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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mayor and Town Council assembled a Committee of experienced architects, real estate management and management consulting executives living in and outside of Glen Echo. The goal of the Committee was to provide an assessment of the Town’s existing real estate assets so the Town Council can better evaluate new real estate opportunities as they arise, and to see if the real estate assets are best utilized for the long term needs of the town. This led to reviewing the Town’s real estate holdings and the Town’s options with regard to these holdings, as well as assessing how the holdings contribute to the Town’s financial stability. Based on this mission, the Committee undertook the following:

- To better understand some of the needs of the Town, the Committee included an assessment of the Town’s financial position, potential future risks, some of its limits, as well as opportunities.
- The Committee took into consideration impacts of the real estate and financial recommendations to the community. However, the Town Council would benefit from a broader discussion (including Town residents) regarding priorities for Glen Echo that would create a basis for assessing future opportunities.
- Tulane/Oberlin findings:
  - We found that the Town’s properties on Tulane/Oberlin are currently not well-positioned for providing an attractive and speedy liquidation value, if and when needed.
  - As residential properties (R-60), these properties likely would not be attractive to buyers, in large part because all of the nearby properties have been rezoned for commercial use. As such we recommend rezoning both of these lots for commercial use.
  - Tulane and Oberlin Roads are needed for use by the businesses located there, yet people who use Glen Echo Park frequently take all or most available parking spaces.
  - Our recommendations include how to improve revenue, and ways the Town should consider reducing any friction points in its relations with the Park Service, The Irish Inn, and other local businesses.
- Town Hall Findings
  - The Town Hall’s lease to the US Postal Service matures in 2021, thereby presenting a risk of losing post office rental income, if the USPS chooses not to renew its lease\(^1\). In addition, we reviewed the property’s upkeep and potential needs for repurposing the USPS space for an alternative commercial use.

\(^1\) Please note: We understand that, if the Town Council would like further information, we can write our local congressman requesting he research the issue. We further understand that, if the post office were to leave, Glen Echo would still retain its 20812 zip code. Our strong recommendation is to refrain from any inquiries.
• **Vassar Circle Findings**
  
  o Several options and alternatives were reviewed regarding the Vassar Circle property (not just the offer(s) from Mr. Hirsch). It is unlikely that any of the options to purchase Vassar Circle would put the Town in a better financial position than it is today. Indeed, a number of the options introduced significant financial risk, dependencies, and complexities if executed in a short time frame, which we attempted to quantify for the Town Council. However, if the transactions could be executed serially, several Committee members felt the financial risks could be mitigated and benefits would accrue to the Town, its residents, and potentially even local businesses and Glen Echo Park. We included consideration of one option related to Vassar Circle for further detail

• Our top recommendation is to focus on improving the value of the Tulane and Oberlin properties. We developed three options to accomplish this.
  
  1. **Improve Existing Real Estate:** Improve one or both lots of Tulane/Oberlin for parking use and re-negotiate a parking lease deal with The Irish Inn.
  2. **Rezone and Sell a Portion:** Rezone the land of Tulane/Oberlin and sell one of the two lots using the proceeds to pay the costs of rezoning. This will net approximately $400K (for Town reserves) to the Town and prepare the 2nd lot for sale at a higher value when needed (details provided in Appendix L).
  3. **Rezone and Sell Both:** Engage with a developer to rezone and sell the both lots of Tulane/Oberlin and net $900K for the Town’s reserves (details provided in Appendix L).

Once that decision is made and implementation has begun, the Town would be in the process of securing resources to purchasing green space on a portion of Vassar Circle (not all), if deemed to be in the best interest of the Town.
I. Committee Charter

The Committee was chartered to provide objective business, financial, and legal analysis and advice to the Mayor and Town Council on the financial strength of the Town’s existing real estate assets, as well as explore ways to enhance those assets and/or acquire new ones that improve the Town’s financial position in a prudent and cost-effective way.

II. Operating Assumptions and Guidelines

As stated above, the Committee was chartered to provide due diligence on potential Town actions which would include reviewing Mr. Hirsch’s offer and/or developing alternative scenarios and deal structures. In all cases, the Committee was chartered to advise the Mayor and Town Council; it had no authority to make decisions on behalf of the Town. Its role was strictly advisory. The following is a list of key assumptions under which the Committee operated:

- While Mr. Hirsch had requested a response from the Town in July, the Mayor advised that the Committee should not feel rushed. Developing a robust set of reasonably viable options and completing considerable due diligence on those options was paramount.
- The Committee was to consider all options for the Town including simply maintaining its current status quo position vis-à-vis all of its existing real estate assets.
- The Committee deemed financial stability of the Town as critical, as evidenced by the fact that financial benefit/security received the highest average weighting of all the criteria in the survey of Committee members. While the Committee assessed the financial risks of all options, we ultimately rejected those that were assessed to present an existential risk to the Town’s long-term viability, with one exception (see Section III, Approach).
- In addition to financial risks, the Committee factored into its consideration the potential positive and adverse impacts to residents and existing businesses for each option.
- The land assets reviewed by the Committee included lots on Tulane/Oberlin, the existing Town Hall, and Vassar Circle.
- The Tulane/Oberlin lots have traditionally been viewed as a rainy day land bank; to be sold in the event the Town needed money for an unexpected or extensive initiative.
- The Tulane/Oberlin lots are currently zoned R-60 (residential property). Given the predominant commercial use of adjoining lots, as well as their proximity to Glen Echo Park, they likely have less resale value/attractiveness than if they were zoned commercial.
- The lease for the Post Office expires in 2021. Based on current practices by the USPS, the Town is not likely going to know about the lease’s potential for renewal until two years

---

2 Complete charter provided in Appendix A
3 The Committee acknowledges that the Town also owns two “pocket parks” on two corners of the Princeton and University Avenue intersection as well as right-of-ways adjacent to MacArthur Blvd. We did not consider these as buildable or able to be “monetized,” so did not factor them into any option.
prior to lease maturity. Proactive measures of inquiry about USPS’ plans more than two years prior to lease maturity are unlikely to yield any answers.

- Historically, rent paid by the Post Office has been a valuable source of income for maintenance of the Town Hall.
- According to a recent evaluation of the Town Hall, it is in relatively good shape, though the contractor did recommend the roof be replaced within the next five years. The Town Hall will need additional funds for repositioning and/or repurposing the post office space, in the event that USPS does not renew its lease.

III. Approach
The Committee followed a multi-step, iterative process in fulfilling its charter. We first started with data gathering. For example, we confirmed zoning, lot lines, and ownership of each property. We also gathered information on potential costs of actions such as refurbishment of the Town Hall, demolition of church building on Vassar, etc. In addition, we heard from knowledgeable and interested parties (Debbie Beers, Katey Boerner, Bob Reaves, Chris Fromboluti, Aaron Hirsch, Chris Hughes, and Dick Leggin, and other Town residents via email or in-person participation). Further we conducted analysis of potential cost of rezoning the Tulane property for commercial use as well as an analysis of potential ways to improve the parking situation on Tulane and Oberlin.

As we gathered data, options began to emerge, as well as additional data requirements and criteria against which to evaluate the options. Specifically, we identified ten criteria against which to consider the options (including renovated town hall, risk, how long it would take, financial cost, etc.). We also identified an initial list of 11 options, including a “status quo” option. Each Committee member then weighted the criteria and then assigned a rating of 1-3 (1 being most favorable) to each of the criteria for each option. We designed the spreadsheet such that it then calculated a total score of 1-3 (1 being most favorable) for each option. When completed, the spreadsheet provided us seven sets individually ranked options, one for each Committee member. These were then combined into a single set of options for the Committee as a whole.

The Committee met to discuss the results of this exercise and agreed upon the top four options; some of the options are not mutually exclusive. For example, two options that could be

---

4 See Appendix C for the full report, and Appendices D, E, and F for estimates for roof replacement.
5 See Appendices G and H for the results of this analysis.
6 See Appendices I and J for two bids for demolition of the current structure on Vassar as well as re-grading, etc.
7 See Appendix K for a list of guests, their relationship or status, as well as the date they appeared.
8 See Appendices L and M for the details of these analyses.
9 See Appendix N for the consolidated matrix depicting the 10 criteria, 11 initial options, and results of the initial ranking.
considered in tandem are addressing the parking issues on Tulane and Oberlin (including consideration of the lease to the Irish Inn), while also rezoning Tulane and Oberlin properties. As such, some were combined into new options, which are presented in the Section IV, below. In addition to a description of the options, we outlined process steps required to implement each option plus financial estimates for costs and/or revenue that might result. Please note that these financial estimates have a varying degree of rigor behind them. If the Town Council is interested in any or all options, we would highly recommend conducting an in-depth financial study before executing.

The Committee deliberated at length about the opportunities surrounding the Vassar Circle property and offer. Of note, and depicted in the results of the voting, the Committee members were least consistent in their views of the merits of pursuing any action with respect to Vassar Circle. Almost every Committee member acknowledged that financial costs of these options were relatively high. However, some Committee members weighted these criteria more moderately than others. As a result, their scores showed a few of the Vassar Circle options as relatively attractive and worth considering. Alternatively, Committee members who weighted those three criteria most highly turned in results that put those options very low on their rankings.

After further review, we determined that we should provide one Vassar Circle option. We concluded this for three reasons. First, while financially costly, almost all Committee members agreed the town residents could benefit from the town owning property on the circle, whether it was for green space or eventually as a site for a new Town Hall. Secondly, we identified an approach that could mitigate the financial risk to the Town, and could actually potentially provide added financial benefits. And finally, though not as highly weighted as the first two, it was the initial offer by Mr. Hirsch that inspired the Committee’s establishment in the first place. Therefore, in the spirit of completeness, we felt it important to include a modified Vassar Circle option for consideration.

Another output of our process is an additional set of recommendations, found in Section V below. These recommendations emerged during our discussions, analysis, and input from both guests who presented to us, as well as from guests who attended our open meetings as observers. Because they are outside the scope of our charter, we did not pursue them in great depth. However, we have included the ones we deemed important for the Town Council to pursue.

We realize that the Town Council has a wide range of responsibilities, this activity being only one of many. We also realize that, perhaps, the Council may not have as much expertise in some of the actions being recommended by the Committee. As such, several on the Committee, if requested, would extend our volunteer service to the town as advisors, if you decide to pursue some of these actions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we received many requests from Town residents and other interested parties to participate in a discussion of the options. We did not feel it was under our purview to engage the public in a debate of the options before the Town Council had the opportunity to review the output of our work and to decide whether any further study and debate should be undertaken. That being said, we feel very strongly that the public should be engaged in
some type of activity where they can participate in consideration of the options. Mr. Khalifa and Mr. Kraus have significant expertise engaging stakeholders with varied, and sometimes extremely conflicting, opinions. They note that well-designed and facilitated sessions frequently result in even better outcomes than were originally envisioned. In addition, the process serves to create consensus that may not have existed before, and perhaps engagement and assistance in execution. They have offered to bring resources to assist in the event the Town Council decides to move forward.

IV. Recommendation
Our top recommendation is to focus on improving the value of the Tulane and Oberlin properties. We developed three options to accomplish this.

• Option 1: Improve Existing Real Estate
  o Description
    ▪ In this scenario, the Town would not buy or sell any land but would focus on maximizing the use of its existing real estate ownership. In particular, the Town would focus on maximizing parking revenue on the Tulane/Oberlin lots by improving the lease with the Irish Inn, and also pursue alternatives to the existing street parking, which could improve traffic and address the Irish Inn’s parking needs. The Town could also pursue parking revenue options that do not conflict with the primarily evening use by the Irish Inn. And, finally, the Town should consider review the level of fees charged for rental of the Town Hall.
  o Possible Actions
    ▪ Consider eliminating public/Glen Echo Park use of street parking to free up more spaces for use by a paying user
    ▪ Renegotiate Irish Inn parking lease, which may include expanding the available parking area to reduce the need for valet parking due to size constraints, thereby improving what the Irish Inn could afford to pay in rent
    ▪ Conduct study of cost of renting other similar properties, and evaluate if fees should increase for use of Town Hall.
  o Benefits/Risks
    ▪ The key benefits would be improved annual revenue for the Town and perhaps an improved parking situation on Oberlin/Tulane
    ▪ Key risks are modest; they include: (a) the risk to the Town of owning land that is not zoned for its highest and best use, and (b) the potential financial impact to the Irish Inn which may, in extreme circumstances, lead to its closing. Many residents consider the Inn a valuable retail amenity they would like to retain.
  o Impact to financial reserve (net gain, loss and how much)
    ▪ TBD. Revenue from the existing parking lease is very low at $300/month and future revenue could be multiples of that amount in the best outcomes.
Similarly, income from Town Hall rental is relatively modest and could be increased.

- Costs to execute plan
  - Minimal: essentially people’s time and legal bills to negotiate and draft an updated lease, along with potentially some design and/or construction costs for a larger parking lot.

- Option 2: Rezone Tulane/Oberlin properties, sell one
  - Description
    - This scenario is based on the assumption that the properties, as R-60 (residential) are not worth as much to the Town from a financial perspective as they could be if rezoned. In addition, their zoned use is not consistent with the increasingly commercial uses in the immediate area. The recommended approach is that the Town engage in an effort to rezone the land of Tulane/Oberlin for commercial use. Rezoning does take time and money, and the likelihood of success is not guaranteed. The Committee recommends that, once re-zoned, the Town should sell one of the two lots using the proceeds to pay the costs of rezoning. This will net approximately $400K (for Town reserves) to the Town and prepare the 2nd lot for sale at a higher value if that is ever needed. Appendix I provides a detailed analysis of rezoning options and potential financial gains.
    - Note: this option could be done in parallel with Option 1, above.

- Possible Actions
  - Engage consultants and brokers to get more detailed cost/benefit assumptions
  - Potentially market the property for sale of one lot after a successful re-zone
  - Have preliminary conversations with Montgomery County to understand likelihood of success
  - Request town resident feedback of any opposition prior to beginning a process
  - Conduct the re-zone process
  - Complete the sale of one lot upon successful re-zone

- Benefits/Risks
  - The benefit of this option is that it improves the value of the property which the Town can choose to sell if and when desired/needed. (Analysis estimates that property value would increase by approximately $200K by re-zoning it for commercial use).
  - The commercial zoning would be consistent with the adjoining uses of other buildings on Tulane and Oberlin, and consequently makes the sites easier to sell quickly. Further, from an urban planning perspective, the commercial rezoning signals the Town’s desire for a focused commercial use of all properties along Tulane and Oberlin.
  - This option alleviates concerns by the Park Service about this property being sold for residential use.
• Assuming the Town sells one site upon re-zoning, the sale provides funds for the Town’s reserves.
• The key risks relate to the time needed to complete the rezoning, as well as the risk associated with selling one of the two properties, i.e., whether it can be sold in a timely fashion, and for a price attractive to the Town. Also, the attempt to obtain re-zoning, while unlikely, could be unsuccessful. This option has the highest at-risk expense for the Town, and therefore the Town should put in substantial upfront work prior to spending re-zoning money. These include:
  • Negotiating with architects, civil engineers, zoning attorneys, and any other necessary consultants upfront to fully understand potential cost of re-zoning the property. The committee has been assuming $100k.
  • Consider obtaining multiple broker opinions of value to understand in greater detail that value increase from re-zoning
  • Potentially bid the lot to future owners, conditioned upon the town achieving a re-zone, and requiring and upfront deposit from a future owner prior to beginning a re-zone process
  • Hiring a development consultant to oversee the process for the Town Council

  o Impact to financial reserve (net gain, loss and how much)
    • Initial financial outlay of up to $100,000, net proceeds to Town of approximately $400K.

  o Costs to execute plan
    • $100,000 (recovered once sale of one of the two properties is sold)

• Option 3: Rezone and sell both lots of Tulane/Oberlin
  o Description
    • Engage with a developer to rezone and sell both lots of Tulane/Oberlin and net $900K for the Towns reserves. Appendix I provides a detailed analysis of rezoning options and potential financial gains.

  o Possible Actions
    • Identify and negotiate with developer to either buy the properties outright, or do a delayed sale, in which the developer pays the cost of the re-zoning and purchases the land at a favorable rate.

  o Benefits/Risks
    • This approach minimizes financial risk to the Town, because the developer pays for the cost.
    • Unless the Town were able to obtain more on-street parking for evening use by the Inn at Glen Echo, the sale of both lots to a third party could present significant impacts to the parking for the Irish Inn.
This option could provide significant funds for major Town initiatives (such as purchasing lots on Vassar if they are still available, and/or major renovations to Town Hall to make it a higher-end venue that could result in ability to charge more for events such as parties, wedding receptions, etc.)

- Impact to financial reserve (net gain, loss and how much)
  - Ultimately depends on final price of purchased and sold land, but could be up to $900K if both lots are sold

- Costs to execute plan
  - Minimal.

Once a decision is made about the Tulane and Vassar properties and implementation has begun, the Town would be in the process of securing resources to purchasing green space on a portion of Vassar Circle (not all), if deemed to be in the best interest of the Town.

- Description
  - 2 Vassar Circle was recently approved for subdivision into 4 lots by a real estate investor/developer (Aaron Hirsch). Mr. Hirsch has suggested that he could sell all or some of Vassar Circle to the Town. A sale would have to take place prior to the construction of the new homes, however once construction of homes begins on each of the lots, the opportunity would no longer exist.
  - Any land purchased on Vassar Circle could be used as additional Town common space and/or green space for functions like: Town gatherings/parties/cookouts, community gardens, outdoor play areas for children, resident events, and more.
  - Depending on what the Town chooses to do with the Tulane/Oberlin lots, sale proceeds from Tulane/Oberlin may be sufficient proceeds to purchase one or more lots on Vassar Circle for this use.
  - Regardless of the perceived cost of purchasing space on Vassar Circle, the Town Council should first ask itself if there is any interest in the Town owning land in that location. If so, the Town Council should then ask itself what amount of money it would be willing/able to spend to achieve that objective. And lastly, if initial conversations with the owner were to stall, it would still be beneficial for the Town to know what it would want and be able to do, as alternative pricing/structures may present themselves down the road and the Town should be able to act quickly if an opportunity presents itself.

- Possible Actions
  - Initiate the sale of some or all of the Tulane/Oberlin lots
  - Negotiate with Mr. Hirsch to purchase a portion of Vassar Circle after the subdivision is completed, the existing structure is demolished, and other requirements to begin construction of green space are completed.
• Work with Town residents to identify most desired uses for this centrally located outdoor space, and plan for ultimate construction of that use, ideally using proceeds from the land sales at Tulane/Oberlin

  o Benefits/Risks

  ▪ A key benefit is the additional outdoor space for use by residents in this part of the Town. Further, such a step preserves a portion of the circle for public use, at least until such time that the Town needs to sell the site.
  ▪ Lower housing density on Vassar Circle may help alleviate resident concerns that were raised during the subdivision process.
  ▪ Preservation of part of the circle for public use as originally intended, prior to construction and likely never having the opportunity again (particularly as the number of potential sites for Town use continues to decrease).
  ▪ A key risk is that the financial investment in Vassar Circle would reduce cash available for other uses.
  ▪ Lower housing density on Vassar Circle may help alleviate resident concerns that were raised during the subdivision process.
  ▪ Ownership of a subdivided residential lot on Vassar Circle is likely more liquid than lots on Tulane/Oberlin.
  ▪ The required sale of Tulane/Oberlin to purchase lots on Vassar Circle may impact the Town’s ability to address parking needs in the area.
  ▪ Potential closing of the Irish Inn if both lots are sold and parking for Irish Inn patrons is negatively impacted.
  ▪ Once these Vassar Circle lots are established as open space, the Town may face significant resistance from some Town residents if it needs to sell them in the future.

  o Impact to financial reserve (net gain, loss and how much)

  ▪ Ultimately depends on final price of purchased and sold land, as well as final construction costs of the Town plan. The Advisory Committee could work with the Town to create best outcome.

  o Costs to execute plan

  ▪ Purchase of one lot may cost of $600-700,000 based on informal conversations with Mr. Hirsch, plus the cost to construct green space, and longer term upkeep. One option to keep maintenance fees low is to establish a committee of Town residents who would volunteer to maintain the green space.
V. Additional Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1: Establish Routine Capital Budget.** In order to help ensure financial stability, Town should develop, and periodically update (perhaps annually or every two years), a five or ten year capital needs plan of project costs, such as roads, Town Hall repair, roof replacement, etc. This then should create an annual allocation in the budget that goes towards capital expenses to set up the fund to pay for those anticipated expenses. Currently the budget is a bit ad hoc. Those things are covered out of savings/reserves and budgeted on annual basis, but don’t appear to be budgeted further than a year or two out.
  - The Town should evaluate all Town Hall systems (HVAC, elevator, etc.) and put them on maintenance/repair schedule, per Recommendation 1. (a consultant can likely help the Town with this for a cost of under $10k)
  - Town should consider forecasting a refresh/update of the Town Hall. Put money aside each year so that after several years portions of the Town Hall can be updated on a rotating schedule.

- **Recommendation 2: Develop a strategic vision for the town.** Several Committee members, as well as guests (both observers and invited guests) observed that the decisions were made more difficult in the absence of a vision for the Town. Questions such as what type of community we would like to be; how we envision commercial activity in our town (beyond that which currently exists in the Tulane/Oberlin areas); what amenities are most important to our citizens; what size our town hall really needs to be, etc. could be very beneficial in matters such as this. In addition, a strategic vision will assist any rezoning process.

- **Recommendation 3: Work proactively with the Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture on their Master Plan.** Our guests included three representatives from the Partnership who shared they had begun developing a long term Master Plan for the Park. They are very interested in working cooperatively with Glen Echo as they develop this plan. They too, are concerned about parking; ensuring the long term viability of the commercial businesses nearby, including the Irish Inn; and the attractiveness of the Park as an amenity for local residents.

- **Recommendation 4: Get clean documents on Tulane/Oberlin.** As noted before, these lots in many cases are “land bank” for the Town. Presently the exact status of the lots is not clear in County records and we recommend now would be the time to clean up the records so that when/if the land needs to be transacted, it can do so expeditiously. On tax records, Tulane/Oberlin properties shows six separate parcels. On the County’s zoning map, they are shown as two lots, one being an “L” shape. While the town attorney, Mr. Ron Bolt, advises that there appears to have been no formal re-subdivision of the lots

---

10 See Appendix K
11 See Appendix O for a letter from the Partnership
12 See Appendices G, P, H for the reference records from Montgomery County as well as the original deed for this property.
(according to land records), and the lots remain as six separate parcels as shown on the tax map, the existence of another configuration (as depicted on the zoning map) at a minimum, causes confusion. We recommend they be replatted to be two lots, one comprising the three lots that abut Tulane Avenue and the other comprising the three lots that abut Oberlin.

- **Recommendation 5:** Set aside sums in annual budget to put towards rezoning Tulane/Oberlin to commercial use. Even if Town decides for “status quo” we would recommend the Town consider rezoning Tulane/Oberlin so that should the Town need to sell the land to raise money in an emergency, it will be able to get maximum value for the land. The land is not as valuable as currently zoned residential. The costs of this are depicted in the scenarios mentioned earlier. We believe that Town could potentially realize revenue from parking or Town Hall events to help raise the funds to cover this rezoning. (However, this recommendation does depend on the Town’s vision for the parcels. If the Town does not envision a circumstance in which they would be sold and wishes to see them remain as open space, their current zoning is indeed appropriate).

- **Recommendation 6:** Explore increasing parking around Tulane/Oberlin. Today a substantial parking shortage exists in this area, because of high demand from customers and employees of various businesses and guests/employees of Glen Echo Park. An initial high-level study\(^\text{13}\) shows that one possibility for this area would be to change the road to one-way and to potentially stripe 45 degree parking around the roads. This would potentially increase street parking from 28 spaces to about 40.

\(^{13}\) See Appendix R for the complete analysis
• **Recommendation 7:** Explore adding parking restrictions/enforcement on Tulane/Oberlin to improve access/use for Glen Echo businesses.

  o One scenario is to explore contracting out meters and enforcement for street parking on Tulane/Oberlin. As mentioned earlier, parking is a problem with guests of the park frequently occupying valuable spaces needed for Glen Echo businesses. The Town could consider metering these roads under a contract with the County and setting hours to be friendly to businesses with Glen Echo; businesses could provide passes/validation for their clients. The Town would not be required to pay for the meters or enforce them, under a County-sanctioned plan. However, Town can set criteria, days/times, and any exceptions.

  o A second scenario is to simply stripe/sign a portion of the area as being permit parking, for Glen Echo residents and Visitors to Glen Echo Businesses. This approach would entail designation of a permit parking zone and citation enforcement, with possible towing. Citation enforcement would have to be conducted by the Town, or an agreement for enforcement would need to be negotiated with the County. Businesses could be given windshield passes to signal tow truck not to tow.

**VI. Appendices**

A. Committee Charter
B. Committee Members
C. Fred/Case Design report dated Oct 3, 2017
D. Roof estimate, Katchmark, dated October 18, 2017
E. Roof estimate, McFarland Woods, dated October 13, 2017
F. Roof estimate, Fred/Case design, dated September 28, 2017
G. Plat Book for Glen Echo, 1891 Source: MONTGOMERY COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT (Plat Book) Plat Book B, pp. 16-17, MSA_C2139_72. Date available 1891. Printed 01/16/2017.
H. Parking lease with the Irish Inn
I. Proposal from McFarland Woods for demolition of the current structure on Vassar Circle, including site work and an option for the required road improvements
J. Proposal from Tamal Demolition for demolition of the current structure on Vassar Circle, including site work
K. Guests
L. Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale Analysis, completed by Cris White (committee member)
N. Ranked options spreadsheet
O. Letter from Bob Reaves, President of Glen Echo Park Partnership for the Arts and Culture, dated October 19, 2017
Q. Tax Map Source: [http://sdat.dat.maryland.gov/RealProperty/Pages/default.aspx](http://sdat.dat.maryland.gov/RealProperty/Pages/default.aspx)
R. Parking Analysis, completed by Shannon Kraus (committee member)
S. Summary cost/revenue tables
Committee Charter

Committee to Evaluate Town Real Estate Assets and Potential Swap with Hirsch

- Committee Goal: provide objective business, financial and legal analysis and advice to the Mayor and Town Council to help them better understand the current and potential value of the Town’s existing real estate assets.
- Committee Purview:
  - Analysis and advice to inform the Town’s decisions about its assets, concerning the potential real estate acquisition or swap proposed by Aaron Hirsch and potential related alternatives, and matters related thereto; help the Town of Glen Echo determine the best outcome for all residents in both short- and long-run scenarios.
  - Recommend options/alternatives to each of Hirsch’s pieces of his proposal
  - Minimize costs to the Town in whatever options are offered
  - Evaluate the two empty lots on the North side of Town behind the Irish Inn, the Town Hall, and Vassar Circle and the building (church) in question, this would include details of time and expense to Town if changed from R60 zone as it is now to Multi-Use zoning
- Committee make up:
  - Five members/residents
  - Two non-residents to ensure objective perspectives.
  - Expertise in real estate, business and financial management
  - Willing to set aside time to walk properties and work on a volunteer basis.
  - Meet several times to develop recommendations before the end of August.
  - Meetings must comply with appropriate legal and regulatory requirements related to transparency (the Maryland Open Meetings Act). Meeting minutes will be kept when there is a quorum (3 or more members).
  - Hirsch will be invited to make a formal presentation to group.
  - Select residents to meet with group to offer perspectives.
  - Town attorney, Ron Bolt, to attend most if not all discussions.
- Committee meeting schedule:
  - Email to established advisory group: done
  - Town Council votes to establish group: done
  - Establish Committee: done by Mayor
  - First Closed Meeting: July 12
  - Second Closed Meeting: TBD
  - Third Closed Meeting: TBD
  - Fourth Closed Meeting: TBD
  - Open Session Presentation: TBD
Appendix B: Committee Members

• **Leon Chatelain**
  With extensive architectural and planning experience spanning five decades, Leon Chatelain has focused on educational, residential, and institutional projects in the Mid-Atlantic region and overseas. His work includes campus master planning, feasibility studies, and design for new projects as well as historic properties. Leon has achieved a distinguished reputation as a leader of the 21st Century Learning Environments. He has served on the Board of Directors for National Easter Seal Society, National Center for a Barrier-Free Environment, AIA/Washington Chapter, Sustainable Buildings Industry Council, and other organizations. Leon graduated from the Rhode Island School of Design with a B-Arch degree and resides in Bethesda.

• **Alexis Feringa**
  Alexis has been a Glen Echo resident since 2002. She and her husband have two kids, Renz and Gevvie, as well as an awesome black lab mix, Zoey. She currently owns her own business providing leadership and team coaching as well as facilitation and consulting services. Her clients are leaders in Fortune 50 companies, law firms, consulting companies, and non-profit organizations. Prior to this, she spent more than 20 years at Booz Allen Hamilton. She had P&L responsibility for professional services businesses across Intelligence Community, Department of Defense, and Civil Agency clients.

• **Karim Khalifa**
  Karim has a broad range of experience in Program/Project Management in the areas of electric power production, water, wastewater, and complex buildings. Karim uses his business expertise to balance quality, schedule, and budgets. He has been responsible for projects from $1m to $250M of investment and is skillful in incorporating design, operational needs and new technologies into projects by establishing processes that solicit input from stakeholders at the critical phases of a project.

• **Shannon Kraus**
  Focused on innovation around community health and well-being, Shannon is passionate about teaming with clients to shape strategies and projects that leverage architecture and design thinking to positively impact their missions, and the communities they serve. With over 20 years of planning and design experience, Shannon has been an integral part of the development of health facilities, neighborhoods, and communities throughout the United States and abroad on projects of all sizes in scope. Currently, Shannon is a thought leader with the AIA’s multi-disciplinary Design Health Leadership Group, which is task to empower architects to enhance human health through the power of design in all building types.
• **Christian Miles**  
Christian is a native of Washington, DC. He had a 30 year career in commercial real estate finance with The Prudential Insurance Company and with Cassidy Turley (now Cushman & Wakefield). He has been an adjunct professor at U-MD School of Real Estate Development. He is currently self-employed in the investment business.

• **Willem Polak (Liaison to Town Council)**  
Willem has been in the riverboat business for 45 years, starting as the CEO of the Potomac Boat Tours Company in 1972, through today as consultant to the Potomac Riverboat Company. As a small business owner operating a concession on the Potomac River, he brings a wealth of financial, business, and community and government engagement experience. He has held leadership positions in a host of educational, non-profit, and community organizations. Willem has lived in Glen Echo with his wife Cathie since 1980. They’ve raised three children, two of whom also live in Town. He was elected Mayor of Glen Echo in 2017.

• **Cris White**  
Cris focuses on existing project acquisitions in the Washington, DC Metro Area and has been directly involved in approximately $1B total capitalization to date. He has 12 years of professional experience in commercial real estate, finance, and consulting in New York and Washington, DC. Prior to joining MRP Realty, Cris worked at H/2 Capital Partners in Stamford, CT where he focused on new investments and risk management of debt securities backed by assets across the United States, Canada, and London. He sits on the Board of Directors for the Montgomery College Foundation and is a Trustee of the Jerome and Grace H. Murray Foundation. Cris and his wife Anna, have three children and have been residents of Glen Echo since 2011.
Appendix C: Fred/Case Design Building Assessment

Project Name:
Willem Polak
6106 Harvard Ave
Glen Echo, MD 20812
703-684-0581
703-675-7830
wpolak@potomacriverboatco.com

Date: 10/03/2017

Consultant: Joe Rocco

BUILDING ASSESSMENT

HVAC
- (3) air conditioning units were replaced in 2007 (5-10 more years life expectancy).
- (2) furnaces were replaced in 2015 (13-18 more years life expectancy).
- Furnace should be cleaned every 2 years.
- Should have an annual inspection of air condition units.
- See MP Energy service agreement attached.

Electrical
- After visual inspection of the electrical panel, sub panel, and building, AR Electrical Solution Inc. found that no circuits are overloaded, everything looks to be in good working condition.

Roof
- After visual inspection of the roof, and gutters, Roof Solutions found that the shingles are in brittle condition and towards the end of their life span. Roof should be replaced in the next 5 years.
- See Roof proposal attached.
Appendix D: Proposal from Katchmark

Proposal Submitted To: William Polak-Glen Echo Town Hall 6106 Harvard Avenue Glen Echo, MD 20812 703-675-0581

Work To Be Performed At: SAME

• Tear off the existing (2) layers of shingles down to the wood sheathing.
• Inspect the roofing sheathing and replace rotted sheathing per the “Extras” section below.
• Furnish and install GAF WeatherWatch ice and water guard along eaves, chimney, and penetrations.
• Furnish and install #30 roof felt on remainder of sheathing.
• Furnish and install White aluminum drip edge along the eaves at the gutters.
• Furnish and install (5) vent pipe collars on all vent pipes.
• Furnish and install GAF Pro Start Starter shingles along the eaves.
• Furnish and install GAF Timberline HD Architectural Lifetime shingles using correct fastening patterns with electrogala
vanzied plated roofing nails at 1 1/4” in length. Color: ______________
• Furnish and install aluminum step and apron flashing on the walls.
• Furnish and install aluminum flashing on the chimney.
• Furnish and install GAF Snow Country ridge vent to ensure proper air exhaust ventilation.
• Furnish and install GAF Seal-a-Ridge hip and ridge shingles along the ridgelines.
• Clean and tighten the existing gutters.
• Clean and remove all job related debris. Sweep property with magnet for loose nails.

Total discounted installed price: $11,485.00

OPTION: Furnish and install ½” OSB exterior plywood over the existing wood sheathing.
COST: $5,793.00 ________

*GAF Golden Pledge 25 Year Workmanship and Lifetime Material Warranty*

A permit is necessary to commence work, Katchmark will be responsible for permit costs.

Any alterations or deviation from above specification involving extra costs, will be executed only upon written orders, and will become an extra charge over and above the estimate. All agreements contingent upon strikes, accidents or delays beyond our control and such events do not constitute abandonment and are not included in calculating time frames for payment or performance. Owner to carry fire, tornado and other necessary insurance upon above work. Note: To exclude wood as listed below.

Respectfully submitted by: Client Contract

Note: This proposal may be withdrawn by us if not accepted within 30 days. If this agreement was solicited at a residence and you do not want the goods or services, you the customer may cancel this transaction at any time prior to midnight of the third business day after the date of this transaction. See attached notice of cancellation form for an explanation of this right. Customer acknowledges that he has been provided with and read the Department of Professional and Occupation Regulation Statement of Consumer Protections available to him through the Board for Contractors

Est. Start Date: 2-3 Weeks Est. Completion From Start: 3-4 Days

There is a FIVE year warranty on all workmanship from Katchmark Construction, Inc.

PAYMENT TERMS: TOTAL: $

DEPOSIT: 1/3 deposit upon acceptance $

Balance upon completion of the work $

Deposit made by: Check: # Credit Card Type: □ Visa □ MC □ Amex □ Discover Exp. Date: / Card # ________

ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL: The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work as specified. Payment will be made as outlined above. If payment is not made when due, interest shall accrue on the outstanding balance at a rate of 1.5% per month and Katchmark shall be entitled to all costs of collection, includes reasonable attorney’s fees. Please see reverse side of this proposal for terms and conditions.

Date: _________________________ Signature: __________

3856 A Dullas South Ct. VA Lic #2705 045188A
Chantilly, VA 20151 MD Lic #120331
Tel: (703) 817-0200 DC Lic Lic#70101956
Fax: (703) 817-1175 DC Lic #40006359
www.katchmark.com

More than just a roof over your head.

Date: 10/18/17

EXTRAS:
If necessary, Slat decking: 1x6 or 1x8 to be replaced and charged at a rate of $8.00 per foot. 1x10 or 1x12 to be replaced and charged at a rate of $10.00 per foot. Plywood Sheathing: CDX will be replaced and charged at $60.00 per sheet. FRT will be replaced and charged at $80.00 per sheet. Any additional layers found will be charged at a rate of $30.00 per square. Flat Roofing: Any additional layers will be charged at a rate of $100.00 per square. Fascia Replacement: Primed board up to 6” will be charged at a rate of $9.00 per foot. Over 6” will be charged at a rate of $12.00 per foot.

There is a FIVE year warranty on all workmanship from Katchmark Construction, Inc.
Appendix E:
Proposal from McFarland Woods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Glen Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Willem Polak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6106 Harvard Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Echo, MD 20812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Markup</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.08 Roofin...</td>
<td>Remove existing 1 layer of Asphalt shingles. Install new Certainteed lifetime shingles to roof. Color T.B.D. This estimate includes all labor and materials including flashing work and new metal drip cap at eaves. Underlayment installed on entire roof with ice and water shield installed at eaves.</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,375.00</td>
<td>32,375.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.08 Roofin...</td>
<td>Removal and installation of new 6&quot; white aluminum gutters (k-style) including 4&quot; downspouts tied to existing drains and or splash blocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.16 Trash ...</td>
<td>Trash Removal (Dumpsters) Contractor will provide dumpster for trash removal and is responsible for all cleanup!!</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $28,925.00
Appendix F: Proposal from Fred/Case

CONTRACT

fredSM, a Division of CASE® DESIGN/REMODELING, INC.
4701 Sangamore Rd., Bethesda, Md. 20816
701 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va. 22046
1327 14th Street NW, Ste. 200 Washington, DC 20005
1(800) 566-9373

DC License #2242   MD License #1176   VA License# 039723A

Date: 09/28/2017

Project Name: Willem Polak
6106 Harvard Ave
Glen Echo, MD 20812
703-684-0581
703-675-7830
wpolak@potomacriverboatco.com

Consultant: Joe Rocco

This will be your THIRD project with fredSM and Case®.

The following is a CONTRACT for material and labor to be supplied by the contractor at the request and order of the homeowner. We hereby propose to perform remodeling and/or repair at the above-mentioned premises per the following descriptions, scope, specifications, allowances, exclusions and general conditions.

Owner provided records indicate this House was built before 1978 and lead paint may be present. This Contract does not call for the disturbance of windows, doors, more than 6sf of interior paint and/or more than 20sf of exterior paint and is therefore exempt from EPA lead paint regulations. No work associated with compliance with the EPA Renovation, Repair, and Painting Rule has been included.

Scope of Work

Area 1: Town Center Roof Replacement

- Provide site and dust protection, as necessary, to prevent the migration of dust.
- Remove existing shingles down to the wood decking and haul away daily.
- Inspect all wood decking for rot or damage, if upon inspection we do find damage additional cost will be presented.
- Furnish and install smart ridge II shingle-over ridge ventilation on all peaks from end to end and install shingle over intake vents.
- Furnish and install rubberized ice & water shield to the gutter line and flashings.
- Furnish and install aluminum drip edge along all gutter lines.
- Furnish and install aluminum flashings at all walls, and chimneys.
- Furnish and install neoprene pipe collars at all vent pipes and paint.
- Furnish and install Duration asphalt shingles.
- Remove 300+- linear feet of gutters and downspouts and haul away.
- Inspect fascia boards for damage, if upon inspection we do find damage additional cost will be presented.
- Install 200 linear feet of aluminum gutters and downspouts.
- Haul away all job related debris.

Work to start approximately the week of: 11/06/2017, and will be substantially completed approximately the week of: 11/10/2017.

Note: Start and completion dates are subject to the delivery of materials, weather, permitting, any Owner supplied items, material selections and the General Conditions which follow. In the event this contract is not executed within 3 business days of presentation, these dates are subject to change.

Payment Schedule

The total cost of the above work, complete in accordance with the above specifications is: $48,542.85

Note: Due to fluctuations in material costing and commitments with suppliers and subcontractors, the contract sum can only be guaranteed for 30 business days after presentation. Contracts executed after this time are subject to adjustments in pricing. Further, any items on an Options List are available to the Owner only until the actual start of construction without change. Payment is due and payable immediately on the date upon which the following occur. Interest shall thereupon accrue at 1-1/2 percent per month:
Project Name: Willem Polak
6106 Harvard Ave
Glen Echo, MD 20812
703-684-0581
703-675-7830
wpolak@potomacriverboatco.com

Consultant: Joe Rocco

1. Signing Draw: $ 16,180.95
2. Start of Work: $ 16,180.95
3. Substantial Completion of Work: $ 16,180.95

Note: “Substantial Completion” as defined herein, is the date upon which the work is sufficiently complete in accordance with the Contract so that the Owner can occupy or utilize the Work or designated portion thereof, for the use for which it is intended. Notice of substantial completion will be provided to the Owner in the form of an invoice less twice the value of unfinished details, if any. Upon completion of unfinished details, Owner(s) will be presented with a final bill. The Owner(s) shall make this final payment within ten (10) days from date of the invoice. **Note: fredSM and Case® do not accept Credit Card charges totaling more than $4,000 per project.**
Appendix G: Plat Book for Glen Echo
Appendix H: Parking Lease with Irish Inn

TOWN OF GLEN ECHO

PARKING LOT LICENSE

This License is issued by the Town of Glen Echo, a municipal corporation located in Montgomery County, Maryland ("Licensor"), acting through its duly authorized Town Council, to Ballymahon Corporation d/b/a The Irish Inn, 6119 Tulane Avenue, Glen Echo, Maryland 20812, and to Clon Chullen Corporation, (collectively "Licensee").

Licensor is the owner of certain property on Tulane Avenue in the Town of Glen Echo, a portion of which is vacant and suitable for use as a parking facility, the location and dimensions of which are described more fully in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof (the "Property").

Licensee, Ballymahon, mailing address 6119 Tulane Avenue, Glen Echo, Maryland 20812, is a Maryland Corporation which operates a restaurant, d/b/a The Irish Inn at the above address and Clon Chullen is a Maryland Corporation, mailing address 6119 Tulane Avenue, Glen Echo, Maryland 20812, which owns the building in which The Irish Inn is located. Licensee desires to use the Property for the purpose of automobile parking associated with Licensee’s business, i.e., The Irish Inn.

This License is therefore issued, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Licensor grants to Licensee the right to use the Property for automobile parking in accordance with the terms and conditions of this License.
2. Licensee agrees to pay to Licensor a monthly license fee of TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS ($250) to be paid when this License is accepted and then, without request, each succeeding month on the same date of the month.

3. The License may be terminated by either Licensor or Licensee for any reason upon giving at least ninety (90) days written notice. In addition, this License may be terminated by Licensor upon at least thirty (30) days written notice to Licensee of a breach of any term or condition of this License. Upon termination, the Property shall be restored to its original condition, by the Licensee, unless otherwise specified in writing by the Licensor.

4. Licensor shall in no way be responsible for loss of or damage to any property belonging to or rented by Licensee, its officers, servants, agents, or employees or invitees, that may be stolen, destroyed or in any way damaged during the period of this License, and Licensee agrees to indemnify Licensor, its officers, agents, servants and employees from and against any and all such claims.

5. Licensee agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend Licensor, its officers, agents, servants and employees against any claims or suits for property loss or damage and/or personal injury, including death, relating to Licensee's use of the Property; and Licensee assumes all liability and responsibility of Licensor, its officers, agents, servants and employees for those suits or claims. Licensee shall likewise indemnify Licensor for any injury or damage to the Property arising out of Licensee's use of the Property.

6. Licensee agrees to furnish Licensor with a certificate of insurance as proof that it has secured and paid for a policy of public liability insurance covering all public
risks related to the use or maintenance of the Property. The insurance policy shall name Licensor as an additional insured and shall provide, in the event of cancellation or change, that such cancellation or change shall not become effective until twenty (20) days after licensor has received written notice from the insurance company(s). The amounts of that insurance shall not be less than ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) for property damage, personal injury or death, per occurrence, and an additional ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) in umbrella coverage. Parking operations under this License may not commence prior to delivery to Licensor of proof of the prescribed insurance. Licensee understands and agrees that such insurance amounts may be revised upward at Licensor’s option, and that Licensee will so revise such amounts with thirty (30) days following notice to Licensee of those requirements.

7. The Property shall be used exclusively for staff parking and valet customer parking for The Irish Inn. No fees may be charged by Licensee for such parking. Licensee will control vehicle access to the Property with a chain across the sole vehicular entrance to and exit from the Property, on Tulane Avenue. The chain will be kept secured across the driveway whenever not in use, but need not be lock-operated. Licensee shall maintain the Property in good repair and clean presentable condition. Licensee shall prevent accumulation of dirt, paper or trash of any kind on the Property.

8. The hours of operation of the parking lot shall be from 10:00 a.m. until 1:00 a.m., Tuesday through Sunday. Licensee, upon written request to and written authorization, from Licensor, may modify the hours of operation. Customers of Licensee will not be allowed to self-park on the Property.
9. Licensor reserves the right to exclusive use of the Property for three days per year, upon reasonable notice to Licensee. Such use may or may not be on consecutive days. If Licensor exercises this option, a pro rata portion of the annual license fee shall be refunded to Licensee.

10. Before commencement of parking operations, Licensee, at its expense, shall have a sufficient number of truckloads of gravel covered with woodchips deposited outside the approximately 36' X 36' blacktop portion of the Property (whose overall dimensions are approximately 60' X 78') to stabilize those unpaved surfaces for vehicle parking as set forth on Exhibit A. Licensee shall touch-up or repave the blacktop and add to the gravel and woodchips, from time to time, so as to maintain the suitability of the Property for vehicle parking. Licensee, at its expense, as set forth in Exhibit A, shall also landscape the area used for parking, with all plantings installed within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this License, weather permitting. No additional impervious surfaces may be installed on the Property. No sign, fence or other structure may be installed on the Property, except posts for holding the security chain and a sign restricting use to valet parking by Licensee. No other alteration of or addition to the Property may be made by Licensee, except upon written request to and written authorization from Licensor.

11. Licensee's valet parking personnel are to be selected, trained and supervised by Licensee in the safe and efficient operation of valet parking, with particular attention to the need for a quiet, unobtrusive presence during evening hours in a residential neighborhood.
12. Licensee shall operate the parking lot in compliance at all times with this License, and with all laws, statutes, ordinances and regulations now in effect or that may later be adopted.

13. This License is personal to Licensee. It is non-assignable and any attempt to assign this License will terminate the License privileges granted to Licensee hereunder.

14. Licensee agrees that should any action, whether real or asserted, at law or in equity, arise out of the terms of this License, or by Licensee’s operations on the premises, venue for that action shall lie in Montgomery County, Maryland.

15. In any action brought by Licensor for the enforcement of the obligations of Licensee, Licensor also shall be entitled to recover damages, interest and reasonable attorney’s fees.

In witness, the parties have acknowledged issuance and acceptance of this License on February 5, 2004.

TOWN OF GLEN ECHO
LICENSED

By: Debbie Beers, Mayor
Town of Glen Echo

BALLYMAHON CORPORATION
LICENSEE

By: Christopher Hughes, Owner

ATTACHMENT: EXHIBIT A

CLON CLULLEN CORPORATION
LICENSEE

By: Christopher Hughes
Appendix I: Proposal from McFarland Woods for demolition of the current structure on Vassar Circle

2 Vassar Circle  
Glen Echo, MD 20812

Demolition and Site Work  
8/08/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>F.O.H</th>
<th>LABOR</th>
<th>SUB CONT.</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>COST+O.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total(s)</td>
<td>$ 2,555.00</td>
<td>$ 1,650.00</td>
<td>$ 94,025.00</td>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
<td>$ 101,730.00</td>
<td><strong>$ 119,682.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Detail</th>
<th>F.O.H</th>
<th>LABOR</th>
<th>SUB CONT.</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 86,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt/safety fence</td>
<td>$ 1,650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing structure demo and debris removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 58,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation work (entire site brought to grade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt removal if necessary billed seperately at a rate of $350.00 per load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of asphalt parking lot (including environmental fees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpster for daily trash cleanup</td>
<td>$ 1,650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable toilet</td>
<td>$ 250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 11,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of underground oil storage tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer and water cut and capped (WSSC fees to be assessed and billed separately)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Power Pole (includes Pepco fees)</td>
<td>$ 655.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,275.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>F.O.H</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Sub Cont.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost+O.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Work/Street Widening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey work to layout new street perimeters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6,500.00</td>
<td>$ 6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asphalt Street Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill 1/2 of Vassar circle, extend to new width and top coat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 38,480.00</td>
<td>$ 38,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Alternate costs (not part of this total cost/needs added)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill entire street in addition to only 1/2 - Includes top coat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 24,660.00</td>
<td>$ 24,660.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J:
Proposal from Tammal Demolition

Proposal

#17 TTG 428
DATE: August 14th, 2017
EMAIL: bshipp@sunrolloff.com

CLIENT: Sun Services
ATTN: Brian Shipp
PROJECT: Glen Echo Church Demo

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Tammal will provide all professional services, including licensed supervision and labors accompanied by materials, and equipment to Remove the existing building in Glen Echo, MD. This work will be performed in accordance with all applicable State of Maryland, EPA, and OSHA regulations.

- **General Conditions:**
  - Provide Demolition work plan
  - Hauling
  - Non-Scale
  - Provide Construction fence during duration of demolition project
  - Provide Raze/Demolition permit
  - Recover HVAC CFC’s prior to demolition

- **Disconnections:**
  - Provide notices to Electric, Gas, and Communications
  - F&I Water/Sewer abandonments per WSSC code

- **Erosion Control:**
  - F&I Standard silt fence around perimeter
  - F&I 1 Construction entrance
    - wash rack not included
  - F&I Final Seed and Straw for stabilization
  - F&I 4 IP’s

- **Hazardous Materials Removal:**
  - Allowance

- **Building Demolition:**
  - Removal of the Existing Building including foundations

- **Site Demolition:**
  - Removal of curbs, sidewalks, and pavement

- **Site Grading:**
  - Grade site for positive drainage to the land contour

- **Comments:**
  - Building have been verified

- **Duration:**
  - Based on pass performances this is 5 weeks per building for complete removal

- **EXCLUSIONS:**
  - BONDS/PERMITS UNLESS NOTED
  - TRAFFIC CONTROL
  - UTILITY DISCONNECTIONS/DELAYS UNLESS NOTED
  - UNDISCOVERED/UNLISTED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
  - SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL ENGINEERED DESIGNED PLAN
  - LAND DISTURBANCE/SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PERMITS
  - MASS EXCAVATION/CONTAMINATED SOIL EXCAVATION
  - PROCTORING
  - UTILITY DEMO- REMOVAL OF UNDERGROUND WORK OUTSIDE OF BUILDING FOOTPRINT
  - SEISMIC MONITORING
  - Dewatering/Drainage Systems
  - REPAIRS/ PATCHING/ PREP FOR NEW WORK
COMMENTS CONT.
- ALL UTILITIES WILL BE DISCONNECTED/TAGGED BY TAMMAL PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY DEMOLITION WORK
- TAMMAL TO PROVIDE 811 LOCATION SERVICES PRIOR TO DIGGING
- PRICING BASED OFF CURRENT STEEL ASSET RECOVERY PRICES
- PRICING BASED OFF HAULING RESTRICTIONS
- WATER TO BE SUPPLIED BY TAMMAL FROM NEAREST HYDRANT/BUILDING ACCESS POINT
- TAMMAL TO PROVIDE RESTROOM FACILITIES. TAMMAL CAN PROVIDE RESTROOMS FOR $650/Per MONTH
- ONE MOBILIZATION IS INCLUDED IN THIS PROPOSAL. ADDITIONAL MOBILIZATIONS $1,650.00/Per MACHINE
- INCLUDES OUR STANDARD POLLUTION LIABILITY INSURANCE OF $3,000,000
- A ENGINEERED WORK PLAN STAMPED BY A LICENSE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER BY THE STATE OF MARYLAND IS NOT INCLUDED IN THIS PROPOSAL
- BID CONSIDERATION GOOD FOR 90 DAYS
- CURRENT EMR 0.80

PROPOSED PRICE:

Tammal can perform the proposed scope work as referenced above for the sum of the following:

Building Demolition: $193,000
Allowance: $35,000

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Tyler T. Greene
TAMMAL ENTERPRISES, INC.

Acceptance of bid: The above prices, specifications and conditions are hereby accepted. TAMMAL may proceed with the work as specified. Payment terms outlined above. Any deviations or change orders to this proposal/contract must be in writing; upon authorization work will be performed. All additional work will be added to the original contract and billed as such. This bid proposal when accepted will become the contract or a legal attachment to the contract. Commencement of work will begin after receipt of a ratified contract or bid proposal from an authorized representative of Sun Services and Owner of the property.

Sun Services

Date

Demolishing for Development
Appendix K:
Guests, Date of Appearance Before the Committee
(Organized Alphabetically)

- Debbie Beers, Former Mayor and Town Resident, July 18, 2017
- Katey Boerner, Chris Fromboluti, and Bob Reaves, Glen Echo Park Partnership for the Arts and Culture, October 18, 2017
- Chris Hughes, Owner of the Irish Inn at Glen Echo, August 2, 2017
- Dick Leggin, Owner of Richard Leggin Architects, August 2, 2017
- Aaron Hirsch, Developer of Vassar Circle and Town Resident, August 9, 2017
Appendix I: Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale

Glen Echo Real Estate Committee Writeup - September 2017

This paper is intended to provide guidance to the Glen Echo Town Council with respect to the potential sale of the Oberlin and Tulane lots that are currently owned by the Town of Glen Echo. There are numerous methods the town could use to dispose of these lots, and this white paper is intended to weigh the merits of each method for use by the Town as it evaluates its real estate holdings.

There are three basic methods the Town could use to monetize these assets:
- **Option 1**: Outright sale of one or both lots as currently zoned
- **Option 2**: Re-zone the lots to a more valuable (commercial) zoning, and then sell one or both lots
- **Option 3**: Delayed sale to a developer, who pays for re-zoning the properties at the developer’s cost and risk

To begin to assess the merits of each option the Real Estate Committee created a financial valuation matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options Financial Comparison</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Sale Price</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Taxes</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker Fees</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Zone Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(100,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Cash Proceeds</strong></td>
<td>$715,200</td>
<td>$997,800</td>
<td>$906,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Option 1</td>
<td>$282,600</td>
<td>$191,300</td>
<td>$191,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated $s at Risk for Town</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds $s / $s at Risk</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key assumptions:**
- $400k value / lot as currently zoned
- $600k value / lot after a re-zone
- $100k estimated cost to re-zone the property for commercial use
- Option 3 price is $200k lower than Option 2 to reflect an estimated impact based on a developer taking the re-zoning risk

Please see additional details below with respect to process, timing, pros and cons for each option.
### Option 1

**Process**
- Hire a broker to market the property as currently zoned
- Once a sale contract is signed the buyer would have a short period to study the property (perhaps 20-30 days)
- At that point a buyer would post a non-refundable deposit and proceed towards closing
- The town may need to work with a civil engineer prior to a sale to make sure each lot is properly recorded

**Timing**
- 30 days to select sales broker
- 30 days to market the property
- 30 days to select buyer and sign contract
- 60 days to close sale
- **150 days total estimate (~5 months)**

**Pros**
- Fastest transaction
- Minimal cost risk (essentially only legal dollars to sign a sale contract after property value is well vetted via the marketing process)

**Cons**
- Lowest value
- Current lot layout is somewhat unclear (difference between land records and tax map). Need to vet with zoning counsel if current lots are buildable

### Option 2

**Process**
- Hire an architect, civil engineer, and land use attorney to conduct a re-zone and subdivision of the property
- The goal of the re-zone would be to change the zoning from existing residential to a commercial zoning similar to neighboring properties
- After re-zoning the property, the town could then begin a sale process similar to the process detailed in Option 1

**Timing**
- 30 days to select consultants
- 360 days to re-zone the property
- 30 days to select sales broker
- 30 days to market the property
- 30 days to select buyer and sign contract
- 60 days to close sale
- **540 days total estimate (~18 months)**

**Pros**
- Highest potential net proceeds

**Cons**
- Longest sale process
- Longest process before having a non-refundable deposit (creates time risk with respect to property value)
- Highest cost risk (estimated ~$100k for consultants plus $25k to select a buyer)
- Value risk (Town would not be able to fully vet the market value of the lots until after the re-zone dollars have been spent)

### Option 3

**Process**
- Hire a broker to market the property as a sale upon re-zoning
- Selected developer would pay for re-zone costs and hire all consultants
- Selected developer would post deposit that would be non-refundable should the re-zoning attempt be successful
- Sale within short time period after re-zoning complete

---

38
| Timing                  | - 30 days to select sales broker  
|                        | - 30 days to market the property  
|                        | - 30 days to select buyer and sign contract  
|                        | - 360 days to re-zone the property  
|                        | - 30 days to close sale  
|                        | **480 days total estimate (~16 months)**
| Pros                   | - Second highest potential net proceeds  
|                        | - Same $s at risk as a sale today  
|                        | - Town can receive value from a re-zone without spending the risk dollars  
|                        | - Highest ratio of sale proceeds to $s at risk  
|                        | - Value would be vetted prior to pursuing the re-zone, and buyer interviews would provide information related to re-zone chances of success
| Cons                   | - Second longest sale process  
|                        | - Second longest process before having a non-refundable deposit (though deposit would be specifically tied to re-zone and therefore minimal risk of value fluctuations)
PROPOSAL

October 2, 2017

Customer Name & Address:     Job Address:
FRED                           6106 Harvard Avenue
4701 Sangamore Road            Glen Echo, Md. 20812
Bethesda, Md. 20817
Joe Rocco / 240-380-9721
jrocco@schedulefred.com

To provide the following equipment and services:

☒ Service 3 Systems Two (2) Times per Year

Warranty:
Two years all parts and labor

We propose to furnish material and labor, complete in accordance with above specifications for the sum of:

Approximately $255.00 per visit, including changing all filters

Authorized Signature: ________________________________

Payment to be made per service

This proposal may be withdrawn by us if not accepted within 120 days.

Acceptance of Proposal – The above price, specifications, and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work as specified. Payment will be as outlined above.

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________
# Appendix N: Ranked Options Spreadsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Vassar Circle</td>
<td>Build park on part of Vassar</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 Vassar Circle</td>
<td>Build park on whole Vassar</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Vassar Circle</td>
<td>Renovate existing building for use as Town Hall</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 Vassar Circle</td>
<td>Build new Town Hall on Vassar</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin</td>
<td>Lease 1/2, build New Town hall on half</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin</td>
<td>Lease for parking</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin</td>
<td>Lease for development</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harvard - Town Hall</td>
<td>Renovate existing Town Hall</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Harvard - Town Hall</td>
<td>Tear down existing Town Hall, build new one on same site</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighting of criteria *(Adjust percents in this Row, total must equal 100%)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Quick</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions:

- Step One: Adjust Weighting of criteria (red cells at bottom) determine the relative importance of each evaluation criteria. Please note that the totals should add up to 100.

- Step Two: for each option, assign it a 1, 2, or 3 in the grey cells. One is the most desirable, three the least. You will find the relevant scoring definitions under each column. For example, for the rating of “additional outdoor green space” you will see that a 1 corresponds to “positive” 2 corresponds to “neutral,” and a score of 3 is “negative.”

Criteria Description:

- A – Add’l Outdoor Space. Does it add/enhance or subtract?
- B – Probability of Success. How likely is it? How feasible?
- C – Timing. How quickly can it happen? How important is timing to you?
- D – Improved Town Hall. Does it do anything for aging town hall, renovate or other?
- E – Supports/Enhances Character of Town. Does it help, hurt or otherwise?
- F – Impact to residents. Does it cause undue traffic? Resolve traffic or other issues like water run-off or Fire truck access?
- G – Impact to Local Business. Does it help or hurt existing businesses?
- H – Risk. How much risk does it require (i.e., large investment, low probability, etc)
- J – Financial Benefit/Security. Does it provide financial security or generate revenue?
Appendix O: Letter from Bob Reaves

October 19, 2017

Chairman Alexis Feringa
Real Estate Committee
Town of Glen Echo
6106 Harvard Ave.
Glen Echo, MD 20812

Re: Tulane Avenue Property

Dear Chairman Feringa:

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday evening regarding the property adjacent to the Park on Tulane Avenue.

The Town of Glen Echo, the National Park Service (NPS), Montgomery County and the Glen Echo Park Partnership for the Arts and Culture (Partnership) have been working closely together for 15 years to coordinate regarding the management and operation of the Park - a valuable historic treasure owned by the federal government since 1968. We have worked well together through our mutually supportive relationships and look forward to continued collaboration.

We are writing you to express our opinion/position on the potential future sale/transfer and uses of the property to the south side of the Park behind the Irish Inn that is currently owned by the Town of Glen Echo on Tulane Avenue. In general we would be concerned about imminent development of those lots. The sale or "swap" of those lots is what we understand is under consideration. As noted in a recent email to the real estate committee of the Town from the Partnership Executive Director, Katey Boerner, we recommend that the land behind the Irish Inn should be developed in tandem with any plans for the Park and would object to development of the property in the short term, particularly for residential use.

We feel there are inherent conflicts between a residential use and both the current commercial business use by local businesses (including the Irish Inn), and the maintenance/programmatic functions serving the Park that occur adjacent to the land in question. These conflicts include noise that is created from activities at the Park on a routine basis, parking of cars for the businesses, and evening and daytime activity for both the Park and the commercial operations.
Additional considerations include a concern that the land abuts open areas owned by the National Park Service. As part of the Park, our partner - the National Park Service - in all likelihood will want to ensure that the land be developed in a manner that does not have a negative impact upon the Park as a natural resource and environmental asset.

We would be very interested to talk with the Town about ideas for future improvements in the subject area. Our Board of Directors has appointed a Master Planning Committee headed by board member Chris Frombooluti, which has begun work on long-term planning for the Park's future. This planning will include addressing the Park's land that interfaces with the Town. We hope invite you to be a part of these discussions as we begin what will be an involved planning process to include all Park stakeholders and neighbors and, of course, the National Park Service and Montgomery County.

We appreciate the efforts of your committee to bring in information from all effected stakeholders to guide the Town's decision-making and your willingness to hear from our organization.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bob Reaves
Bob Reaves, Board President
Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture

Cc:

Town of Glen Echo, Mayor Willem Polak
Town of Glen Echo Town Council Members
National Park Service, Superintendent Alex Romero
Montgomery County, Director, DGS - David Dise
Glen Echo Park Partnership Board of Directors
Appendix P: Original Deed for Lots 7 - 9, 1618

Annie Denell Andrews, (formerly known as Annie Louise Keely), and now a widow, and Bernard E. Denell; the third child of the marriage of the late William Thomas Denell and Clara May Denell, namely, William Theodore Denell, had predeceased his mother, having died on January 30, 1959, and

WHEREAS, Annie Denell Andrews, widow, and Bernard E. Denell, the two surviving children of the late William Thomas Denell and the late Clara May Denell, following the decease of the said Clara May Denell, together with all the children of the deceased William Theodore Denell, and with all respective spouses, did join in a deed conveying the subject property to Annie Denell Andrews and William T. Denell, as joint tenants, the deed being dated January 29, 1962 and intended for record, and being recorded among the Land Records of Montgomery County immediately prior to the recordation of the within deed; and

WHEREAS, the first parties herein are the grantees in the said January 29, 1962 deed, joined by Naomi Denell, the wife of William T. Denell, and all parties are agreed that title shall vest absolutely in the party of the second part.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10.00) and other good and valuable considerations, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the said parties of the first part, ANNIE DENELL ANDREWS, WILLIAM T. DENELL and NAOMI DENELL, do hereby grant and convey unto the TOWN OF GLEN ECHO, party of the second part, its successors and assigns, in fee simple, all those pieces or parcels of ground situate, lying and being in Montgomery County, Maryland, and described as follows:

Being Lots numbered 7, 8, 9, /17 and 18, of Block No. 6 in the subdivision known as the "National Chautaugua of Glen Echo," as per plat thereof recorded in Liber JA No. 25 at Folio 253 and re-recorded in Plat Book B at Folio 16, among the land records of Montgomery County, Maryland.

TOGETHER with the improvements thereon and the rights, ways,
easements, and appurtenances to the same belonging or in anywise appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid pieces or parcels of ground and premises above described or mentioned, and hereby intended to be conveyed, together with the rights, privileges, appurtenances and advantages thereto belonging or appertaining unto and to the only proper use, benefit and behoof forever of the said party of the second part, its successors or assigns, in fee simple.

AND the parties of the first part covenant that they will warrant specially the property hereby conveyed and will execute such other and further assurances as may be necessary or requisite.

WITNESS the hands and seals of the parties of the first part on the day and year first hereinbefore written.

WITNESS:

[Signatures and seals of the parties]

STATE OF MARYLAND ) SS
COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY)

On this the __ day of August, 1964, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared ANNIE DENELL ANDREWS, WILLIAM T. DENELL and NAOMI DENELL, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged that they executed the same for purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I hereunto set my hand and official seal.

My Commission expires:

May 1965
Appendix Q: Tax Map

Montgomery County
District: 07   Account Number: 00511695

The information shown on this map has been compiled from deed descriptions and plats and is not a property survey. The map should not be used for legal descriptions. Users noting errors are urged to notify the Maryland Department of Planning Mapping, 301 W. Preston Street, Baltimore MD 21201.

If a plat for a property is needed, contact the local Land Records office where the property is located. Plats are also available online through the Maryland State Archives at www.plats.net (http://www.plats.net).

Property maps provided courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning.

For more information on electronic mapping applications, visit the Maryland Department of Planning web site at www.mdp.state.md.us/OurProducts/OurProducts.shtml (http://www.mdp.state.md.us/OurProducts/OurProducts.shtml).

- Town property
- USA
- Glen Chateau Corporation (Irish Inn)
- GIIO Oberlin LLC
- GI12 Oberlin LLC
- Sally E Law, Trustee
Appendix R: Parking Analysis by Shannon Kraus

Parallel parking spots with two-way road
45 degree slanted spots with one-way road: approx. 40 spots

Existing Parking Lot: approx. 12 spots

Expanded Parking Lot: approx. 25 spots

Expanded Parking Lot 2: approx. 42 spots
### Appendix S: Summary of financial costs and revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravel 5000’ of Tulane/Oberlin lot for expanded parking</td>
<td>$49,441</td>
<td>Case (estimate via email to William Polak)</td>
<td>Only one source, need to get additional estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of current structure on Vassar Circle, incl site work</td>
<td>$193,000</td>
<td>Tammal Development</td>
<td>$35,000 “allowance” unspecified; see Appendix J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of current structure on Vassar Circle, incl site work AND milling ½ Vassar Circle street</td>
<td>$172,600</td>
<td>McFarland Woods</td>
<td>Additional $24,660 to mill entire street; see Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone Tulane/Oberlin</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale Analysis by Cris White</td>
<td>See Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service agreement for three A/C units in town hall</td>
<td>$510/year ($255/visit)</td>
<td>M.P. Energy Services proposal</td>
<td>See Appendix M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Postal Service rent</td>
<td>$31,899/yr</td>
<td>Post Office Lease</td>
<td>Lease up for renewal in 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Irish Inn parking</td>
<td>$3000/year</td>
<td>Lease with Irish Inn</td>
<td>See Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash proceeds of Tulane/Oberlin lots if sold as currently zone (residential)</td>
<td>$715,200 total</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale Analysis by Cris White</td>
<td>See Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash proceeds of Tulane/Oberlin lots if commercial, if Glen Echo undertakes rezoning</td>
<td>$997,800</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale Analysis by Cris White</td>
<td>See Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash proceeds of Tulane/Oberlin lots if commercial, in “delayed sale to developer” scenario, in which developer undertakes rezoning at his/her cost and risk</td>
<td>$906,500</td>
<td>Tulane/Oberlin Lots Potential Sale Analysis by Cris White</td>
<td>See Appendix L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>