in the back, and Roll Call-Line up room. This multi-use is distracting to each of those functions.

The police station building has been in continual use since 1979 as police facilities are 24/7 critical facilities. This type of heavy usage far exceeds the normal use and wear and tear of an ordinary office building and therefore shortens the useful life span of a facility and its equipment.

Subcommittees Formed

To work more efficiently and help expedite the completion of our Committee goals, three subcommittees were formed:

Space Needs Assessment: The purpose of the Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee was to compare the space of the current facility with the document detailing the Space Needs Assessment of 2007 and determine what size a station in Norwich should be to meet the needs and mission of the Police Department.

Site Inventory List: The purpose of the Site Inventory List Subcommittee was to make a list of suggested police station site locations and update the list as new sites were added for consideration. The list started with previously considered sites. Sites recommended by the Committee and by members of the public were added resulting in a final list of 30 sites. The subcommittee decided it would be helpful to create the list with links to the sites on the GIS mapping system on the City of Norwich website. This method provided quick, accurate and pertinent information about each site at the click of a computer mouse. The Committee used the GIS mapping system property cards as the source of detailed site size in acres and assessed values. The Committee also used the “Hazardous Mitigation” map overlay showing the presence or absence of various levels of flood zone designation for sites being considered.

Site Ranking Criteria: The purpose of the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee was to create a ranking system whereby the sites being considered could be scored on criteria that would rank the sites suitable for locating a police facility with the goal of finding the most suitable site. Criteria were grouped into four categories: Location, Site Geometry, City Cost, and Community Benefit. Each category had three to five criteria and used a 1-5 number ranking system to weigh each criteria; 1 being the lowest ranking and 5 being the highest ranking. Zeros were used for indicating criteria not applicable at all. It was decided that the subcommittee would rank the sites then lead the entire Committee through an exercise determining if the rankings were accurate or if anything needed to be adjusted.

Work Done by the Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee:

The Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee was formed to reevaluate the 2007 space needs assessment and either validate its findings or provide recommendations for adjustment. The needs assessment ultimately establishes a square footage that is the largest driver of the police station's cost. The Committee felt that this influence was so important that scrutiny of each line item was necessary. Every aspect of this Subcommittee's efforts was a collaborative effort that included Norwich Chief of Police Louis Fusaro and Norwich Police Captain Pat Daley. The following paragraphs explain the Subcommittee's methodology and findings.

Starting with the 2007 space needs assessment of 57,000 square feet, the Subcommittee reviewed each line item against what the Norwich Police Department currently had. It was clear that many critical needs were not being addressed in the existing facility. Some examples of critical functions that had no dedicated square footage allocated are youth detention cells, bulk evidence storage, and narcotics unit work area. It became apparent that to best understand what an effective police facility should look like they needed to benchmark.

After reviewing a list of over 15 communities that had undergone an upgrade to their police department's facilities the Subcommittee decided to visit the West Haven police department facility. There were many reasons why the West Haven police department was a good choice for this benchmarking exercise. First the West Haven Police department has similar population, demographics and socioeconomic status to Norwich. Second it was completed only 10 years ago so the floor plan is new enough to represent a modern day mission but has been in use long enough to appreciate inadequacies and inefficiencies in its design. Last, West Haven and Norwich are very similar in the amount of undeveloped land remaining within the community so long term needs relative to population growth should be similar.

The Subcommittee visited the West Haven Police Department on November 1st, 2013. They were joined by Norwich Chief of Police Louis Fusaro, Norwich Police Captain Pat Daley, and Brian Humes the architect for the West Haven Police Department facility. The architect provided them with plans of all three floors with square footage defined for each space. This was important so that as the group toured the facility they could visually appreciate each functional area's square footage and discuss the adequacies of the space as it relates to the Norwich Police Departments mission needs.

The tour of the modern West Haven facility also confirmed that two other approaches to solving the space needs issue in Norwich would not work: 1) locating some police functions in other buildings and 2) a phased building approach. Many police functions are related to each other and the space used for those functions belong in the same building. Some of the functions must be adjacent to each other. Some need to be separated. An awareness of these relationships is one of several keys to understanding why the current police station is inadequate. If you need more space in a home or an office building you can add more rooms and the added spaces will work for you. But in a police station, if the spaces are not sized properly or need to increase in the future, you're not likely to add functional space without needing to affect other parts of the building layout. Further, it is difficult to predict future needs which make expansion plans uncertain. A phased approach means paying now to allow for uncertain future expansion and paying more later to complete the expansion.

It is important to understand the thought process of the Subcommittee during this benchmarking exercise. It was not their intention to validate the existing 57,000 square foot space needs assessment but to identify where they could reduce square footage and still establish a facility that supports the objectives of the Norwich Police Department. The summary below which recommends an 11% reduction in square footage is evidence that their efforts were successful. The recommendation is that the following update to the original 2007 space needs summary be accepted:

Work Done by the Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee: (continued)

Table 1: Revised Space Needs Summary

Designated Requirements	Area Estimate (square feet)
Visitor Parking (50 cars)	15,000
Official Vehicle / Staff Parking (140 cars)	42,000
Vehicle Impound ¹	-
Refuse	350
Fuel Dispensing	1,500
Communications Antenna	1,500
Sally Port Approach	1,350
Subtotal	61,700
Building Footprint (3 Story)	17,000
Landscape Setbacks	40,000
Future Expansion Potential ²	-
Total Site Area	118,700
Acre Conversion (Buildable Acres - Min)	2.72

Notes:

1 - Recommend vehicle impound remain at Asylum Street Location

2 - Lot size recommendation assumes an open parking lot (no garage). Design should consider future expansion into the parking lot and construction of a multi-level garage.

In support of the work done by this subcommittee, refer to Attachment A, Space Needs Summary Final 011414. This file provides a comprehensive list of all the functional areas that we recommend be included in the new facility.

Work Done By the Site Inventory List Subcommittee

The Site Inventory List Subcommittee was formed to create and maintain a list of sites for the Police Station Committee to rank. The subcommittee worked to ensure that all properties previously considered were included as well as any additional sites identified by the Police Station Committee or identified by members of the public. A total of 30 properties (see below) were identified for the list and approved by the Police Station Committee.

The subcommittee determined that the list should include, in addition to the property's address, a link to Norwich's GIS where each property's location, property record card, and thematic overlay maps would be available to all members of the Police Station Committee. This approach ensured that the Committee members shared a common, precise definition for each property and access to a common database of accurate information about each property. The subcommittee also completed visits to all sites.

All data used in ranking sites is current as of March 27, 2014.

- 418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street
- 390-420 West Thames St.
- Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land
- 299-323 Franklin St. –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10
- 188 Cedar ST - Former Buckingham School site
- 132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow, Chestnut Street block
- 2-6 Cliff St
- Any school buildings which become available
- Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)
- New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)
- Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke)
- Stanton School Land (386 New London Tpke)
- Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)
- John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)
- 8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)
- Thames Plaza (101 Water St)
- Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)
- Former Greeneville School Site (165 Golden St)
- Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)
- Flat Iron (9-15 Main St)
- Former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)
- Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)
- 20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)
- Existing police station (70 Thames St)
- 28 North Thames St (Thayer property)
- YMCA – (337-341 Main St.))
- Post Office (340 Main St)
- Elk's Building (352 Main St.)
- United Congregational Church (95-101 Broadway)
- 30-66 Franklin St. Norwich Bulletin

Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee

The Site Criteria Subcommittee set out to establish a set of objective measurements that would then be applied to all prospective sites in order to determine the optimal location from the list of sites under consideration. The primary goal was to remove the effects of bias and potential for conflicts of interest, as much as possible, from the ranking process. A secondary goal was to establish a set of go/no go criteria that would be used to narrow the field of potential sites without requiring a lengthy, detailed review of each of the 30 sites. These go/no go criteria could also be used by the Site Inventory List Subcommittee for evaluating future sites that may be brought up by the community for consideration once the site evaluation process had commenced.

The methodology created by the Subcommittee served to enable the full Committee to evaluate locations in the absence of personal preferences and potential conflicts of interest, and also to ensure public transparency for the selection process. The same set of criteria may also be used as a tool by the City Council to evaluate future sites that may come up for consideration following the disbanding of the Police Station Committee; ensuring consistent evaluation criteria for all current and future alternatives.

Criteria was developed from attributes used in previous site assessments, ranking schemes developed by other communities, requirements identified by the Norwich Police Department, considerations identified by architect Brian Humes, and development priorities outlined in the Norwich 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development. Where possible, the subcommittee sought objective, quantitative criteria for the measurements. Where a quantitative criterion was not available, the Subcommittee established qualitative criteria that could be applied across all sites. This process was validated by using a reiterative process of applying the criteria.

The criteria used to rank the sites consist of 10 attributes grouped into four main categories:

- Site Location
- Community Benefit
- Site Geometry
- Site Cost

The ideal site would be centrally located relative to population centers and access to major roadways, conspicuously improve the health and appearance of the selected site, be an efficient and cost effective use of land, and be the lowest reasonable cost, including preservation of the city's tax base.

All individual criterions were rated on a scale of 1 to 5; low to high. The total score within each category was then averaged for the main category score. Each main category was assigned a total weight, based on its importance for the site selection. An ideal site, one that was rated high in all areas, would score a weighted maximum of five. Any site that was determined to be a "No Go" site due to its location in a flood plain or because it did not meet the minimum required acreage, was not scored. Out of the 30 sites considered by the Committee, nineteen were eliminated using the Go/No Go criteria. The remaining 12 locations were ranked according to these criteria. The top ranked site scored 3.8.

Here is an example of how the scoring worked using Site Geometry. The John Edward Drive (Mohegan Park) location was determined to be 27.58 acres. This size is consistent with the space needs assessment (5 points) and is a suitable geometry for the new police station (5 points), giving it an average score of 5 for Site Geometry. Site Geometry is weighted at 20% of the total score, or a maximum of 1 point ($5 \times 0.2 = 1$) toward the total score maximum of five.

The Committee reviewed the outcome of the ranking, considered the influence of different criteria on the results, and used independent judgment to conclude that the results were reasonable and consistent with the intent of

Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued)

the ranking process. An unexpected or unreasonable result would have led the Committee to reexamine the criteria for logic flaws or factors that unduly influence the outcome. This was not necessary.

Each of the four main criteria are described in the next sections. Each criterion is explained using the method of ranking and the resource used to determine the criterion.

Site Location: Weight = 40%

Site Location was given the highest weight because the location of the police headquarters is the most important of the site ranking criteria. Any location ranking high in all other criteria, but low for location will not be a desirable location. The city covers a geographically diverse area and is physically divided in its center by a large park, making travel from one side to the other a challenge. To counter this, the Committee determined that the most desirable location would be in a core population center with access to main roadways. Flooding is a significant concern in a number of locations within the city. As a matter of practicality, the Committee determined to locate the Police Station outside of the influence of the 100 year flood plain. Additionally, access routes to the facility were considered with respect to flooding. Table 1 details the criteria used to rank location.

Table 2: Site Location

Criterion	Source	Method of Ranking
Proximity to population centers	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps 2. City of Norwich Plan of Conservation and Development	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for location in core population centers
Access to major roadways	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps 2. Common site evaluation criteria used by other communities 3. Norwich Police Department requirement	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for access to main roadways
Potential to be affected by flooding*	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps, Hazard Overlay 2. Association of State Floodplain Managers, Critical Facilities and Flood Risk position paper 3. Norwich Police Department requirement	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for location and unobstructed access outside of 100 year flood plain *Eliminate sites predominantly located within, or with all access through, 100 year flood plain

*Go/No Go criterion

Community Benefit: Weight = 30%

Community Benefit was given the second highest weight. The police department is a community service and a core component of the city's infrastructure. It possesses intrinsic value regardless of location. However, its location may add or detract value to the surrounding community. All other factors being equal, preference would be given to a location where the construction of a new facility would provide a physical and potential economic benefit to the surrounding community. The Committee also recognizes that a modern police station generates traffic around the clock. A location that provides minimal disruption to residential communities was also preferred.

Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued)

Table3: Community Benefit

Criterion	Source	Method of Ranking
Utilize a vacant, derelict, or brown field site	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps 2. Visual evaluation	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for use of empty or derelict space over occupied property
Preservation of green space	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps 2. Visual evaluation 3. City of Norwich Plan of Conservation and Development	Sites ranked <u>Low</u> for use of parks, recreation, or rural space
Conspicuous site improvement	1. City of Norwich GIS Maps 2. Visual evaluation	Sites ranked <u>High</u> if improvements highly visible to the public

Site Geometry: Weight = 20%

The geometry of the site needs to be appropriate for the use. The Space Needs Subcommittee determined a minimum acreage for the new station. The Site Criteria Subcommittee determined that this minimum acreage needed to be a Go/No Go criterion. Any locations less than 2.72 acres were eliminated from consideration. For the remaining sites, a weight of 20% was given to Site Geometry. Any location in excess of the minimum was considered unless it failed other Go/No Go criteria. The subcommittee further agreed that the 2.72 acres needed to be “buildable” acreage considering the shape and topography of the location. Norwich has many areas with steep slope and uneven lots. While the Committee recognizes that current construction methods can overcome topographic challenges (consider the recent construction of the CVS building and the Goodwill strip mall, both on West Main Street/Route 82) preference was given to locations that would not require terraforming in order to support the project.

Table 4: Site Geometry

Criterion	Source	Method of Ranking
Size consistent with space needs*	1. Revised Space Needs Assessment from Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for consistency with Space Needs Assessment Committee recommendations *Eliminate sites smaller than the recommended acreage
Suitability for intended use	1. Revised Space Needs Assessment from Space Needs Assessment Subcommittee 2. City of Norwich GIS Maps 3. Visual evaluation	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for topography and site geometry consistent with Space Needs Assessment Committee recommendations

*Go/No Go criterion

Site Cost: Weight = 10%

Site cost was weighted the lowest of the four main categories. While the Committee was sensitive to the overall project cost, the costs associated with site acquisition and preparation represents a fraction of the overall project costs (In the proposal for the previous Cliff Street project, site acquisition costs represented approximately 10% of

Work Done By the Site Ranking Criteria Subcommittee (continued)

the overall project). The Committee felt that project cost savings were more readily achieved by the Space Needs Assessment subcommittee and chose to place more emphasis on location, community benefit, and site geometry.

Table 5: Site Cost

Criterion	Source	Method of Ranking
Cost rating	1. Assessed value from City of Norwich Property Record Cards	Sites ranked <u>High</u> for lower cost and for use of city owned property
Brownfield Risk**	1. 2012 Norwich Area Wide Brownfield Study 2. Discussions with Marjorie Blizzard 3. City of Norwich GIS Maps, Brownfields Overlay	Sites ranked <u>Low</u> for potential costs associated with site preparation due to designation as a brownfield location **Criterion not used due to lack of brownfield site remediation cost data.

** Criterion not used

Although the Brownfield Risk criterion was not used, this did not alter the results. The Committee compared the results using fabricated data as a test for scoring brownfield sites and found minimal scoring differences that did not fundamentally alter the overall ranking.

The entire Committee engaged in a site ranking exercise over the course of a few regular meetings. What resulted from that exercise is a document Attachment B to this report, Site Criteria Ranking (sorted highest to lowest ranked, includes City of Norwich GIS hyperlinks to sites).

Financing Options

The Committee met with Mr. Joseph Ruffo, Comptroller for the City of Norwich and a financial consultant to the City, Mr. Richard Thivierge, Managing Director of the William Blair Agency, to discuss police station financing options. There are multitudes of financing options available to the City. The different options have pros and cons, which depend on current market interest rates, the amount being financed, and project responsibilities.

During this meeting, it was explained that if the City chooses to obtain the financing and manage design and construction, the cost of financing is determined by the City's credit rating and the financial and project risks are carried by the City. If the City enters into a public-private partnership, the cost of financing will be different based on the nature of the partnership and the financial strength of the partner. Also, public-private partnerships can transfer many of the financial and project risks to the private partner.

Based on financing information received, the variety of options available, the number of undetermined variables, and technical nature of the decision, the Committee does not prefer one approach to funding over another. The approach to funding needs to be determined by financial experts and the City.

Although the Committee has no funding preference, the Committee has recommendations connected to two of the financing options. If the City chooses to finance with a bond, once the design is established the Committee recommends obtaining construction bids in advance of setting the bond amount. This approach reduces the uncertainties associated with costs which results in the smallest possible bond. If the City chooses to pursue a public-private partnership, the recommended course of action is to still create a request for proposal for the design of the facility and use that design to create the request for proposal for the private developer to build a facility on the Buckingham site.

Recommended Course of Action

A new facility for the Norwich Police Department should be built on the site of the former Buckingham School. The Committee envisions locating the facility and parking on the Washington Street border of the lot. Based on our lessons learned from the West Haven Police Station we believe that any neighborhood concerns regarding impact can be alleviated utilizing this location. Many of the Committee members are also parents and consider it important to preserve the basketball court and playscape. We recommend that both items be relocated to the upper section of the lot bordering Cedar Street.

There are multiple building designs and sites which can accommodate the required 51,000 square feet. But the most suitable, lowest cost building the Committee can envision requires a minimum 2.72 acre lot size. The Committee applied the criteria to 30 sites and evaluated the results. The results show which sites are superior with the former Buckingham School site being the highest rated. The Committee notes that some of the sites are privately owned and some have viable businesses on them. These factors could complicate development efforts. The former Buckingham School site has no such complicating factors.

The next steps to move the building of a police station forward recommended by the Committee are:

- Step#1: Create a building project committee focused on developing the Buckingham location.
- Step #2: Engage an architect to design a facility based on the approximately 51,000 square foot space need.
- Step#3: Obtain construction quotes.
- Step# 4: Create a communication plan to educate the public on the architectural design and funding plan

We wish to convey a sense of urgency for the need to replace the existing police station. Further, we consider it vital that the City develop and implement a multifaceted communication plan that provides the public with all the architectural and funding details they need to be well informed. We believe that only through this multifaceted communication plan will the City Council be able to instill public confidence that the new police station is justified. The Committee urges the City Council to be deliberate in their going forward actions.

With submittal of this report to the City Council, the Police Station Committee has completed the mission it was created for on March 18, 2013.

Appendix A - Previous Project Documents Reviewed by Committee

A complete set of these previous project documents is maintained by the Norwich Police Department.

*Request for Qualifications for Needs Assessment for a combined Police & Civil Preparedness Facility
Norwich, CT*

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, June 7, 2006

Space Needs Assessment for the Norwich Police Department

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, July 2007

Site Assessment for the Norwich Police Department

*Four Properties: Mechanic Street Ball Fields, 401/418 North Main Street 299-323 Franklin Street, 400
West Thames Street*

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, May 2008

Site Assessment for the Norwich Police Department

137 Washington Street & 132-176 Franklin Street Mill Buildings

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, September 2010

Site Assessment for the Norwich Police Department

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, October 2011

Appendix B-Committee Educational Documents

Copies of these documents have been put on file with the Norwich City Clerk.

Police Station Financing and Refunding Bonds Opportunities

Richard Thieverge, William Blair, August 22, 2013

Critical Facilities and Flood Risk

Association of State Floodplain Managers, Inc., February 2011

Space Needs Assessment for the Norwich Police Department (marked up by Deputy Chief Mocek to reflect current facility space numbers)

Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC, July 2007

West Haven Police Facility Floor Plan

Provided by Brian Humes, Architect, Jacunski Humes, LLC.

Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414

Area	Committee / NPD 2014 Space Needs Assessment (SQ FT)
Patrol Functions (Patrol Officers' Locker Rooms / showers - Men)	2100
Indoor Firearms Training Range	1700
Detention (Cells)	1400
Community Room / Training Classroom with Kitchenette	1300
Investigative Division (Squad Room)	1250
Mechanical (HVAC Equipment)	1200
Sally Port (Sally Port)	1200
Evidence and Property (Processing and ALL storage needs)	1056
Detention area including Prisoner Processing and Toilets	1000
Patrol Functions (Briefing / Roll Call)	851
Records Division (Office / Work Area)	800
Training Classroom	768
Large Vehicle Storage	750
Narcotics Unit (Work Area)	750
Forensics	700
Patrol Functions (Patrol Officers' Locker Rooms / showers - Women)	700
Communications Center (Dispatch Center)	688
Community Policing with Interview room and storage room	650
Patrol Functions (Physical Fitness Room)	650
Patrol Functions (Superior Officers' Locker Room)	600
Public (Lobby/Reception/Waiting)	600
Vehicle Storage Bays	600
Juvenile / DARE / SRO (Unit Area)	550
Patrol Functions (Sergeant's Office)	500
Mechanical (Boiler Room)	456
Records Division (Archive File Storage)	450
Administration (Chief of Police with Toilet / Shower)	400
Administration (Conference Room)	400
Community Outreach Office	400
Patrol Functions (Lunch / Day Room)	400
Youth Detention	370
Administration (Executive Secretary/Receptionist)	350
Dept of Information Technology	350
Armory / Arsenal	338
Public (Interview Rooms 2) (3)	315
Administrative File Storage	312
Communications Center (Equipment Room)	312
Administration (Deputy Chief of Police)	300
Investigative Division (Tactical Planning Rm / Conference room)	300
Computer Equipment Server Room	275
Indoor Firearms Training Range (Ready Room / Training Classroom)	267
Administration (Captain)	250
Computer Forensics Lab	250
Public Inquiry office	250
Investigative Division (Interview Rooms, 2)	239
Sargeant - training Office	238

Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414 (continued)

Sally Port Storage Space	235
Patrol Functions (Report Writing)	225
Patrol Functions (Captain)	207
Investigative Division (Captain)	200
Investigative Division (Lieutenant's Office)	200
Juvenile (Interview Rooms, 2)	200
Juvenile Unit / DARE / SRO Officer (Parents / Family Waiting Area)	200
Narcotics Unit (Outside Agency Workroom)	200
Public (Toilets)	200
Toilets and Janitorial (Building Receiving)	200
Upper Lobby space (above main lobby)	200
Patrol Functions (Lieutenant's Office)	185
Patrol Functions (Lieutenant's Office)	185
Patrol Functions (Lieutenant's Office)	185
Recruitment Office	185
Communications Supervisor	180
Public (Vestibule)	175
Records Division (Record Supervisor)	175
Building Maintenance Storage	170
Toilets and Janitorial (Custodial Office)	170
Men & Women main lavatory	160
Men & Women main lobby lavatory	160
Traffic Division Storage	160
Workroom	158
Administration (Workroom & Central Copy Room)	154
Community Room Furniture Storage	150
Court Officer	150
Evidence and Property (Temporary Bulk Evidence Storage)	150
Evidence and Property (Valuables Storage)	150
Investigative Division (Public Waiting Area)	150
Mechanical (Fire Suppression)	150
Patrol Functions (Laundry Room)	150
Workroom	145
Evidence and Property (Receiving)	140
Chaplain Unit	125
Sex Offender Registry Compliance Officer	125
Toilets and Janitorial (Janitor Closets)	125
Victim Advocate	125
Interview room	120
Patrol Functions (Quartermaster Storage)	120
PBA / Union Office	120
Shift Commander (Lieutenant or Sergeant)	112
Main Desk / Desk Officer	100
SWAT	89
Communications Center (Resource Area)	80
Communications Center (Toilet)	80
Investigative Division (Toilet Room)	80
Toilets and Janitorial (Toilet Facilities)	80
Water Service	80

Attachment A- Space Needs Summary Final 011414 (continued)

Janitor	73
Maintenance Storage	65
Storage	65
Mechanical (Emergency Generator)	64
Storage space	63
Electrical service	61
Investigative Division (Monitoring Room)	60
Mechanical (Electrical Room)	55
Indoor Firearms Training Range (Control Room)	50
Narcotics Unit (Telephone Room)	50
Sally Port (Medical Supply Storage)	50
Sally Port (Road Supply Storage)	50
Training Unit Supplies Storage	50
Custodial storage	45
Chiefs Closet	31
Chiefs Storage	31

2014 Summary Details	2007 Summary Details
----------------------	----------------------

Total Net Square Footage	38,013	42,510
Net to Gross Factor	1.35	1.35
Total Gross Square Footage	51317.55	57389
Coste Estimate @ \$375 / sq ft	\$ 19,244,081	\$ 21,520,688
 % of original 57,389 sg ft	 89%	

Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Total

Ranking Exercise Site #	Site Location	Averages for				Total Score
		Location	Community Benefit	Site Geometry	Site Cost	
2	188 Cedar St - former Buckingham School site	5.0	1.7	5.0	2.5	3.8
24	390-420 WEST THAMES ST (2008 Assessment)	3.7	3.7	4.5	1.5	3.6
6	New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)	4.7	2.3	4.5	0.5	3.5
25	Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land (2008 Assessment)	4.7	1.0	5.0	2.5	3.4
16	20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)	3.7	2.3	4.5	2.0	3.3
10	8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)	3.7	1.3	5.0	2.5	3.1
12	Former Greeneville School Site (165 Golden St)	3.7	1.7	4.5	2.5	3.1
9	John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)	3.7	1.0	5.0	2.0	3.0
5	Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)	3.0	1.7	5.0	0.5	2.8
7	Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke)					
	Stanton School land (386 New London Tpke)	3.0	1.7	4.5	1.0	2.7
1	2-6 Cliff Street	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	Any schools buildings which become available	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow, Chestnut Street block	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	Thames Plaza (101 Water St)					
	Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14	Flat Iron (9-15 Main St)					
	former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15	Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17	Existing police station (70 Thames St)					
	1.8 acres across the road (part of 101 High St)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	28 North Thames St (Thayer property)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
19	YMCA – (337-341 MAIN ST)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	Post Office (340 Main St)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21	Elk's Building (352 MAIN ST)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22	UNITED CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (95-101 Broadway)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
23	418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street (2008 Assessment)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26	299-323 FRANKLIN ST –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10 (2008 Assessment)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
27	Norwich Bulletin buildings - 30 - 66 Franklin Street	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Location

Ranking Exercise Site #	Site Location	Proximity to population centers	Access to major roadways	Potential to be affected by flooding	Average for Location
1	2-6 Cliff Street	0	0	0	0.0
2	188 Cedar St - former Buckingham School site	5	5	5	5.0
3	Any school buildings which become available	0	0	0	0.0
4	132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow, Chestnut Street block	0	0	0	0.0
5	Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)	1	3	5	3.0
6	New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)	5	4	5	4.7
7	Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke) + Stanton School land (386 New London Tpke)	3	3	3	3.0
8	Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)	0	0	0	0.0
9	John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)	3	3	5	3.7
10	8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)	3	3	5	3.7
11	Thames Plaza (101 Water St) +Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)	0	0	0	0.0
12	Former Greeneville School Site (165 Golden St)	3	3	5	3.7
13	Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)	0	0	0	0.0
14	Flat Iron (9-15 Main St) + former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)	0	0	0	0.0
15	Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)	0	0	0	0.0
16	20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)	3	3	5	3.7
17	Existing police station (70 Thames St) + 1.8 acres across the road (part of 101 High St)	0	0	0	0.0
18	28 North Thames St (Thayer property)	0	0	0	0.0
19	YMCA – (337-341 MAIN ST)	0	0	0	0.0
20	Post Office (340 Main St)	0	0	0	0.0
21	Eik's Building (352 MAIN ST)	0	0	0	0.0
22	UNITED CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (95-101 Broadway)	0	0	0	0.0
23	418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street (2008 Assessment)	0	0	0	0.0
24	390-420 WEST THAMES ST (2008 Assessment)	3	3	5	3.7
25	Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land (2008 Assessment)	5	4	5	4.7
26	299-323 FRANKLIN ST –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10 (2008 Assessment)	0	0	0	0.0
27	Norwich Bulletin buildings - 30 - 66 Franklin Street	0	0	0	0.0

Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Community Benefit

Ranking Exercise Site #	Site	Utilize a vacant, derelict, or brownfield site	Preservation of green space	Conspicuous site improvement	Average for Community Benefit
1	2-6 Cliff Street	0	0	0	0.0
2	188 Cedar St - former Buckingham School site	1	3	1	1.7
3	Any school buildings which become available	0	0	0	0.0
4	132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow, Chestnut Street block	0	0	0	0.0
5	Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)	1	3	1	1.7
6	New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)	1	5	1	2.3
7	Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke) + Stanton School land (386 New London Tpke)	1	3	1	1.7
8	Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)	0	0	0	0.0
9	John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)	1	1	1	1.0
10	8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)	1	2	1	1.3
11	Thames Plaza (101 Water St) + Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)	0	0	0	0.0
12	Former Greenville School Site (165 Golden St)	1	3	1	1.7
13	Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)	0	0	0	0.0
14	Flat Iron (9-15 Main St) + former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)	0	0	0	0.0
15	Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)	0	0	0	0.0
16	20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)	3	3	1	2.3
17	Existing police station (70 Thames St) + (21) 1.8 acres across the road (part of 101 High St)	0	0	0	0.0
18	28 North Thames St (Thayer property)	0	0	0	0.0
19	YMCA – (337-341 MAIN ST)	0	0	0	0.0
20	Post Office (340 Main St)	0	0	0	0.0
21	Elk's Building (352 MAIN ST)	0	0	0	0.0
22	UNITED CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (95-101 Broadway)	0	0	0	0.0
23	418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street (2008 Assessment)	0	0	0	0.0
24	390-420 WEST THAMES ST (2008 Assessment)	3	5	3	3.7
25	Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land (2008 Assessment)	1	1	1	1.0
26	299-323 FRANKLIN ST –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10 (2008 Assessment)	0	0	0	0.0
27	Norwich Bulletin buildings - 30 - 66 Franklin Street	0	0	0	0.0

Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Site Geometry

Ranking Exercise Site #	Site	Size (acres)	Size consistent with space needs	Suitability for intended use	Average for Site Geometry	Assumptions
1	2-6 Cliff Street	2.55	0	0	0	Reuse and add to existing structures
2	188 Cedar St - former Buckingham School site	4.21	5	5	5	New construction
3	Any school buildings that become available	n/a	0	0	0	
4	132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow , Chestnut Street block	1.83	0	0	0	Partial demolition and re-use
5	Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)	134.4	5	5	5	New construction, back end of cemetery land
6	New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)	8.51	5	4	4.5	Renovate and re-use existing structure
7	Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke) + Stanton School land (386 New London Tpke)	30.02	5	4	4.5	Raze structure and build new on fraction of site, don't need both properties
8	Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)	1	0	0	0	Raze structures and build new
9	John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)	27.58	5	5	5	New construction
10	8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)	13.84	5	5	5	New construction
11	Thames Plaza (101 Water St) + (13) Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)	1.43	0	0	0	Raze structures and build new
12	Former Greenville School Site (165 Golden St)	12.3	5	4	4.5	New construction
13	Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)	2.5	0	0	0	Raze structures and build new
14	Flat Iron (9-15 Main St) + former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)	0.26	0	0	0	
15	Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)	1.8	0	0	0	New construction
16	20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)	20.63	5	4	4.5	Raze structures and build new
17	Existing police station (70 Thames St) + 1.8 acres across the road (part of 101 High St)	4.5	0	0	0	New construction and renovation of existing structure
18	28 North Thames St (Thayer property)	2.11	0	0	0	Raze structures and build new
19	YMCA – (337-341 MAIN ST)	0.64	0	0	0	Raze and build new
20	Post Office (340 Main St)	0.79	0	0	0	Raze, remediate, build new
21	Elk's Building (352 MAIN ST)	0.95	0	0	0	Raze and build new
22	UNITED CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (95-101 Broadway)	0.38	0	0	0	
23	418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street (2008 Assessment)	2.47	0	0	0	
24	390-420 WEST THAMES ST (2008 Assessment)	10.31	5	4	4.5	Raze structures and build new
25	Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land (2008 Assessment)	4.89	5	5	5	New construction
26	299-323 FRANKLIN ST –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10 (2008 Assessment)	2.13	0	0	0	Raze structures and build new
27	Norwich Bulletin buildings - 30 - 66 Franklin Street	1.51	0	0	0	Raze, remediate, build new

Attachment B- Site Criteria Ranking – Cost

Ranking Exercise Site #	Site	Cost	Rating	Brownfield Risk	Average for Site Cost	Property Owner
1	02-6 Cliff Street	891,900	0	0	0.00	Lord Family Nominee Trust + Norwich City Of
2	188 Cedar St - former Buckingham School site	0	5	0	2.50	Norwich City Of
3	Any school buildings that become available	0	0	0	0.00	
4	132-176 Franklin St - Franklin, Willow , Chestnut Street block	467,300	0	0	0.00	Franklin St Llc
5	Maplewood Cemetery land (184 Salem Tpke)	4,316,800	1	0	0.50	Norwich Cemetery Association
6	New London Mutual Insurance Building (101 High St)	5,715,200	1	0	0.50	New London County Mutual Ins Co
7	Beth Jacob Synagogue (400 New London Tpke) + Stanton School land (386 New London Tpke)	2,856,400	2	0	1.00	Norwich City Of and Beth Jacob Community Synagogue
8	Norwich Public Utilities land, North Main Street (16 South Golden St)	0	0	0	0.00	Norwich City Of
9	John Edward Drive, Mohegan Park (Ox Hill Rd)	214,100	4	0	2.00	Ox Hill Land Llc
10	8 Mahan Drive - Skate Park End (8 Mahan Dr)	0	5	0	2.50	Norwich City Of
11	Thames Plaza (101 Water St) + Market Street Garage (75 Chelsea Harbor Dr)	2,071,700	0	0	0.00	Norwich Harborview Corporation AND Norwich City Of
12	Former Greenville School Site (165 Golden St)	0	5	0	2.50	Norwich City Of
13	Former Mr. Big's Site (5 and 6 Eighth St, Taftville)	614,800	0	0	0.00	8th Street Ventures Llc
14	Flat Iron (9-15 Main St) + former Dunkin Donuts (16 Main St)	400,000	0	0	0.00	Yesenko Michael G + Yesenko Catherine H
15	Part of 101 High St (across from current Norwich Police Station)	106,900	0	0	0.00	New London County Mutual Ins Co
16	20 Prentice Ln (off of Boswell/lot abuts Sandy Lane)	122,500	4	0	2.00	Brennan Beatrice
17	Existing police station (70 Thames St) + 1.8 acres across the road (part of 101 High St)	106,900	0	0	0.00	Norwich City Of and New London County Mutual Ins Co
18	28 North Thames St (Thayer property)	247,200	0	0	0.00	Thayer Richard A + Thayer Mary Anna
19	YMCA – (337-341 MAIN ST)	2,082,300	0	0	0.00	YMCA Of Southeastern Conn Inc C/O Att Block Janey + Pascal
20	Post Office (340 Main St)	1,745,300	0	0	0.00	United States Post Office P T
21	Elk's Building (352 MAIN ST)	475,900	0	0	0.00	Sunford Properties And Development Llc C/O Janny Lam
22	UNITED CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (95-101 Broadway)	668,700	0	0	0.00	United Congregational Church In Norwich Ct Inc
23	418 North Main ST – 401 North Main ST is across the street (2008 Assessment)	1,202,200	0	0	0.00	418 North Main Realty Llc C/O Robert Kleeman
24	390-420 WEST THAMES ST (2008 Assessment)	1,077,600	3	0	1.50	Goldberg Joseph Tr Et Al
25	Mechanic Street Ball Fields & Across the street Tennis Courts / Recreation Land (2008 Assessment)	0	5	0	2.50	Norwich Redevelopment Agency
26	299-323 FRANKLIN ST –the white square at the start of McKinley Ave is #10 (2008 Assessment)	194,900	0	0	0.00	P J + A LLC
27	Norwich Bulletin buildings - 30 - 66 Franklin Street	1,259,900	0	0	0.00	Gatehouse Media Connecticut Holdings Inc