



Medfield State Hospital Development Committee

MEETING OF:
January 20, 2021

MINUTES

Present: Todd Trehubenko, Johnny Martinez, Gus Murby, Randy Karg, Mike Metzler (departed at 7:25), Chris McMahon, Pat Casey (departed at 7:25), Nicholas Milano, Assistant Town Administrator (Ex Officio) Sarah Raposa, Town Planner, Beverly Gallo of Peregrine Urban Initiative (PUI), Eric Busch of Peregrine Group (PG), Erica Schechter (PG), Mike Mitchell of MassDevelopment

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Chair Trehubenko called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 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.

Draft RFP Comments

Chair Trehubenko said that tonight's goal is to resolve the Committee's open issues on RFP v1. One main takeaway from the last meeting is the importance of maintaining flexibility in the RFP and not making it so detailed or cumbersome it could unintentionally discourage responses. The Committee has received a lot of good comments and will be discussing the open issues as the items which are consistent with the discussion and follow up from the last meeting. Since then, input has been received from counsel MTC on several items and Ms. Gallo has clarified that the bidder's conference will be the equivalent to a site visit for interested developers and should not be viewed as a pitch meeting or forum for providing additional information to bidders that is not referenced in the RFP, its appendices, or internet links.

1. Disposition Property - what is the most the Town will be selling as part of this disposition?
 - CM: Everything should be on the table because we'll see creative ideas and/or partnership options.
 - RK: Agreed
 - TT: Should language be crafted that maintains rights for the Town?
 - BG: Still complies with 30B
 - GM: Laundry and Water Tower are not part of the RFP
 - PC: Agreed to keep flexible to induce bidders to meet multiple goals work for the entire site (i.e. no piecemeal development)
 - MM: Agreed
 - JM: Agreed

2. Must a bid address all components of the Disposition Property defined above, or are partial bids (and therefore multiple awards) potentially possible?
 - All just discussed, no; partial bids may be acceptable but perhaps not preferable based on potential submissions.
 - CM: Is Cultural Center Lease transferable?¹
 - SR: CAM lease will be an appendix in RFP

3. If partial bids are acceptable, are there any elements of the existing property (minimum requirements) that must be included in each bid to be responsive?
 - PC: Core Campus/existing buildings redevelopment is the priority
 - RK: Avoid carving off arboretum or sizable west slope buildings
 - GM: Clarified what the developer is supposed to submit; extensive group discussion about priorities for redevelopment and scoring: If a developer submits a proposal to develop the main campus, but not the Arboretum, we might then want a developer to propose on the Arboretum. The committee came out concluding that we should make clear that our priority here is the development of the hospital campus and the West Slope, but we want to leave open the possibility that someone might come in with a proposal that is focused on the other areas only.
 - BG: Scoring, weights, negotiation
 - RK: Language in draft is good (See Section I)

4. Is the level of disclosure offered in RFP v.1 appropriate or are there additional documents or statements that should be included regarding the current condition or history of the site?
 - TT: MTC advises this is more a matter of preference than law as the RFP states that respondents are responsible for their own due diligence.
 - SR: Documents available on website
 - GM: Make sure details are correct; there are no additional disclosures that we are obligated to make, but the committee should think about whether there is additional information that the town should provide to alleviate any concerns, or perceptions of risk, prospective developers may have ie how we should describe the situation with the clean-up of the dry cleaning plant site.
 - MMitchell: Timing is tight

5. Are there actions to be taken with the state regarding the laundry parcel before the RFP is published and, if so, what are these?
 - GM: Not before RFP goes out but the delay on the Laundry Parcel cleanup is a concern and could impact the development potential of the property; and a better deal is a potential future discussion.
 - BG: Add a right of first refusal language provision or negotiate it later
 - MMitchell: happy to be of assistance in dealing to DCAMM discussions, if needed, as a sister-agency

6. Must a valuation of the Disposition Property be included to meet the RFP requirements under 30B?
 - TT: MTC advises that there are no requirements under 30B to provide a valuation in the RFP.
 - BG/NM: Valuation documentation can happen post award, per MTC; strike from draft

7. If a minimum price must be specified for the Disposition Property, what should it be?
 - TT: MTC advises that there are no requirements under 30B to require a minimum price in the RFP.

¹ Follow-up – Per CAM Lease Section 19 Miscellaneous g. Assignment: CAM can assign the lease in order to secure funding or historic tax credits. The Town does not have rights to assign or transfer the lease.

- BG/RK: discussion about “value is a function of use” and total financial impact on town including purchase price; use total financial impact as a criteria, not merely the future tax revenue that is reflected in the draft language.
8. Criteria - are the threshold criteria necessary, and sufficient? For scoring criteria, should all of these be weighted equally? Does the rating scale need to be explicitly articulated for each item to be scored or simply documented as part of the review process for submitted proposals?
- BG: Evaluation of financial feasibility of the development itself vs overall cost to Town
 - TT: submissions requirements, thresholds, and scoring
 - GM/BG/PC: Scoring criteria weighted equally or not; communicate what to weight highly but not add exact percentages. BG reviewed proposed language from draft for discussion. Weights may not be equal depending on the proposal and recommended that weights should not be stated in the RFP; PC agreed with her. TT: MTC to opine to avoid potential challenge from a developer.
 - RK: Keep flexible as it could be a bargaining point based on what the proposals are
9. Sustainability - how should sustainability goals be addressed in the RFP, with respect to threshold requirements and the Evaluative Criteria?
- MM: Good info submitted by MEC and other supporters
 - PC: Proposes generality in the RFP to support the notions that “it pays for itself” and “moves fast” and let the developers propose
 - BG: Scoring might reflect the ability of developers to work with MEC through the course of development
 - RK: Intent is in the Master Plan (p 114) so we don’t need specifics in RFP
 - JM: Agreed
 - GM: Unsure of how aggressive the building standards are and hesitant to impose additional costs; balance the amount of text to all the criteria fairly. In favor of limited the number of special requirements for developers.
 - CM: Agreed
 - TT: Articulate what is desirable without being too prescriptive
 - EB: Insert language in the Team section to provide an incentive to include an energy-focused team member
10. Should the idea of "Medfield values" be used in the RFP and if so does this need to be defined?
- PC: Charter from Selectmen to MSHMPC – *“One of the criterion established by the Medfield Board of Selectmen for the strategic reuse master plan for MSH was the consideration of “Medfield values” as to new uses. MSHMPC identified twelve attributes to define Medfield values from a town-wide perspective. -They are: 1) education; 2) heritage, town history and historic preservation; 3) fiscal prudence; 4) open space; 5) fitness; 6) appreciation for nature; 7) rural character and scale; 8) family; 9) community involvement; 10) community spirit and local events; 11) acceptance and inclusion; and 12) caring and compassionate community. The MSHMPC has sought to develop a master plan that reflects these Medfield values.”*
 - TT: The scoring matrix is a good indicator of community values
 - JM: ok with nature of discussion but was thinking of future conversations at town meeting
 - CM: Agreed; matrix provides guideposts
 - GM: Agreed; notes that list was created prior to his joining the BoS
 - Committee agreed to NOT define Medfield values in the RFP

Minutes–

- **October 28, 2020**

- **November 4, 2020**
- **November 18, 2020**
- **December 16, 2020**
- **January 13, 2021**

It was noted that the 10/28/20 and 11/4/20 were approved on 11/18/20 but the committee will re-approve them again for convenience.

Mr. McMahon made a motion to approve the minutes of 10/28/21, 11/4/20, 11/18/20, 12/16/20, and 1/13/21. Seconded by Mr. Martinez. The Vote: 5-0 (Roll Call: GM=yes, TT=yes, JM=yes, CM=yes, RK=yes).

Next Meeting – Meeting with BoS on February 2, 2021

Adjournment – Mr. Karg made a motion to adjourn at approximately 7:40 pm; Seconded by Mr. Murby. The Vote: 5-0 (Roll Call: GM=yes, TT=yes, JM=yes, CM=yes, RK=yes).