



Medfield State Hospital Development Committee

MEETING OF:
January 23, 2019

MINUTES

Members Present: Adam Ameden, Johnny Martinez, Gus Murby, Ken Richard, Todd Trehubenko

Staff Absent: Sarah Raposa, Town Planner

Others Present: John Harney, Bill Massaro

Location: Town Garage (DPW) Training Room

Mr. Todd Trehubenko called the meeting to order at 7:20 pm.

- **Assigning teams for interviews of RFI respondents**

Mr. Trehubenko reported that Ms. Sarah Raposa and Mr. Trehubenko consulted with Mark Cerel, Town Counsel and his recommendation is that a single member of the MSHDC meet with each developer. Mr. Trehubenko said Ms. Raposa would be attending the meetings also. Mr. Trehubenko said that if one member and Ms. Raposa attended the meetings, it would not be considered a Committee or subcommittee meeting per Mr. Cerel. Mr. Trehubenko said that if any member has connections or past connections with interested developers, those members should be assigned to those developers accordingly unless these relationships would constitute a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Ken Richards said he prefer to not be reviewing developers that he has a client/past relationship with. The development groups are Beacon, Flatley, Pulte, Trinity and Winn. Mr. Gus Murby feels the other committee members are more technically qualified to do the interviews than him. Mr. Murby also suggested the same committee member meeting with Flatley and Poulte; both development companies seem to have a similar approach to the site. Mr. Trehubenko confirmed:

- Mr. Johnny Martinez will interview Flatley and Pulte.
- Mr. Adam Ameden will interview Beacon.
- Mr. Todd Trehubenko will interview Trinity.
- Mr. Ken Richard will interview Winn.

Mr. Trehubenko suggests conducting the interviews as soon as schedules will permit. Mr. Trehubenko also noted that Ms. Raposa should attend the meetings. The members need to be as accommodating to her schedule as much as possible since she will be participating in all five meetings.

- **Discussion of standard questions to be used for RFI respondent interviews**

The following questions were discussed:

Regarding Zoning - How critical is it that the town has zoning in place before developers are willing to put forth a bid? Can the bid be subject to zoning?

Regarding Infrastructure - At what point does the developer undertake their own understanding in pricing out infrastructure and can those costs be considered entitlement costs and included in the basis? If the town is unwilling to pay for the infrastructure, what are the consequences for the town in terms of real estate taxes, abatements, etc.?

Senior Housing vs. Affordable Housing – what are the cost thresholds for construction and infrastructure to make these intended uses practical?

Is the commercial component in the Master Plan obtainable? Should the town adopt the Master Plan as written? What about housing unit counts? What about commercial? Different types of units? (Mr. Murby referenced the recent Senior Housing Survey by Ms. Barbara Gips. Mr. Murby said that he will get a copy of the study for the committee).

Is there a tradeoff between rehabilitation and new construction?

The town is hopeful the plan will be implemented in “bite-size” pieces, what are the structural phases for the town to be able to absorb growth and development?

Would the new construction developers be willing to work with affordable and/or historic developers and vice versa, where the town is excluded from it? Would the two developers have to enter a joint-venture?

Qualifications of potential developers- give the potential developers an opportunity to talk about their experience in similar/comparable properties.

Away from public transportation – how to make the site more transit oriented?

Mr. Johnny Martinez suggested sending all questions to Ms. Sarah Raposa and then obtaining a master list from Ms. Raposa to work from.

Mr. Martinez asked if the questions should go to the developers prior to the interviews. Mr. Ameden believes it is more efficient and Mr. Murby feels it would be beneficial because the ultimate goal is to get the most effective RFP prepared. Mr. Richards believes that if the questions are sent prior to the interview, the respondents might just want to give a written response and not conduct a meeting. Mr. Richard said that if we want to have meetings/interviews then the questions should just be presented then. Mr. Richard believes it will leave more room for open dialogue. Mr. Murby said we could give the highlights of the topics to be discussed at the interview/meetings prior to having them.

Mr. Trehubenko said that are 5 or 6 categories of questions. The categories could be used to highlight to the developers the discussion points of meeting/interviews. Mr. Trehubenko asked each member to type up and send their list of questions to Ms. Raposa.

Mr. Bill Massaro, 36 Evergreen Way, asked to make a few comments/observations on the discussion. Mr. Massaro said regarding the cost of rehab vs. new construction, one of Kathy McCabe’s pushes during the time the Master Plan was developed was that the cost of rehab and new construction was equal. Mr. Massaro noted all of the numbers are in the Master Plan. Mr. Massaro noted it is important to find out what type of rehab the developers are proposing. Mr. Massaro said he has struggled with the cost of demolition of buildings. The discussion of demolition began 7 – 8 years ago and DCAMM was asked what an appropriate cost is. They responded, at the time, saying the non-prevailing wage cost was \$6.00 per square foot. That cost included taking it out and taking it away. However, DCAMM also said they paid \$16.00 per square foot. At one point,

the Master Planning Committee received a quote for \$32.00 per square foot for demolition. Mr. Massaro noted demolition costs should be included in discussions with developers.

Mr. Massaro said the numbers have been “all over the place” for infrastructure. Ralph Costello of Unique Homes, VHB, and McCabe have all given potential costs. Mr. Massaro said members of the Master Planning Committee were concerned about costs (dollars for linear feet). Mr. Massaro is curious as to what numbers potential developers will give.

Mr. Massaro said that he knows one of the questions to developers will be how long of a build out the project will be. Mr. Massaro said he is curious about the absorption rate of housing units.

- **Review and approval of minutes (12/12/18)**

Mr. Murby noted that a correction is needed on the 12/12/18 minutes regarding the approval of the 12/4/18 minutes. Mr. Murby abstained from the vote. Mr. Murby was not present at the 12/4/18 meeting. Mr. Murby was not present at the December 12, 2018 meeting. Both Mr. Murby and Mr. Richard abstained from the approval of the 12/4/18 minutes.

At approximately 8:24 pm, Mr. Richard made a motion to approve the minutes from December 12, 2018. Seconded by Mr. Ameden. The Vote: 5-0.

- **Upcoming meetings: February 27, March 27, and April 24**

Mr. Murby noted that he will not be attending the February 27, 2019 meeting.

Adjournment

At 8:26 pm, Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Ameden. The Vote: 5-0.