



Medfield State Hospital Development Committee

MEETING OF:
September 29, 2021

MINUTES

Present: Todd Trehubenko, Johnny Martinez, Chris McMahon, Gus Murby, Nicholas Milano, Assistant Town Administrator (Ex Officio), Sarah Raposa, Town Planner, Eric Busch of Peregrine Group (PG), Erica Schechter (PG), Mike Mitchell of MassDevelopment

Absent: Pat Casey, Mike Metzler

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Chair Trehubenko called the meeting to order at approximately 7:32 pm, and did a roll call for attendance.

Follow-up from 9/15/21 meeting:

- Mead, Talerman, Costa opinion memo regarding the process of selecting “best and final.” The “best and final” option is not required as long as a developer is identified as “most advantageous,” the due diligence phase may commence while maintaining a back-up offer i.e. not rejecting any proposal at this time. MTC was also asked if the Town may retain certain parts of the disposition property (i.e. arboretum, green) without violating 30B requirements or the terms of the RFP. MTC has responded that we may but have not submitted a formal memo.
- **Historic Tax Credit (HTC) Consultant:** Mr. Busch provided two proposals (from MacRostie and Epsilon) for the determination of whether the demo of the cottages would jeopardize any federal or state historic tax credits useful for the core campus buildings. Mr. Busch described the “preliminary determination” process led by a third party HTC consultant. MacRostie is part of the CAM team and Epsilon was engaged by DCAMM to inventory the buildings in 2014. The Committee discussed the proposals, scope, prices, whether there were potential conflicts of interest, timeline and what the Park Service and Mass Historic responses would be like. Mr. Murby noted the TB Cottage.

Chair Trehubenko made a motion to recommend engagement of Epsilon for the HTC pre-determination process; Seconded by Mr. Martinez. The Vote: 4-0 (Roll Call: GM = yes, TT=yes, JM=yes, CM=yes). Ms. Raposa and Mr. Milano will work with Mr. Busch on contracting with Epsilon.

Developer References: Ms. Schechter shared the summary of developer references. All of Trinity’s have been received and not all of Pulte’s have been received but all were favorable. It’s unclear of the reason behind the non-responsiveness but Ms. Schechter will continue to solicit the non-responsive references and the Committee is open to receiving them.

Developer Written Q&A: The written responses have been received and were posted with the agenda.

Committee Evaluation: Mr. Busch summarized the evaluation matrix criteria and shared the summary of the Committee’s responses. Individual scores in the subcategories were not listed but the main categories (Community Impacts/Benefits, Vision/Consistency with Disposition Intent, Development Team, Design Guidelines and Zoning) were averaged for each reviewer and posted to the summary chart. Discussion about the

ranges and clear areas of committee agreements. Pulte A, B, C options were discussed in terms of how they measured against the RFP and not against the other proposals.

- Trinity Total: 70.9 Average: 4.43
- Pulte A Total: 42.1 Average: 2.68
- Pulte B Total: 41.8 Average: 2.61
- Pulte C Total: 41.8 Average: 2.61

Mr. Murby stated that the Committee could have dialogue with the Board of Selectmen on October 19th to bring the selectmen up to speed on the Committee’s progress, share key findings, current thinking, and get their inputs on specific issues from individual selectmen.

Chair Trehubenko summarized open issues: one proposal consistently scored higher than the other, which raises the question of whether to proceed with the “most advantageous” developer to allow the developer to obtain more information about the site/buildings. Mr. Martinez believes there is a clear choice based on the evaluations. Mr. McMahon agreed, but pointed out that the process did not result in selecting the proposal with the highest pure economic/financial value to the town. There is a lot of work for Trinity to do in due diligence in order to finalize firm answers. Mr. Murby felt there is an obvious choice in proposals with Trinity but Pulte’s proposal gives a great benchmark in the Town’s evaluation of values (qualitative and quantitative). Completion of due diligence, negotiations, costs (sales prices and LDA split), disposition parcel, gun range are very important topics to be determined. Chair Trehubenko feels we are still on track with the timeline from the RFP.

Mr. Martinez inquired about the Committee’s role over the next phase(s). MSHDC to identify aspects of proposals to be refined (impacts, gun range, etc.). Mr. Murby’s perspective is that the DC would help bring the proposal to town meeting (land disposition phase). He hopes that Mr. Metzler and Mr. Casey can rejoin the Committee once a developer is identified and their recusals are no longer a factor. He also wondered if this committee would act as an overseer of the ultimate redevelopment. The public outreach process should be ramping up once we have a developer identified.

Adjournment: Mr. Murby made a motion to adjourn at approximately 8:53 pm; Seconded by Mr. McMahon. The Vote: 4-0 (Roll Call: GM = yes, TT=yes, JM=yes, CM=yes).

Next Meeting: Attend BoS Meeting on 10/19/21

Attachments: Q&A Screenshots

The screenshot shows a Q&A session with Bill Massaro. The text is repeated three times, showing a question about Medfield Historic District Commission and a response.

BM Bill Massaro 6:29 PM ...

Keep in mind that Medfield Historic District Commission has repeated many times that their main concern is the core campus quad-- both they and Mass Historic could be helpful in discussing the credits risk and in pproaching the National Park service. Consultant \$5K to possibly make \$4 million sounds like a good investment.

Answer live Type answer

BM Bill Massaro 6:33 PM ...

This is another question for the Historic consultant--if a building is not salvagable, is the developer required to build a replacement or put the total credits at risk. Trinity does not build new.

Answer live Type answer

BM Bill Massaro 6:49 PM ...

Trinity is not using the North Field--see my comments. It was one of my questions for Trinity---not using, what is impact on your proposal--

Answer live Type answer