

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. in Memorial Hall at Memorial Hall Library. 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: Associate Planner Tony Collins, Director of Business, Arts and Culture Ann Ormond, Town Clerk and Chief Strategy Officer Austin Simko, Theresa Peznola, and McCall/Almy Team members: Lauren Donahue and Danielle Donovan.

**Oral Presentation from Proposer**

Mr. Fantini welcomed everyone, introduced the Selection Committee members and Town Staff, and explained the format of this meeting.

*Minco Development Deliberation on Final Rating for CPP (cont'd from yesterday):* Overall, the Committee felt that Minco provided a strong presentation and were pleased with their responses to questions raised during the public review session. Each item of the CPP was reviewed resulting in final ratings as reflected on page 3.

*A motion was made by Ms. Washington to change the Traffic Circulation (b-ii) to Highly Advantageous based on the movement that was provided through the site, gives clarity and consistency to the DCI transportation plan that the community developed. The motion passed by unanimous (7-0 roll-call) vote.*

**Leggat McCall:** Vice-President Mark Campbell introduced their Team who gave a brief overview of their firm, showed similar projects they developed, and addressed questions from the Committee's public review session of their proposal including the massing and height of the building as well as the circulation. They explained their justification for the project plan as presented.

*Deliberation on Final Rating for CPP:* Overall, a thorough and clarifying presentation was given but there is still concern about the massing of the building and private-way circulation which would need further discussion.

*A motion was made by Mr. Materazzo to change the Neighborhood Context and Character of Development (a) to Advantageous. The motion passed by 5-2 roll-call vote.*

**Rank Four Proposals Based on Final Conceptual Program & Plan (CPP) Ratings**

There was much discussion about Neighborhood Context and Character criterion from the RFP, along with consideration for all items in the RFP, with knowledge that the permitting process and all Town checks and balances will continue to help the chosen Developer refine their design. Also, important to consider is the Developer with whom the Committee would feel comfortable entering into a long-term partnership, who would listen, be flexible and trustworthy and would reflect the priorities of the Town. The project specifics will continue to evolve throughout the process. The Proposers were ranked as follows:

1. *Minco* (Unique building design with 3 areas for the public. Café interior location with community space at Pearson St. Suggest to consider some type of retail in community space. In line with design guidelines but concern for Buxton Court and access to site. Splash Park a plus but seasonality to be explored.)

**Rank Four Proposals Based on Final Conceptual Program & Plan (CPP) Ratings (cont'd)**

2. *Procopio Companies* (3 buildings, most retail with courtyard feel and public walking street. Work space a plus but concern about location at dead end. Fits in neighborhood context but less open/green space. Adapted to committee comments including iconic features. Eligible for highest LEED ratings. Good circulation plan. Center water pool questionable.)
3. *Leggat McCall Properties* (green/open space attractive, retail on Pearson St., but building massing and half the units facing train a concern)
4. *Trinity Financial* (Overall Composite Rating was Not Advantageous – product type)

**Review Financial Feasibility of Four Proposals**

All are financially feasible but Ms. Donahue explained many factors that need to be considered. Key element is return on cost.

**Adjust Rankings Based on Price Proposals**

In addition to purchase price of land, offsite mitigation amount and any extraordinary feature to the project should be counted.

- Minco offered purchase price \$4.55M along with offsite mitigation budget and value of community building (to be further explored) to total \$6.2M.
- Procopio offered purchase price \$5.5M along with offsite mitigation commitment to total \$5.65M.
- Trinity offered purchase price \$4.535M along with offsite mitigation commitment, unique public art and infrastructure budget to total about \$9M.
- Leggat McCall Properties offered purchase price \$6M along with mitigation commitment to total \$7M.

Other significant features like wayfinding, public art and landscaping can be considered.

**Recommendation to Select Board**

Mr. Simko will draft a letter to the Select Board with the Selection Committee's recommendation of Minco as 1<sup>st</sup> choice with Procopio Companies as a very close 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. He will outline the reasoning behind the decision and the differences between the project proposals – they have proposed very different buildings but both meet the high standard stated in the RFP and Committee would be happy choosing either one. The price differential was insignificant. The Committee will meet to approve the letter prior to submittal. The Select Board can discuss the differences and then make their final decision.

**Adjournment**

On a motion made by Mr. Materazzo seconded by Mr. Childs, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Proposer	Minco <i>*(revised)</i>	Leggat McCall Properties <i>*(revised)</i>
<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>*Advantageous</i>
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>
ii) Traffic Circulation	<i>*Highly Advantageous</i>	<i>Highly Advantageous</i>
c) Community Spaces:		
i) Spaces	<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	<i>Highly Advantageous</i>
ii) Public Access	<i>Advantageous</i>	<i>Advantageous</i>
d) Product Type	<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	<i>Highly Advantageous</i>
e) Environmental Responsibility	<i>Advantageous</i>	<i>Advantageous</i>
<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>
g) Adherence to HMD design guidelines for rail corridor	<i>Advantageous</i>	<i>Advantageous</i>
Overall Composite Rating (a-g)	<i>Advantageous</i>	<i>Advantageous</i>