

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. and was conducted via Webex. Present were: Tom Childs, Chair George Fantini, Vice-Chair Suzanne Korschun, Joyce Losick-Yang, Planning Director Paul Materazzo, Andrew Maylor and Clerk Lais Washington; also present were: Theresa Peznola, Associate Planner Tony Collins, Senior Planner Lisa Schwarz, Town Clerk and Chief Strategy Officer Austin Simko, and McCall/Almy Team members: Kati Brigham and Lauren Donahue.

Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Korschun seconded by Ms. Losick-Yang to approve the May 24th minutes. The motion passed by unanimous (7-0 roll call) vote.

Review Evaluation Process

Mr. Simko explained the framework to evaluate the 4 Proposers chosen from Round 1. Committee members discussed each Proposer’s Conceptual Program and Plan (CPP) and their reasoning for the rating they gave on their scorecards for each aspect of the CPP. Collectively, proposer ratings were determined and an overall Composite score established.

On August 25th, interviews will be conducted for those who qualify. A determination will be made then, whether the proposal is financially feasible and, if so, the ranking may be adjusted based on price proposal. The Committee will then make a recommendation to the Select Board who will make the final decision on Developer selection.

Review and Evaluate Submissions of Final (“Phase Two”) Proposals for Town Yard

See Table, pages 2 and 3.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Proposer	Trinity Financial	Minco
Selection Criteria: Conceptual Program and Plan (RFP p. 25-28)		
Provision of Community Planning Objectives (a-e)		
a) Neighborhood Context and Character of Development	Advantageous (incorporation of art creating meaningful community connection a highlight; Open Spaces too close to trains - noise not welcoming)	Advantageous (dynamic space for community indoor and outdoor but still some lacking features; questions about residential vs. community bike/pathways)
b) Linkages, Networks and Circulation		
i) Pedestrian & Bicycle Experience, Connectivity to Surrounding areas and Accessibility to MBTA Station	Highly Advantageous (some concern expressed re: continuation of Pearson and Lewis Streets through the property and vehicular connection breaks up green and public space)	Highly Advantageous (concern for bike path being a downhill ramp; drop-off area stops vehicular traffic but is in middle of green space with parking for only a few cars; improves pedestrian and bike experience)
ii) Traffic Circulation	Highly Advantageous (similar concern was expressed as above. Mr. Materazzo screen-shared some maps showing a couple vehicular connection possibilities that had been discussed previously)	Not Advantageous (pedestrian standpoint is good but gets blocked off; vehicles are dead-ended; question about Pearson/Lewis St. intersection improvement)
c) Community Spaces:		
i) Spaces	Not Advantageous (linear green space constrained by train noise and traffic through the site was expressed; also lack of proposed underground parking is taking space that could be utilized differently)	Highly Advantageous (space btwn Lewis and Pearson St. for community use but question much of space which seems for residents not community; significant public space around train but other space was cut-off; splash pad and retail space was positive)
ii) Public Access	Advantageous	Advantageous
d) Product Type	Not Advantageous (only proposed green space but not indoor restaurants, etc. other than 1 small retail space; market rate condo proposal was positive)	Highly Advantageous (provided mixed-uses)
e) Environmental Responsibility	Advantageous (minimal LEED requirements)	Advantageous (will not meet LEED for neighborhood development but can for bldg.; request they look at LEED ND criteria)
Adherence To Design Objectives (f-g)		
f) Adherence to all dimensional, design and other requirements of HMD Zoning By-Law	Advantageous (requesting a waiver to HMD zoning by-law)	Highly Advantageous (no waivers needed)
g) Adherence to HMD design guidelines for rail corridor	Advantageous	Advantageous (bldg. too vertical; question how they see the public interacting)
Overall Composite Rating (a-g)	Not Advantageous (concern about timing for a phased project, product type, if truly mixed-use, open space concerns, and other points discussed above which does not meet community goals)	Advantageous (8/9 criteria rated Advantageous or higher based on Committee discussions)

Proposer	Procopio Companies	Leggat McCall Properties – to be discussed at mtg on Thursday
Selection Criteria: Conceptual Program and Plan (RFP p. 25-28)		
Provision of Community Planning Objectives (a-e)		
a) Neighborhood Context and Character of Development	Advantageous (nothing iconic; too much vehicular traffic and surface parking but question pkg. access; no versatile event space or placemaking)	
b) Linkages, Networks and Circulation		
i) Pedestrian & Bicycle Experience, Connectivity to Surrounding areas and Accessibility to MBTA Station	Unacceptable (more vehicular traffic and less pedestrian and cyclist pathways; crosswalks noted)	
ii) Traffic Circulation	Not Advantageous	
c) Community Spaces:		
i) Spaces	Not Advantageous (open space, dog park close to train; too much vehicular traffic and asphalt; nothing iconic)	
ii) Public Access	Unacceptable (good for vehicles but not pedestrians)	
d) Product Type	Highly Advantageous (combination of apts and condos along with retail)	
e) Environmental Responsibility	Not Advantageous (could qualify for neighborhood LEED cert; some Green proposals but no detail)	
Adherence To Design Objectives (f-g)		
f) Adherence to all dimensional, design and other requirements of HMD Zoning By-Law	Highly Advantageous (intend to meet all guidelines)	
g) Adherence to HMD design guidelines for rail corridor	Advantageous (no artistic element; concern about public spaces; question train platform)	
Overall Composite Rating (a-g)	Unacceptable (lack of Green space; missing bike/pedestrian friendliness; other issues as mentioned above; meets design objectives)	