



TOWN OF MEDFIELD

Medfield State Hospital Planning Committee

For internal committee review only - not for publication

REPORT OF THE MEDFIELD STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

AUGUST 4, 2015

- Meets twice monthly on the first and third Wednesday at 7 pm in the Town Garage meeting room
- Received mission statement from Board of Selectmen
- Established internal goals and objectives (attached)

Member	Resource
Stephen J. Browne	John Harney
Patrick Casey	Bill Massaro
Ralph Costello	Jean Mineo
Teresa James	Frank Perry
Randal Karg	Ros Smythe
Stephen M. Nolan, Chairman	Alec Stevens
David Perini	John Thompson
Kenneth J. Richard	
Gil Rodgers	

Subcommittee Reports:

1. VHB/RKG Project Liaisons
 2. Communications Subcommittee
 3. Survey Subcommittee
 4. Financials Subcommittee
 5. Developers Roundtable Subcommittee
 6. Lightning Strike Subcommittee
 7. Committee Outreach Reports (Council on Aging, Cultural Visioning, Medfield Energy Committee)
- Appendix A: Agreements Log

Mission, Goal and Objectives of Medfield State Hospital Reuse Master Plan - 2014

Board of Selectmen Mission Statement:

The overall goal of the Committee is to present to the Board of Selectmen a comprehensive and coordinated vision for the sustainable redevelopment and reuse of the former Medfield State Hospital.

Goal:

The goal is to create a Master Plan for the former Medfield State Hospital whose initial phase covers reuse of the core campus but also suggests compatible uses for the adjacent town- and state-owned properties. Alternative reuse designs will be based on balancing the competing uses and following set of objectives.

Objectives:

- Preserve the natural resources and rural character of the site.
- Conserve when feasible the architectural and cultural history of the site.
- Consider and select reuses that are informed by the underlying values and character of the Town of Medfield.
- Consider housing needs for multiple economic and demographic segments of the Medfield population.
- Create and integrate open space with easy access throughout the site.
- Create economic value to the overall site and serve the needs of the community.
- Establish a sense of place and destination.
- Provide recreational, learning and cultural opportunities to support Medfield's diversity of talents and interests.
- Consider retail and commercial space within the context of the campus reuse plan and supportive of ongoing economic development in downtown Medfield.
- Achieve acceptable long-term economic, environmental and financial impacts on Medfield residents and town services.

REPORT #1 – VHB/RKG PROJECT LIAISONS

- Teresa James
- Randal Karg
- Sarah Raposa

The Committee held an initial meeting for the master planning process on May 6, 2015 with VHB and RKG to kick-off a year-long planning process that will over the following objectives:

- Maintain and enhance the character and values of the Town of Medfield and its residents
- Upgrade Town housing inventory and address underserved housing needs
- Achieve reasonable economic and financial impacts on Medfield residents and Town services

A Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was created for the purpose of identifying opportunities to gain community and stakeholder involvement at optimal points during the process. The PIP is a dynamic, evolving document that identifies goals for each of the (4) public meetings, potential timeframes for the public meetings, and a draft format and outreach tools anticipated for use during each event, and opportunities for the town to consider in advertising these events.

Phases and Elements of the Planning Process:

- Public Meeting # 1: “Shaping the Alternatives” on June 11, 2015
- Developer’s Roundtable on August 11, 2015
- Public Meeting #2: “Alternatives” on September 16, 2015 at the High School Auditorium
- Public Meeting #3: “Preferred Plan” Target Date: TBD/November 2015?
- Public Meeting #4: “Zoning and Implementation” (includes disposition strategy) Target Date: TBD/February 2016?

Current status and upcoming meetings:

- On June 17th the Committee met with VHB & RKG where three high level re-use scenarios were created based on committee and public input from the 6/11 public meeting. The methodology included drawing ‘bubble diagrams’ on site maps and capturing elements and key points for each case:
 - Alternative #1 – Community Asset Resource (value balance of cost/benefit)
 - Alternative #2 – Balanced Smart Growth (mix of uses, retain “village” feel)
 - Alternative #3 – Market Driven (residential heavy and/or business campus)
- On August 5th the Committee will have a meeting with VHB & RKG to review progress thus far, identify and capture insights discovered from the current scenario development process (major cost drivers, benefit sources, revenue/cash flow opportunities and constraints), develop strategies for development implementation, review updated market information.
- On August 19th the Committee will hold a housing workshop sponsored by the Massachusetts Housing Partnership. The focus will be on the various types/styles and affordabilities of multi-family housing, state programs, ie “the 40s” (B, R, S) and other zoning tools.

REPORT #2 – COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

- Ralph Costello
- Randal Karg
- Gil Rodgers
- Brandie Erb
- Lucille Fisher
- Ros Smythe
- Alec Stevens
- Sarah Raposa

Media Efforts

1. Website, MSHVision.net, is constantly updated with current news on the property
2. Weekly email updates to a list of 467 interested people and 18 groups and organizations
3. Medfield TV interviews , available on YouTube, the Medfield TV website and MSHVision.net., are approximately 25 minutes each and cover issues relevant to the property
4. Press releases for local news media
5. 357 Facebook followers and 47 followers on Twitter.
6. links to the web site and notifications of all public meetings provided in the Thursday school packets.
7. @MSH_Vision is following all the principals in the school system and local and regional media outlets.
8. Medfield Professionals group on LinkedIn is actively monitored for MSH references

Subcommittee Outreach

1. Information sessions with local organizations: Open Space and Recreation; Conservation Commission; Warrant Committee; Board of Water and Sewerage; Housing Authority; Energy Committee, Parks and Recreation; Boy and Girl Scout Leaders; New 'N Town, Board of Assessors; and, Council on Aging
2. Participation in MEMO'S Discover Medfield History Day Trolley Tour. Provided Committee member on each of the six tours to answer questions and encourage community participation. Set up information table at trolley stop to educate and create discussion.
3. Set up information table at Thistle Art Installation to answer questions and encourage community participation
4. Booth at Medfield Day (2014 & 2015)

REPORT #3 – SURVEY SUBCOMMITTEE

- Patrick Casey
- Teresa James
- Jean Mineo
- High School interns: Olivia Taylor, Marykate McNeil, & Dana Cruickshank.

Surveys intend to start broad and subsequently explore topics raised in more detail, determined by responses. They are intentionally short with a goal to expand input to the planning process. We expect to issue a new survey every 2-3 weeks. Notification through the email blast, Facebook, Selectmen blogs, etc. Sign up through MSHVision.net

Survey #1 June 28 - July 12

- Responses from 1,073 people, 95% from Medfield and in demographics roughly corresponding to Medfield in ages
- 86% hadn't attended the June 11 workshop = great outreach!
- We asked for "dreams" and "nightmares." Under dreams - most commonly mentioned categories were Recreation/Sports (programs & facilities), Open Space/Park (passive use), and Housing. Under nightmare, housing was mentioned by 75% of those who wrote in a response.
- These will be explored in Survey #2
- Survey notices to planning boards and board of selectman from adjacent towns
- Executive Summary and full report is available online (MSH Vision?)
- People were asked if they'd like more communication and of those who responded, 61% said yes. Therefore the committee is planned 2 walking tour / discussion groups.

Walking Tour/Discussion Group #1 July 22

- About 45 attended the walking tour led by John Thompson
- About 22 attended the discussion group at DPW Garage
- Looked at questions of <use> + <benefit> + <stakeholder(s)> and <use> + <issue> + <stakeholder(s)>
- Written summary forthcoming
- Special note: we even had some young adults who are interested in architecture, photography and state hospitals (their passion) from RI who participated and shared some historical photographs of the property in their possession and are active users of the property as it is today.

Survey #2 Open NOW through Aug. 9 - this Sunday

- Explores topics of Recreation and Housing raised in Survey #1
- **Response is currently under 150 - HELP NEEDED TO PROMOTE** and encourage response
- Survey link on homepage of MSHVision.net

Walking Tour/Discussion Group #2: Tues. Aug. 18

1. We have about 45 signed up already for the tour (RSVPs are to help with supplies/planning)
2. Attendees can come for one or both (tour and discussion)
3. Sign up link is through Eventbrite.com and use the search box to type in Medfield Walking Tour

REPORT #4 – FINANCIAL ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE (FAS)

- Stephen Nolan
- Ken Richard
- Gil Rodgers
- Bill Massaro
- Mike Marcucci

The FAS is composed of Steve Nolan, Ken Richard and Gil Rodgers; Bill Massaro attends meetings as resource support; and Mike Marcucci attends meetings to coordinate with Warrant Committee. Its purpose is to develop accurate and realistic assumptions to enter into financial analyses of MSH alternatives, review and comment on the financial model structure and analytical approach, and to review results of financial analyses.

Action items:

1. Coordinating financial modeling and analyses with Warrant Committee through Mike Marcucci.
2. Obtained copy of preliminary financial model from RKG and reviewed model structure. Sending RKG/ VHB list of comments. Scheduling working session with RKG/VHB to discuss model and provide feedback.
3. Obtained updated data from Superintendent of Schools on student population projections and total costs per student, current and projections for 10 next years.
4. Obtaining estimating factors for number of students per household and number of students per number of bedrooms.
5. Obtaining updated assumptions on municipal costs per resident (current and projection for 10 years) from Medfield Town officials.
6. Developing RFP to obtain more accurate and relevant demolition and abatement cost assumptions based on four buildings (C1, C2, B4 and 27b - Food Service Building, representing 142,000 ft²) requiring demolition. Assembled CD of all previous studies of these and comparable buildings to provide detailed data for respondents. Working jointly with Building and Grounds Committee.
7. Obtaining revenue, cost, and physical size assumptions from: (1) Parks and Recreation, (2) Arts/culture center, and (3) Other Institutions (health, high-tech, bio, industry)
8. Refined and documented 40B housing gap numbers in Medfield.
9. Organizing and scheduling designer/architect roundtable to expand inputs and assumptions in development of alternatives.

REPORT #5 – DEVELOPERS ROUNDTABLE SUBCOMMITTEE

- Stephen Nolan
- Ralph Costello
- Ken Richard

The VHB team recommended an outreach process to invite qualified development interests to potentially participate with the Town in the redevelopment of the MSH campus. Using an approach that has been successful in comparable projects, this will include an initial “developer’s roundtable” wherein real estate developers and other interested parties are brought together to see and discuss the project, accompanied by a suitable marketing effort to attract qualified professionals. This approach includes a controlled site visit, an introduction and presentation the Subcommittee and VHB regarding the process and draft alternatives, followed by a roundtable discussion or Q&A session. The purpose of this initial outreach step is to create awareness of the property and the opportunities presented in the Master Plan, and to refine the plan in response to input from the development community received. The VHB team is organizing this step in concert with the Town earlier in the process than originally anticipated (it was part of the Phase III scope).

?, Hall Keen	Acquisition, development and management of affordable, conventional, and mixed income housing (Baker Chocolate Factory in Dorchester, Kennedy Biscuit Lofts in Cambridge)
Brian Goldson & Peter Roth, New Atlantic Development	Midway in Fort Point, ArtBlock in S End, Brookside Artists Lofts in JP
Peter Daly, Homeowner’s Rehab	Non-profit housing (Putnam Green & Chapman Arms in Cambridge)
Kevin Burke, North Hill	Continuing care retirement community
Michael A. Stoller, LCB Senior Living	Assisted living
Emily Reichert, Greentownlabs	Energy and clean technology entrepreneur incubator
Josh Cohen, Beacon Communities	Mixed income housing
Tony Green, The Pinehills	Housing developer
Torben Arend, Gilbane	Housing construction
Ron Bonvie, Southport	Senior housing developer
Ron Roux	Housing developer

REPORT #6 – LIGHTNING STRIKE SUBCOMMITTEE

- Stephen Browne
- Ralph Costello
- Gil Rodgers
- Stephen Nolan

The subcommittee's mission is to reach out, and not wait for lightning to strike, to identify potential institutional users for MSH, including educational (e.g., universities), non-profits, bio-tech, and sports.

Impressions of First Meeting with North Hill:

Key Messages from the Meeting:

North Hill is a successful non-profit with a vertically integrated business model for seniors, offering owner-occupied independent living condos, enhanced living (their variation on assisted living), and nursing home care, operating on a large campus in Needham with about 600 residents in various components of their model (more than 80% are in the condos).

Expressed interest in locating in the Core Campus area (not Hinkley/Ice House Road)

- They are attracted to the campus atmosphere, adjacent conservation / recreation areas, the views – all of which also are elements of their campus in Needham
- They are looking for a place to expand, because their Needham campus is full

In Medfield, they would provide only Independent Living units (i.e., owner occupied condominiums)

- They would not replicate the full business model of their Needham campus
- They would not build assisted living or nursing home facilities, even though they do provide those facilities in Needham
 - They would provide those services at their Needham campus and/or outsource to local Medfield providers of assisted living and nursing home services

North Hill's product would be expensive, and would require buyers to pay for a full package (purchase a condo plus purchase a long term care program)

- It would be an attractive development for MSH and would appeal to one segment of the Medfield senior market
- Because of its high price, it will not meet all the needs expressed by seniors (who want Moderate Price Housing)
- It would be highly complementary to more moderate priced senior housing at another "MSH" location (Hinkley and potentially Ice House Road, as requested by the senior community)
 - Two different locations serving two different market segments

North Hill will engage strongly to pursue the potential at MSH

- Anne Orens of North Hill, who was at the meeting at North Hill, later attended the MSH walking tour on July 22, and was very impressed with its potential
- Kevin Burke (CEO of North Hill) will attend the August 11 Developers Session (as invited), along with assisted living invitee Michael Stoller (CEO of LCB)

REPORT #7A – COMMITTEE OUTREACH REPORTS – SENIORS

Based on outreach to the Council on Aging Board of Directors and separate discussions with Roberta Lynch and members of the COA

Outreach representatives of MSH MPC: Browne, Costello, and Rodgers

Key Messages from the Seniors:

- Seniors want “Moderate Price Housing”
 - They want housing available similar to what is available in Norfolk now -- \$300,000 - \$350,000 units, designed for senior needs (one level living, with possibility of additional bedrooms and bath on the same level or second floor) , etc.)
 - This is distinguished from 40B-style definitions of “Affordable Housing”
- Seniors do not want 40B housing
- Seniors want owner occupied housing, not rentals
- Seniors want a range of housing-related services for seniors, in Medfield, including
 - Moderate price housing
 - Moderate size housing, (1,200 s.f. to 1,800 s.f)
 - Walkable neighborhood
 - Opportunities for social interaction
 - Low or maintenance free housing
 - Assisted Living
- The COA recommends placing Moderate Price Housing for seniors near the COA
 - Hinkley parcel
 - Lot 3 Ice House Road
- Seniors feel
 - They have been ignored / shortchanged, and that although much has been said they think little has been done to address their needs in Medfield
 - They are a growing segment of the population in Medfield
 - They should not have to leave Medfield as they seek housing and other services as they age

REPORT #7B – COMMITTEE OUTREACH REPORTS – CULTURAL VISIONING

MSH: Cultural Community Update submitted by Jean Mineo

The cultural community embraces the unique challenge of transforming the historic MSH property into a beehive of activity for creativity, discovery, inspiration, and education for residents and visitors to the region, while creating linkages to downtown.

Research to date:

Fall, 2014: MPC members visit 5 arts organizations, presented summary report

Dec. 2014: ArtsMarket consultant Louise Stevens presents to MPC and meets with cultural leaders, teachers and artists.

Jan – Feb: MA Cultural Council facilitates two community meetings to develop cultural plan

April, 2015: Cultural community presents a 32 page vision report detailing potential facilities, programs, resources and partnerships, capital, models, and a detailed case study of the Hopkinton Center for the Arts located in a community with similar demographics to Medfield (see MSHVision.net).

Cultural development offers:

- Programs: multi-generational and multi-disciplinary (music, culinary, visual art, history, horticulture, etc.)
- Strengthen Schools: provides tools, materials, and expertise to enhance curriculum
- Open Space and Passive Recreation: stewardship through use with public art, outdoor amphitheater, gardens/arboretum, connections to natural assets, etc.
- Preservation: desire for re-use of existing buildings where possible
- Scale: flexibility to work with cottage plan, maintain rural character
- Economic Development: creative enterprises start up/move to town, increase property values, direct and indirect economic benefits accrue to the community
- Uniqueness of Place: attracts those who value preservation and culture; support Medfield's historic properties; artist-in-residence brings new perspectives
- Land Control: typically with a cultural development project, a municipality provides a long-term lease to a cultural organization(s) to use a building/property to provide community programs. Organization(s) maintain the property at their expense, the town retains ownership and flexibility for future use without ongoing financial burden.

Next steps:

A successful plan will seek partners and mix mutually supportive creative industries (film, publishing, gaming, design) and fine art disciplines (visual, music, drama, literary, culinary, public art) spread over several MSH buildings, and be fully integrated with open space, landscape and housing plans.

Identifying both what is possible and what is right for Medfield, along with synergistic partners will determine related capital and operating needs. ***Professional arts-based specific market research is a critical and unmet need. Estimated expense: \$10-20,000.*** We remain very concerned that the current process will not adequately address this issue.

REPORT #7C – COMMITTEE OUTREACH REPORTS – ENERGY COMMITTEE

To: Ros Smythe and Stephen Browne
Medfield State Hospital Reuse Master Planning Committee

From: Medfield Energy Committee

Date: July 8, 2015

Dear Ros and Stephen,

Thank you for taking the time to present the current status of the Medfield State Hospital Reuse Master Planning Process to the Medfield Energy Committee on May 12th, 2015. Your work is vital to the Town and will help insure the most effective use of the property.

You had requested that the Medfield Energy Committee (MEC) consider its "hopes and desires" on how the property would be developed and what things should be included in the planning process.

In the realm of "How to develop" the MEC is vitally concerned that the standards for development and construction include the best practices in energy use and energy conservation. Energy Star qualification and adherence to the Massachusetts Stretch Energy Codes are considered must-haves by the MEC. A plan for achieving net zero, and even net + energy consumption for buildings should be included in the evaluation process. Further, it was suggested that a consideration of LEED certification be part of the design and construction process.

Regarding the overall plan of "What to develop", MEC strongly recommends that appropriate space be allocated to solar energy generation. Per the deed restriction from the Commonwealth, the open area around the water tower cannot be built on unless the use is directly related to the water tower. This could be an ideal site for a solar array to at least offset the electric cost of operating the tower.

Again thank you for presenting the plans to the MEC. Please let us know when we can be of help in the planning process.

Sincerely,
Fred Bunger, Chairman, Medfield Energy Committee

Date	Agreement
05 Nov 14	The capital assessment report document was distributed. Members agreed to keep findings confidential until it is reviewed and accepted at the next meeting.
05 Nov 14	Current site security plans presented by Bob Meaney appear to be adequate. Additional measures such as a 'citizen's watch' or contract security staffing will be pursued if experience warrants.
05 Nov 14	A communications sub committee of Gil Rodgers, Ralph Costello, Ros Smythe, Alec Stevens and Randy Karg was formed.
05 Nov 14	Lucille Fisher and Brandy Morris were approved by unanimous vote as communications resource members.
05 Nov 14	A draft project goals and objectives document prepared by Gil Rodgers and Ros Smythe was accepted as working document
05 Nov 14	Agreed to have Frank Perry approach two real estate developers attend a meeting to share their point of view on potential re-use concepts as input to our deliberations.
05 Nov 14	Agreed to have a historic tax credit expert attend a meeting to review this subject.
17 Dec 14	Unanimous acceptance of revised Goals and Objectives. Document included as Appendix 1 in meeting minutes.
17 Dec 14	Unanimous acceptance of Communication Policy Document. Document included as Appendix 2 in meeting minutes
07 Jan 15	The approach for evaluation and selection of the preferred Master Planning consultant will be determined at the 21 January meeting after all proposals are received (due 16 January) and the size of the effort is known.
07 Jan 15	Article 27 as shown on the handout 'DRAFT 2015 ATM Warrant Articles relating to MSH' is inappropriate at this time. Approval of this Article will obviate the mission determined by the Board of Selectmen for our team.
07 Jan 15	Follow up with the Park and Recreation Commission by Steve Nolan will be pursued as to whether the Warrant Article should be pursued
21 Jan 15	<p>Consultant Proposal Ranking: Good – Community Opportunities Group, Dodson & Flinker, Gateway Planning Better – Architerra, DEI, Principle+ Group, Touloukian Touloukian Best – Cecil Group, VHB</p> <p>Follow Up Activity 1. The follow up approach for interviews will be:</p> <p>Four consultants, the two 'Best' and two selected from the 'Better' group, will</p>

Date	Agreement
	<p>be invited to interview with the Committee on this schedule –</p> <p>February 4 at 06:30 and 08:00 February 5 at 06:30 and 08:00</p> <p>2. The selection of the two consultants from the 'Better' group will completed offline. Each Committee member will submit their individual forced rank selection of the 'Better' group to Sarah Raposa for compilation by 25 January.</p>
04 Mar 15	<p>1. VHB was selected as the best firm to assist in our planning efforts by unanimous affirmation. DEI presents a credible alternative if contract negotiations with VHB are unsuccessful.</p> <p>2. Ken Richard and Sarah Raposa will represent the committee at the New in Town group meeting April 16</p> <p>3. Steve Nolan, Ken Richard and Ralph Costello will conduct contract negotiations with VHB</p> <p>4. A single point of contact or subcommittee from the committee will be identified to manage the relationship and coordinate activities with VHB during project execution. Interested committee members should contact Steve Nolan.</p>
18 Mar 15	<p>1. Modifications to the VHB services agreement were made and will be forwarded to VHB for their consideration and approval.</p> <p>2. A request for \$200k of additional funding will be made in Warrant Article #24 at this year's town meeting.</p> <p>3. Randy Karg and Teresa James were approved to serve as liaisons to VHB along with Sarah Raposa as Town Planner.</p> <p>4. Bill Massaro will initiate collection of documentation to support the planning process.</p> <p>5. Bill Massaro will investigate the potential to conduct a tree maintenance service day at the site.</p>
01 April 15	<p>1. Steve Nolan will take the lead in answering any questions regarding ATM Article 24 at Town Meeting</p> <p>2. The April 15 meeting will be canceled if the Parks and Recreation Board is not available to meet with us. (Post meeting update – the April 15 meeting will be held as previously scheduled. Sarah has posted the agenda.)</p>
15 April 15	<p>VHB and Town of Medfield have formally signed contract for master plan development.</p>
06 May 15	<p>1. The schedule and project plan as presented by VHB was approved by the committee</p> <p>2. A Motion was proposed by Stephen Nolan, seconded by Steven Browne and approved unanimously:</p> <p>The Board of Selectmen to write a letter to the Division of Capital Asset</p>

Date	Agreement
	<p>Management and Maintenance requesting Town participation and input on the design of the Parcel A-2 access road and parking facility for the Charles River Canoe Livery on the former State Hospital land. The design of the parking facility should be done in a manner that facilitates early phase access via existing central campus roadways as well as later phase access via parcel A-2. The design of the long term access on parcel A-2 should be done in a manner which preserves the valuable soils on that parcel for agricultural use.</p>
20 May 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All prior meeting minutes approved unanimously. 2. All files posted to VHB extranet will be handled by Sarah Raposa. She will provide guidance on process to be followed. See Action Item #1 below. 3. Use Survey Monkey for public input. 4. Committee desires to be an active participant in selecting developers who participate in the Developers Roundtable event. 5. Definition of "Base Case" for analysis prior to 11 June meeting is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolish all buildings • Keep roadways • Leave underground utilities in current state • Backfill foundations • Maintain mowing and landscaping activities as currently conducted • Security by routine police patrols 6. Approved \$500 to Sarah Raposa for preliminary project expenses. Later amended to increase to \$1000. Motion - K. Richard; Second R. Costello
03 Jun 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Minutes of May 20, 2015 meeting were approved unanimously. 8. Agreed that suggestions for additional "Did You Know" items will be completed and submitted by the end of the week of June 5th. 9. RKG will provide Committee Members with a copy of the Proforma for the No-Development Scenario prior to the date of the first Public Meeting. 10. Teresa James had prepared a draft of questions for the upcoming Public Survey Questionnaire, (Survey Monkey), and, together with Pat Casey, they will submit an update to the Committee for comments. The hope is to be able to send out the Survey as soon as possible after Public Meeting #1.
17 Jun 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 03 June 2015 meeting minutes approved. Motion – Randy Karg; Second – Ken Richard 2. Financial review sub-committee formed with Ken Richard, Gil Rodgers, Steve Nolan members; Bill Massaro Resource Member 3. Survey sub-committee formed with Pat Casey, Teresa James , Jean Mineo and Richard Scullary citizen resource member 4. Developer Roundtable sub-committee formed with Ralph Costello, Ken Richard and Steve Nolan members. 5. 16 September is the date for the next Public Involvement Meeting 6. Next regularly scheduled committee meeting will be 01 July

Date	Agreement
01 Jul 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hard copies of the survey need to be posted at the Library, Town Hall and Senior Center to enable those without computer/online voting capability to participate 2. Decisions on re-naming the property and conducting a 'Blessing Event' at the site were deferred. 3. A "Lightning Outreach" effort will be conducted to leverage network contacts that committee members have with key people in academia and targeted industries. Timing is urgent for this activity. A sub-committee of Steve Nolan, Gil Rodgers, Steve Browne and Ralph Costello was named to drive the effort with substantive results by the end of August. 4. A site information packet to support the "Lightning Outreach" should be developed. 5. The Warrant Committee was identified as a key stakeholder for our group. A member of the Warrant Committee will be invited to the next meeting of the Finance Sub-committee. 6. The issue of demolition costs remains unresolved. This information is vital to accurately assessing the financial impact of various re-development scenarios. We unanimously agreed to pursue an RFP for demolition of Buildings C-1, C-2, B-4 and 27B to resolve this issue. These buildings are appropriate for demolition as they have been identified as being dangerously deteriorated and/or highly risky attractive nuisances. There are no issues or opposition to demolishing these buildings from the various Historical Commissions. The exact process for gaining funding approval for this work will be investigated. See Action Item #5 Below. 7. Delegation of Authority to appropriate an additional \$2,000 for two additional meetings with VHB was unanimously granted to Sarah Raposa, Randy Karg and Teresa James. Moved: Gil Rodgers, Second: Ralph Costello. 8. The Finance Sub-committee will respond to a request from the School Committee for a student population forecast resulting from any re-development activity.