

**900 Worcester Street Committee**

**February 17, 2016**

**7 pm at the Warren Building**

**Attending:**

Andy Wrobel, Suzy Littlefield, Mike Pakstis, Meghan Jop, Barbara Searle, Ellen Gibbs, Deborah Carpenter, Tim Barrett, David Perry, Brandon Fitts, Mark Wolfson, Mike Zehner

**No Minutes to Approve**

**Reissuing the RFP - Darcey:**

Debriefed what worked and what needs improvement:

Worked – Subgroups to get work done. Two step RFP process. The meeting to compare scores and identify questions before the Q&A presentation. Grouping of criteria into the 5 categories in the summary. The numeric and then color representation of results.

Minuses – Responses were missing some information we felt like we needed (make clearer in RFP, be more specific what we want to see). Need to have a conversation with Haynes and provide a path and expectations for how to approach and how permitting will view Haynes parking. Need to summarize Vinesse parking findings for each use to be a guide for parking requirement. Split parking criteria into two: operating parking at peak and special event plan. A project that cannot park its peak operating load on site will receive “unacceptable”. Rework financing criteria to have a fundraising criteria. Need to better understand the relationship between any financial partners. Create a forfeitable deposit once lease is signed (performance bond?). Need to make Q&A process more equal for respondents vs. allowing last to have advantage. Need responses to list zoning variance expectations 9compare project to current zoning). Need to highlight the minimum criteria more. Need to have “acceptable project financing “ on the minimum criteria like permissibility is.

The two biggest areas to be better developed are:

1. Fundraising – how does the committee score projects needing fundraising? Proposal below
2. Parking – Ultimately parking matters since the project can't be permitted if it can't be parked. Mike Z reviewed the metrics used in the Town's parking study for each of the three responses. Two of the responses were at the ceiling of the requirement while the third was significantly under-parked (even if the use of the Haynes parking was included). Mike Z offered to develop a paragraph for the revised RFP that states how the Committee considers the parking requirements for the different potential uses. In addition, the parking criteria was segmented to separate “peak operational need” from “special event need”. Proposal below.

Despite the length of the lists, all felt the process went pretty well.

In order to improve perceived fairness during the Q&A process, a number of questions were identified for Jennie Merrill to consider – Do we need to do a two part review of response (since lease and compensation to Town are 2 criteria can we review the lease info with all the other information). Is equal weighting of criteria necessary or can some criteria have more weight for some members of the committee. Can we have the initial review of the leases in executive session to keep the process more

even for the respondents in the Q&A. Can we executive session the RFP Q&A with the respondents and produce “minutes” that would summarize what we learn. Can we not allow the respondents to be present for the other respondents’ presentations? Andy W, Mike P, and Dave H will meet with Jennie on Monday to get the legal opinion on these questions.

Specific solutions suggested:

D5 - Fundraising criteria

No Fundraising required	Highly adv.
Recent successful fundraising experience raising at least double the need and clear process and professional team	Adv.
Proven fundraising experience in the past and part of the organization but need is large	Non-adv
Unproven fundraising expertise or too big of a need	Unacceptable

D4 – Financials – certainty of project funding thru construction and operation – add in

Revenue assumptions clearly listed - \$/hr, \$/mon membership, peak/non peak hrs, no. of members, \$/class etc. with assumptions that match the future operating pro form projections per year	Highly
Revenue assumptions clearly listed - \$/hr, \$/mon membership, peak/non peak hrs, no. of members, \$/class, etc. with growth rate per year provided	Adv.
Revenue assumptions clearly listed - \$/hr, \$/mo. Memberships, peak/non-peak hrs	Non-adv
Minimal revenue assumptions leaving questions about cost to customers and therefore reasonableness of occupancy/members/users and revenue projections	Unacceptable

S7a - Parking for normal operations (incl. peak) – based on provided requirements

125% of parking need met on site, buses on site	Highly
100% of parking need met on site, buses on site	Adv.
Parking need met on site, offsite plan for buses and last cars	Non-adv
Can’t park peak parking on site.	Unacceptable

S7b - Special Events – parking and plan

Special event parking on premises. Detailed special events plan. Experience	Highly
Special event parking secured offsite. Detailed special events plan. Experience	Adv.
Special event parking offsite plan. Some special event plans.	Non-adv.
Insufficient special events parking plan. Insufficient special event plans. Inexperienced	Unacceptable

T1 – needs to include a specific list of “free hours and benefits” to the Town.

T5 – add in

All zoning variance expectations clear in accompanying exhibit	Highly
All zoning variance expectations clear in separate paragraph in response	Adv
All zoning variance expectations estimated from description of components of project	Non-adv
Some zoning variance expectations unclear	Unacceptable

Revisions to be done by subgroups:

Deb, Mike Z, Tim to review and edit the permitability criteria. Also Mike Z needs to create a paragraph describing how parking should be counted by use.

Dave P, Barbara S, Ellen, Andy to revise financial criteria

Suzy and Dave H to review sustainability and facility design criteria

No changes discussed for developer quality or advantages to town.

Motion: To approve adjourn Suzy Littlefield  
Second: By Mark Wolfson  
Vote: All in favor

Meeting ended at 8:15 pm