

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 a.m. and was conducted via Webex. Present were: Tom Childs, Jeremy Cyrier, Chair George Fantini, Vice-Chair Suzanne Korschun, Joyce Losick-Yang, Planning Director Paul Materazzo, 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, Lauren Donahue and Danielle Donovan.

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

This was a continuation from the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The ratings that were assigned at Monday’s meeting of the 3 Proposers were reviewed to allow additional conversation or revisions. There was discussion about the following for Procopio Companies:

- Pedestrian & Bicycle Experience, Connectivity to Surrounding areas and Accessibility to MBTA Station (scorecard item b-i): although concerns still remain for better pedestrian experience, according to the rating criteria for this item, improvements were proposed so the overall rating is changed from Unacceptable to Highly Advantageous. If invited for an interview, further discussion can be explored with the Proposer.
- Traffic Circulation (b-ii): based on their modeling of traffic flow plans to those that had been previously presented by the Town, resulted in a change from Not Advantageous to Highly Advantageous.
- Environmental Responsibility (e): proposal beyond a low-impact development (roof garden, charging station, solar panels, etc.); therefore, change from Not Advantageous to Advantageous.
- Overall Composite Rating (a-g) is changed from Unacceptable to Not Advantageous (lack of Green and Community spaces).

The CPP ratings of the 4 Proposers are provisional as the Oral Presentations will provide additional information and insight.

See Table page 2.

**Discuss Oral Presentations by Proposers**

*A motion was made by Mr. Materazzo seconded by Mr. Cyrier to invite all 4 Proposers for an interview at a date to be determined by the Selection Committee. The motion passed by unanimous (7-0 roll call) vote.*

These interviews will be conducted in-person. The public can access the meeting room but there will be no public comment. The format of the proposed 1-hour interviews will include the Proposer giving a 10-minute introductory presentation and then using the majority of the time for clarifying questions from the Selection Committee. Proposers will be notified in advance how the time will be spent and that the purpose is to give the Selection Committee members a chance to engage with them. A list of questions/items will be sent ahead to Proposers for planning purposes. About 15-30 minutes between interviews will be spent to recap. Suggested dates: Wed. Sept. 1<sup>st</sup> and Thurs. Sept. 2<sup>nd</sup>, time to be determined, with a goal to complete 3 on the first day and the 4<sup>th</sup> on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day. Committee members will also need to assign final CPP ratings, rankings, determine financial feasibility and price, and then provide recommendations to the Select Board. Committee rating sheets can be shared with Proposers along with an invitation to watch the meeting video recordings.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Proposer  | Procopio Companies<br><i>*(revised)</i>                          | Leggat McCall Properties  |
| <b>Selection Criteria: Conceptual Program and Plan (RFP p. 25-28)</b>                                   |  |   |
| <b>Provision of Community Planning Objectives (a-e)</b>   |  |   |
| a) Neighborhood Context and Character of Development  | <i>Advantageous</i>  | <i>Not Advantageous</i><br>(large building mass and faces train; could be buffer to Green space; interesting Green space; underground parking)  |
| b) Linkages, Networks and Circulation   |  |   |
| i) Pedestrian & Bicycle Experience, Connectivity to Surrounding areas and Accessibility to MBTA Station | <i>*Highly Advantageous</i>                                      | <i>Highly Advantageous</i><br>(a 6-story bldg. against tracks like a wall, amplifies the train but retail space may link to other side of track; amphitheater and Green space helps link to Downtown; good pedestrian/cyclist accessibility; concern for linkage from Main St. to river; commit to additional funding to help linkages) |
| ii) Traffic Circulation   | <i>*Highly Advantageous</i>                                      | <i>Highly Advantageous</i><br>(minimal traffic; pedestrian site; underground parking; concern re: connection end of Buxton Ct. and for the residents – one way; differentiate btwn public vs. private way and would possibly need Town Mtg approval for changes)  |
| c) Community Spaces:  |  |   |
| i) Spaces   | <i>Not Advantageous</i>  | <i>Highly Advantageous</i><br>(site plan with pavilion and plaza, artwork, food trucks, etc. create community space)  |
| ii) Public Access   | <i>Unacceptable</i>  | <i>Advantageous</i><br>(retail space easily accessible as well as easy access for pedestrians and bikes)  |
| d) Product Type   | <i>Highly Advantageous</i>                                       | <i>Highly Advantageous</i><br>(integration of retail/restaurant space; retail good location but small; no condos; offered to help finance affordable housing)   |
| e) Environmental Responsibility   | <i>*Advantageous</i>   | <i>Advantageous</i><br>(single bldg. and retail space not habitable; provided detail score sheet for attaining LEED certification)  |
| <b>Adherence To Design Objectives (f-g)</b>   |  |   |
| f) Adherence to all dimensional, design and other requirements of HMD Zoning By-Law                     | <i>Highly Advantageous</i>                                       | <i>Highly Advantageous</i><br>(complying with zoning)   |
| g) Adherence to HMD design guidelines for rail corridor   | <i>Advantageous</i>  | <i>Advantageous</i><br>(questions re: bldg. massing and height)   |
| Overall Composite Rating (a-g)  | <i>*Not Advantageous</i><br>(lack of Green and Community spaces) | <i>Advantageous</i><br>(concerns about bldg. size and traffic circulation; provided what community wants re: pedestrians, parking; small commercial space; no architect evaluation)   |