



Medfield State Hospital Development Committee

MEETING OF:
January 13, 2021

MINUTES

Present: Todd Trehubenko, Johnny Martinez, Gus Murby, Randy Karg, Mike Metzler, Chris McMahon, Pat Casey, Nicholas Milano, Assistant Town Administrator (Ex Officio), Beverly Gallo of Peregrine Urban Initiative (PUI), Mike Mitchell of MassDevelopment, Eric Busch of Peregrine Group, Erica Schechter of Peregrine Group, Jay Talerman of Mead, Talerman, Costa (MTC)

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Chair Trehubenko called the meeting to order at approximately 7:04 pm, and read the following statement into the record:

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Medfield State Hospital Development Committee is being conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order. A reminder that persons who would like to listen to or view this meeting while in progress may do so by following the instructions on the agenda and meeting notice. This meeting is being recorded.

MassDevelopment Update - Mike Mitchell gave an update on the current status of the Memorandum of Agreement to be signed with the Town, which is under review with their legal department. MassDevelopment contracts directly with Peregrine and manages the scope. Chair Trehubenko updated the Committee on the minor change in the scopes between Peregrine Urban Initiative (PUI) and Peregrine Group (PG).

Peregrine update - Ms. Beverly Gallo clarified the difference between PUI and PG.

Marketing Plan - The marketing plan was logged as received by Mass Historical Commission (MHC) on December 31, 2020 and their 14-day window closes tomorrow. Liz Sherva confirmed to Ms. Gallo that MHC had no comments on the marketing plan; in fact, it is a formality per the LDA MOA. If there are no changes, then the additional seven days doesn't apply. The partial list of developers to be contacted is adequate. The chairs of the Medfield Historical Commission and Medfield Historic District Commission also received the marketing plan and had no comments. Ms. Gallo will circle back to update with the MHC's position as the RFP is updated. Mr. McMahon suggested getting coverage in the Boston Business Journal and the Boston Real Estate Journal. Ms. Raposa and Mr. Milano will research the advertising costs. Ms. Mitchell indicated the RFP could be posted on the MassDevelopment page in addition to the Central Register, per 30B.

Review Comments on draft RFP - Chair Trehubenko briefed the Committee on the process of receiving comments (via the form or emails submitted to BoS, Administration, etc.). The focus of tonight's discussion will be by the Committee members for major comments/open issues to develop an agenda for next week, which can be updated as public comments are reviewed. Comments were received from both Town Counsel, Mark Cerel, and Special Counsel, MTC, and neither indicated that the draft was off-track in any substantive way.

Atty Talerman summarized their process of review and had verified certain processes with the IG's office. Ultimately, they are comfortable with the RFP form as it is well thought out and highly developed.

Committee Discussion Points:

- “last day to ask questions” clarification of intent and process
- Section 4.2 (re: interpretation of “Values” as subjective. Chair Trehubenko referred to the articulation by the BoS about what “values” meant as the master plan stage)
- 4.2.G (long term ground lease clarification). Mr. Murby suggested there is an open issue regarding ground lease vs. sale linkage to the open space designations. A lease would let us retain control of the open space and keep maintenance simpler. Mr. Martinez doesn't want to lead developers into a lease if other options are available that may be of benefit to a developer. Mr. Trehubenko confirmed that prior Committee discussions wanted to keep a level of flexibility.
- Page 36 – Open Space and Recreation phrasing about access to trails (state-owned land). Committee discussion on North Field open space vs future development potential.
- Some comments indicated that the Town should not pursue the redevelopment regarding the preferred scenario of the master plan while other comments were to the opposite extreme in that the criteria weren't bold enough. Mr. Murby said that the comments critiquing the preferred scenario were not part of this committee's charge and not relevant for the committee's purposes at this point and will not be considered.
- Priority to develop the campus proper with an optional supplemental proposal for the arboretum. The Town could do the Arboretum project in the future
- West Slope – the land along Hospital Road could be subdivided for a couple of high value single family lots for the future.
- Laundry Parcel – follow up with the State on distribution of profits based on the Laundry Parcel not being cleaned up for transfer.
- Do we or don't we convey the Green and the Northfield and to be proactively thoughtful about that.
- Single or Multiple Developer Contracts?
- Section 1.2 – Disposition intent of RFP; committee discussion about the language. Atty. Talerman said that subjective terms like “values” enhances breadth of Town's discretion in reviewing responses but the point of differing opinions of the definitions can indeed be difficult.
- Various wordsmithing comments
- Page 14 Paragraph F – Water Tower, clarity on additional restrictions
- Premises excluded from disposition
- Page 18 Paragraph D – Affordable Housing Goals and integration with the tax financing incentives. Sections A-H are extracted from the zoning bylaw
- Page 18 - Break Paragraph E into two items (could be from zoning)
- Page 22 Paragraph A – be clearer on the possibility of new buildings and building types and uses in 4.3
- Page 23 – Clarify first sentence criteria
- Paragraph F – Narrative about Cultural Center; follow up with Jean Mineo
- Paragraph G – Open space subzones
- Paragraph K – Infrastructure subsidy
- Paragraph L – Detailed Plan
- Page 25 Paragraph N – Public benefits list should be longer (what could be added?)
- Page 31 Rule for Award – Question there was do we need to make it clear that the developer's presentation at the town meeting is in support of the request for land disposition.
- Is it advantageous for all of the criteria have the same weight and importance? The Committee discussed the Town's priorities and flexibility for the proposals. We don't want to preclude people from responding based on the current rigidity of the current draft. Net zero is a very high hurdle when it comes to proper historic

preservation and ability to qualify for essential tax credits. Include Eric and Erica in the future discussion about scoring and ranking. Balance! Committee to review Fred Davis' comments regarding energy.

- Page 32 – criteria
- Financial feasibility threshold and how to define?
- C, Public Access Charles River and East Side Access
- D, what is the threshold, Chapel/Infirmary land and use of parking lot
- Page 33 – score criteria
- Page 35 – matrix
- Page 37 – D, pending MEC comments
- Page 38 – artist/live/work space; commercial mix; assisted living parking circulation access
- Page 40 – Impact on tax base, public funding (earlier point)
- Q – well thought out plan
- Page 44 – zoning limitation clarity
- Page 48 – Appendices, CAM lease; all proposals must “bake-in” CAM considerations
- Developer’s communication with State re Laundry Parcel?
- Phase I/II reports available for Laundry Parcel
- Intro – remove dog walking/horse riding reference to assuage
- Medfield demographics
- Dates/Timeline; advertising and marketing helps
- 2.3 and 2.4 – make info available on line
- Price Proposal/Total Consideration – to be discussed next week
- 4.1 – clarify complete proposals
- 99-year lease (not 75 years)
- Page 39, 4 – include diversity clause?
- Page 43, 5.1 – scalability; relates to subdivision
- Energy use provisions
- Historic Tax Credits – more info about tax credits being more beneficial
- Pages 5, 24, 25 – add “or ground lease”
- Page 23, Housing – rephrase
- Scorable Criteria weigh vs weight
- Consultation with Town – consult with other committees or the state historical
- Separate out items to consider in negotiation without cluttering the RFP
- There is value in letting developers ask questions; don’t make too complicated
- Capture the info that helps us evaluate the proposals (narrative: population mix, traffic impact, tax impact, sustainability, water usage by building type)
- Community Impacts and Benefits – add parameters
- Consider adding briefings (CAM, MEC, Historical) as way to not clutter RFP? Committee discussion: developer could get a confusing picture. Perhaps done during the bidder’s conference or one briefing could be provided. Let’s not re-open the master plan with this process; keep it clean and relevant with appropriate guardrails.
- Summary of outstanding issues (not comprehensive) – What is for sale/ground lease, are we requiring bidder to acquire the whole, price logistics & legalities

Next Steps – Meet next Wednesday to craft final RFP. Look to 1/26 or 2/2 for the BoS meeting. MHC has another 14-day review for final RFP.

Next Meeting – Wednesday, January 20, 2020 at 6:00 pm

Minutes (10/28/20, 11/4/20, 11/18/20, 12/16/20) – tabled

Adjournment – Mr. Metzler made a motion to adjourn at approximately 9:04 pm; Seconded by Mr. Martinez.
The Vote: 7-0 (Roll Call: GM=yes, TT=yes, JM=yes, PC=yes, CM=yes, MM=yes, RK=yes).