

**Attendance Roster**

<b>Committee Members</b>		
--------------------------	--	--

Stephen Nolan	Patrick Casey	Ralph Costello
Teresa James - absent	Randal Karg	Brandie Erb
Gil Rodgers		

<b>Resource Members</b>		
-------------------------	--	--

Alec Stevens - absent	John Harney	Frank Perry - absent
Lucille Fisher - absent	Jean Mineo - absent	Bill Massaro
John Thompson - absent		

<b>Others</b>		
---------------	--	--

Sarah Raposa	Kathy McCabe	Jen Mecca
Ona Ferguson	Betsy Jacobson	Dave Jacobson
Jack Wolfe	Martha Festa	Mel Seibolt
Gus Murby	Osler Peterson	Tom Caragliano
Jasmin Chan	Sadie Durham	

**Agenda**

- 6:30 Welcome, intros, review previous sessions
  - Confirm completion of action items from 20 Sep 17
  - Discuss and vote on meeting minutes
- 6:40 Public comment
  - Opportunity for members of the public to share any pressing questions or thoughts
- 8:10 Financials: Town and taxpayer financial options and implications
  - Presentation and discussion of predicted impacts to the Town of Medfield and Medfield taxpayers, including estimated number of school children
  - Discussion of and decision about adoption of cost estimates
- 8:45 Design guideline principles
  - Presentation and discussion of principles to use in developing design guidelines for MSH
- 9:45 Committee business
  - Review revised committee timeline
  - Discuss letter for the Cultural Alliance of Medfield
- 9:55 Public comment
  - Opportunity for members of the public to share any pressing questions or thoughts
- 10:05 Review action items and topics for the next meeting agenda
- 9:20 Adjourn

*And, any additional business that came in after the deadline that must be discussed prior to the next meeting*

**Agreements**

1. An appropriate level traffic study should be incorporated into our timeline at a later date. The need for the study and level of detail will be determined later.
2. The proposed financial analysis work plan should be incorporated into our timeline.
3. The draft letter in support of the Medfield Cultural Alliance's initial fund raising efforts was approved.

**New Action Items**

#	Item	Responsible	Due
1.	Create a proposal to incorporate an appropriate level traffic study into the work plan. The proposal should include use of prior traffic studies performed by both MEPA and Larkin Builders	S. Nolan/K. McCabe	18 Oct
2.	Verify the building permit revenue estimate	K. McCabe	18 Oct
3.	Get the number of school-aged children at The Parc development on West Street and review the estimated projection for school-aged children in the preferred plan	K. McCabe	18 Oct
4.	Refine the cost/pupil number with input from the school department	K. McCabe/M. Festa	18 Oct
5.	Forward the draft senior housing study plan to all committee members	S. Raposa	Done
6.	Update the financial summary slide deck with input from this session. Separate the one- time costs and revenues from the annual ongoing cash flows.	K. McCabe	06 Oct
7.	Revise timeline and link with financial decision-making process	P. Casey, S. Nolan, O. Ferguson, K. McCabe	17 Oct
8.	Communicate with PARE about what reports the committee already has and what it might need from a traffic study at this stage.	S. Nolan, O. Ferguson	31 Oct
9.	Share the DCAM estimate of number of children per household with the committee.	B. Massaro	17 Oct

**Holdover Action Items**

#	Item	Responsible	Due
10	Schedule Tangerini farms to meet with the Committee regarding potential agricultural uses	G. Rodgers	Open
11			

**Summary Notes**

Meeting began: 18:36

Meeting concluded: 22:29

**20 Sep 17 Meeting Minutes/Action Item Review -**

K. McCabe reported back on her findings regarding transportation *assessment* versus transportation *analysis*. In summary an *analysis* provides a more thorough survey of traffic patterns based on quantitative data with more detailed and specific recommendations for traffic management methods. The group felt that this level of detail was not needed at this time for our master planning activity, but would be appropriate when the master plan is more defined. An action item was taken to communicate with PARE about what information the committee might need given that we have several previous reports. Prior studies from both MEPA and Larkin Builders are available to assist this effort.

Meeting minutes for 20 Sep 17 approved by consensus with one dissenting vote. One member felt that the notes about the utility cost estimate did not adequately capture his disagreement. A member of the Warrant Committee stated that he would not accept cost estimates based upon anecdotal project data but only those estimates prepared by credible professionals.

Motion: P. Casey

Second: R. Karg

**Financials: Town and taxpayer financial options and implications -**

K. McCabe presented the analysis of the potential financial impact to the Town.

Major revenue sources include one-time items such as land acquisition (revenue from property (land and building) sale to a developer), building permit fees and connection fees. Ongoing revenue is created by real estate taxes and personal property taxes.

Major ongoing costs to the town include the cost for incremental school-aged children and the cost of general Town services.

Meeting participants asked for clarification about or challenged several assumptions used in the analysis.

- \$10/sq. ft. assumption for renovated or new building space and assigning zero value for land used in estimating acquisition value to Town
- Building permit revenue
- Impact of revenue sharing with DCAMM
- Average vs. variable costs per pupil for incremental students in Medfield schools
- Estimated number of school-aged children in the proposed plan
- Market demand for senior housing stock
- Need to use ranges (e.g., high, low, & mid-point) for both costs and revenues to quantify sensitivities and uncertainties of the analysis

Action items were identified to clarify and confirm these assumptions.

A request was made to separate the one-time items from the recurring annual items in the summary tables. K. McCabe will make that adjustment prior to distributing the slide deck to committee members.

K. McCabe described how District Improvement Financing (DIF) can help with Town costs. The advantage of this approach compared to straight bond financing by the Town is that it does not count against the Town's debt limit.

P. Casey reviewed his proposed work plan for gaining concurrence and alignment of the financial analysis of the preferred plan. He suggested involving the Board of Selectmen and the Warrant Committee to gain their understanding, constraints, and recommendations with the project and its financial implications. There are a number of key cost and revenue assumptions fundamental to the analysis that need to be vetted, but he did not feel the task will impede the work. His proposal for next steps was accepted and will be incorporated into the committee's work plan.

### **Design Guidelines –**

J. Mecca conducted a quick review of the design guideline concept and conducted a visual preference exercise using photos of selected developments. Committee members identified key design aspects like rooflines, massing, street walls and materials that they think are important. A suggestion was made to review other projects (such as other state hospital redevelopments and the Wentworth Institute of Technology student exercises) for ideas and examples to guide this effort. Jen noted other recommendations and feedback on the visual preference exercise were noted for her follow up.

### **Committee Business –**

O. Ferguson reviewed the 04 Oct 17 draft timeline. Suggestions were solicited for the best point to involve the Board of Selectmen. The consensus opinion was that at least one more Committee meeting was needed to firm up the financials prior to involving other groups formally in the discussion. O. Ferguson will incorporate P. Casey's proposed work plan into the timeline.

S. Nolan noted that the Board of Selectmen approved the McCabe and CBI change orders requested, but strongly cautioned that this is the final approval for additional funding for consulting services. He asked all committee members to involve him in any requests for additional services from our consultant team.

The draft letter for the Cultural Alliance of Medfield was reviewed. It was accepted as written but it raised the issue of how an arts/cultural center will be treated in the financial analysis and if this should be an "off-balance sheet" element similar to a sports and recreational complex. O. Ferguson will add this topic to the agenda for discussion at the October 18th meeting.

### **Public Comment –**

One public attendee related his conversation with an acquaintance who is a master developer. In this person's opinion the Lee Chapel is not in the correct location at the site for a culture center and would be better suited to a community center type use. He also volunteered to respond to an RFI if it were sent to him.

Another person raised concern about "front-loading" and timing of fundraising for the proposed Lee Chapel culture center prior to having an agreement upon Master Plan proposal.