

Present Charles Bonenti, Van Ellet, Cheryl Shanks, Leigh Short, Catherine Yamamoto (chair); Absent: Bilal Ansari

Invited for today's business: Peter Fohlin (town manager), Tom Sheldon (AHT)

Also present: Joan Burns, Dick DeMayo, Nancy Scerbo; Martin Filion (Willinet)

## **Business**

### 1. Minutes

Van Ellet proposed one change to the minutes of May 14. The minutes as amended were approved 4-0-0.

### 2. Advice on Crafting an RFP

Peter Fohlin introduced the committee to good and bad ways to draft an RFP.

A. Bad: describing sites, recapitulating code, crafting legalese, covering areas that other offices or committees have responsibility for--those can be done later and better by others.

B. Good: criteria for evaluation

1. Legally required, stated standards used to evaluate the proposals, basis for choosing one

2. Can divide them into necessary v. desired attributes

3. Examples include: number of units, number or proportion affordable at various AH levels (low, moderate), number of stories tall, setback from property line, percent impervious surface, how long to completion, density (# units/acre), consistency with its neighborhood, LEED, designated community or laundry area or dining hall; track record of the developer (experience and financial stability)

C. Sending out an RFP

1. Necessary under MGL 30B since these would be for municipally owned properties and would be for projects greater than \$25,000

2. Separate RFPs could be sent out, sequentially, for each site.

3. RFPs could also be sent out simultaneously, in a single bundle, for all possible projects (multiple sites), which has the benefit of educating prospective developers about the development context while still allowing them to bid on only one or two of many if they chose

4. A request is not a pledge, just a request for information.
5. Anyone sending out an RFP should consult or tell related town agencies that it is thinking about doing this, but is not legally required to. Cathy volunteered to draft a letter to the related town committees.

### 3. Sites

#### A. 59 Water

1. Need letter from the state saying it's set to be built on, but at least no more actual remediation is needed
2. Need listening session open to the town but focused on neighbors: Charles and Van will try to organize something, tentatively between June 4 and 27 (AHC meeting dates), and tentatively at the American Legion building (in the neighborhood).

#### B. Photec

1. Waiting for the river to go down before remaining silver contamination can be remediated
2. Already have an evaluation of the building (done a time ago)
3. We must decide whether to send out an RFP noting that a building there needs to be demolished first, or
4. We first get bids to demolish the building.
  - a. If a bid is low enough we can take it and get it done
  - b. It's possible that DHCD could kick money in for demolition if the site is going to affordable housing
  - c. If the town did not demolish the building we would at least have a cost estimate to give to the prospective developer

#### C. Conflict and competition

There was some discussion of whether with multiple sites in play (including ones not handled by AHC, e.g. Higher Ground and Traggorth) one site was going to be competing with another site for funding, or whether inherent differences were going to put each on a different timetable.

### 4. Near-term agenda

#### A. Discussion with Affordable Housing Trust June 4

1. Division of responsibilities/ labor
2. Criteria for the RFP.

Leigh, Van and Tom formed a subcommittee to draft the 25 or so criteria that might apply to the next RFP.

B. Discussion with ConCom about land under their supervision: possibly scheduled for June 27.

C. Listening session and perhaps discussion for 59 Water: invite neighbors of 59 Water, town residents in general, and the Chamber of Commerce to voice their wishes and concerns about the site's development: Charles and Van will start that in motion.

**Next Meeting: June 4 at 7:00  
with AHT**