

Medway Redevelopment Authority
January 14, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X		X	X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Marcandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development
Kelly O-Rourke, Community Improvement Planning Committee Liaison

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

There were no citizen comments.

The Chairman explained that this was the first time the Redevelopment Authority has met since the passing of the Consultant Hubbard and the hiring of Stephanie Mercandetti, the Director of Community and Economic Development.

The Chairman welcomed Stephanie Mercandetti and wanted her to provide her Background experience to the Redevelopment Authority.

Ms. Mercandetti explained that she previously worked in Walpole as the Director of Planning and Economic Development. She has over 15 years of experience in this field. Stephanie will work as a staff liaison to the Redevelopment Authority. Stephanie also serves as the Chairman to the Framingham Planning Board. She is currently making her rounds to the various Boards and Commissions.

The Chairman communicated that Stephanie will be providing recommendations for improvements to the process and will help to guide the town and boards to make us more permit friendly to business.

Office Space:

The office of the Director of Community and Economic Development is located where the IT was housed; upstairs in Stanford Hall. There will be a future goal to have a land use office area.

Bid Process:

Stephanie informed the Authority that after going through the paperwork Rob had there was not an RFP bid process. There was \$80,000 allocated, but there was no formal vote on the scope of the RFP. There were also no quotes for the proposals. Stephanie did speak with Carol Wolf and the RDA is not exempt from the procurement and we need to go through 30 B process for proposals.

The Authority was presented with a draft of the scope of services.

The Authority explained that they were led to believe that they could move forward with BSC. The Board would like to look over the document and they will provide input to Stephanie.

The Board would like to meet on Wednesday January 28, 2015 to review the bid documents.

Economic Development Members:

Stephanie is looking for members to serve on the Economic Development Committee.

Community Improvement Planning Committee:

Kelly O'Rourke the liaison for CIPC was present at the meeting. She explained that there has been a place holder for the \$1,000,300 for the taking of land for development

The minutes of CIPC will be referenced to see what was sought for money for FY 2016 for land acquisition.

The Chairman indicated that we need to be careful about being too specific. We need to be in a position to buy key parcels. The insurance policy needs to be in place. During process there will be advertising and legal costs, but the minutes and supporting documents need to be reviewed.

Liaison O'Rourke wanted to know if the RDA will be in the position for land acquisition in the next fiscal cycle.

The Chairman responded that if the Urban Renewal Plan is in place, then we will be in

the position.

CIPC Representative exited from the meeting. It was communicated to her that their committee will be included in the distribution list when our agenda is posted.

Steering Committee:

Stephanie provided an update on the status of the steering committee after her conversation with Ray Himmel. The goal is to keep moving forward with forming this committee. Ray would like to have further outreach done for members. He did reach out to Susy Affleck Childs, Mike Boynton, and Andy Rodenhiser and will follow-up with Selectmen Foresto to see if they may want to get involved. One of the tasks of the steering committee will be to work with the consultant and interview the consultants in the RFP process.

There was a question about what funds are available for the Authority. It was communicated that there was money allocated at the town meeting for the Urban Renewal Plan. There is also possibly money remaining from what was provided for Rob Hubbard's work as a consultant. There was \$175,000 allotted for legal expenses. The Redevelopment Authority would like to verify some of these numbers.

Insurance coverage:

Stephanie did inform the Authority that she did follow-up with Allison Potter and was informed that the town's insurance carrier does not cover Redevelopment Authorities. The carrier for Police and Fire have been contacted and they do not cover redevelopment authorities. There is a carrier by the name of National Association of Housing Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) which does cover redevelopment and housing authorities and the town is seeking quotes. The members would like to see the quote when available.

All members are in agreement that they want insurance in place prior to the taking of any land. There is also a concern about awarding a contract for consultant without insurance coverage.

Mission Statement Review:

The RDA was provided with a draft mission statement.

The mission of the Medway Redevelopment Authority is to stimulate economic revitalization in specific parts of Town that are substandard, decadent or blighted open space per the mandates and authority of the Massachusetts urban renewal program. The MRA will serve as a catalyst in fostering public/private partnerships with resultant

improvements in employment, infrastructure and the Town's tax base.

The Chairman suggested adding language about work force housing. There was disagreement that this type of language “work force housing” should be added in the mission statement. There was also discussion relative to the terminology “blighted” being included in the mission statement. It was communicated that this is how the state statute defines. There should be some explanation of how this term is used so that the general public can understand.

Stephanie suggested that we can add a link to terminologies when you click URP.

The members will provide comments and suggestions to Stephanie and it will be added to the next agenda.

Insurance Coverage:

Minutes:

October 23, 2014:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Mike Griffin, the Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to approve the regular minutes from August 28, 2014. (Member Downing abstained from vote)

Website/Email address:

Stephanie Mercandetti, informed the Authority that she has been in touch with IT and a webpage for Redevelopment Authority. It was recommended to add the terms of the appointments whether elected or appointed. Authority suggested deleting the last sentence the focus being the bottle cap lots. The meetings will also be noted as the fourth Wednesday of the month at the Medway Senior Center.

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Paul Yorkis, the Authority voted to approve the information as presented on the webpage.

Stephanie will be inviting Carol Wolfe Urban Renewal Coordinator for the Department of Housing and Community Development to come to the February 11, 2015 RDA meeting.

Town Meeting Article:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Mike Griffin, the Authority voted unanimously to recommend the town warrant article.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting for the Redevelopment Authority is scheduled for Wednesday, January 28, 2015 at 7:00 pm at the Medway Senior Center.

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Mike Griffin and seconded by Doug Downing, the Authority voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary

Accepted January 18, 2015

Medway Redevelopment Authority
January 28, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X		X	X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development

Vice Chairman, Michael Griffin opened the meeting at 7:16 pm.

There were no citizen comments.

Minutes:

January 14, 2015:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Doug Downing, the Medway Redevelopment Authority (MRA) voted unanimously to approve the minutes from January 14, 2015 as amended. (Andy Rodenhiser did not vote)

Chairman Andy Rodenhiser arrived at 7:25 pm.

Mission Statement Review:

The MRA was provided with two options for the Mission Statement. The revisions came from suggestions from the last Redevelopment Authority meeting on January 14, 2015. There were two alternatives reviewed.

The MRA prefers how the (alternate one) mission statement reads:

- *The mission of the Medway Redevelopment Authority is to encourage reinvestment by means of development of underutilized areas that will lead to job creation, added housing opportunities, a mix of commercial and industrial uses*

an improved tax base and a better quality of life for all residents of Medway. The MRA will function as a catalyst in fostering public/private partnerships.

Vote on Mission Statement:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Paul Yorkis, the Medway Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to accept the mission Statement (alternate one) with the amendments.

Urban Renewal Plan:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority is in receipt of a draft of the Request for Proposal for the Urban Renewal Plan for the Oak Grove Park Area. It was recommended that page numbers be added to the document. The recent Request for Proposal for an Urban Renewal Plan for the Stoughton Redevelopment Authority was used simply as a template. There was a concern about the language in the last sentence within the scope of services which references the “development will benefit the low and moderate income households..... There was a recommendation to just put will benefit “residents”. The requirement of G.L. Chapter 121B will cover the issue of blighted areas. There was discussion to add language that we want the land developed for the highest and best use and not the word “blighted”.

Section 1.1.3 of the RFP was referenced in regards to the language “up to seven meeting”. The MRA does not think the number seven (meetings) is needed. There will be two meetings for public hearing, and at least four process meetings. There will also be meetings with the steering committee. The reasoning for adding a number of meetings was strictly for budgetary purposes. It needs to be communicated to the consultant that there is an expectation that they will be meeting with the steering committee separate. This needs to be clarified. The consultant will be driving the process. It was recommended to leave the meetings to be negotiated by the Medway Redevelopment Authority. This document will be revised for the next meeting on Monday February 9, 2015.

Section 3.0 relating to counsel was discussed. It was suggested that there may be benefits to having a different counsel than the town. The big problem is that there are no funds available for legal for the MRA. This is a question that may need to be addressed with Carol Wolfe.

The MRA would like the request for proposal to be sent as an electronic version. There was also an evaluation criteria sheet. This will be provided to the applicants.

The awarding will include a ranking and then the price will be reviewed.

The MRA was informed that the \$80,000 is currently in the Director of Community and Economic Development's budget. This money may need to be transferred to the Medway Redevelopment Authority (MRA). In terms of the contract with the consultant, the MRA does not want the Board of Selectmen to be on the contract, since the MRA is Independent, but the MRA is not comfortable entering a contract without insurance, if this is the case, then the town can enter into the contract. The MRA treasurer Doug Downing is the treasurer of the authority. There is an indemnification clause for the town, but the members want to know if this also includes them.

CIPC Update:

The Chairman informed the members that CIPC did not agree to fund the \$75,000.00 Since the Urban Renewal Plan is not in place. They would revisit this in the future.

Steering Committee:

Stephanie Mercandetti met with Member Ray Himmel and Board of Selectmen member John Foresto to discuss the steering committee. There were some names provided to member Himmel. The goal is to have a meeting convened the second week in February. There will be between 11-13 members on this steering committee.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting for the Medway Redevelopment Authority is scheduled for Monday, February 9, 2015 at 7:00 pm at the Medway Senior Center.

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Mike Griffin and seconded by Doug Downing, the Authority voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary
Approved March 18, 2015

Medway Redevelopment Authority
March 18, 2015
Medway Middle School
45 Holliston Road, Room 1319
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X	X		X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development
Amy Sutherland, Recording Secretary

The meeting was opened at 7:00 pm.

Minutes:

January 28, 2014:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Medway Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to approve the regular minutes from January 28, 2014.

(Member Himmel abstained from vote)

Remote participation:

The Board is in receipt of the following documents:

- Agenda Item #5 sheet “Brief Overview of Remote Participation and Mullin Rule.”
- Town of Medway Remote Participation Policy.

Stephanie Mercandetti explained that the Town of Medway Board of Selectmen have adopted the remote participation policy for members regardless if appointed or elected. This does extend to Redevelopment Authorities. There are various boards which do take part in this policy. The requirements for remote participation include that a quorum of the body shall be physically present at the meeting location. The members who participate remotely must have access to the same materials. The member who participates remotely and all members at the meeting locations shall be clearly audible to each other.

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Authority voted to approve and allow for remote participation. (vote approved 3 to 0)

Member Yorkis joined the meeting remotely by cell phone at 7:27 pm and arrived as an active member at 8:00 pm.

Mullin Rule:

The Mullin Rule allows board members to participate and vote after missing one public hearing session. The member would need to certify in writing that they have reviewed evidence of missed session of public hearing.

The MRA did not vote to adopt the Mullin Rule.

Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was informed by member Himmel that there was a meeting to come up with members who may be willing to serve on the Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee. There were 19 names suggested. The list was shown on an overhead. Included on the list were two members which abut the property, members of the Business Counsel, and staff at the Town Hall, Consultants, and residents. It was suggested that those who do not reside in Medway could be used as a resource instead of sitting on the steering committee.

The suggested names included:

Ray Himmel, Andy Rodenhiser, Mike Griffin, Doug Downing ,Paul Yorkis, Stephanie Mercandetti, Richard DiInnocenzo, Michael Boynton, Matt Durgin Paul Rao, Rich Parella, Dan Hooper, Bob Ferrari, Matt Buckley, Bridget Graziano, Paul Marble, Dave DiAmico Susy Affleck Childs, Chief Jeff Lynch and Steve Mitchell.

There was a suggestion to add a representative from the school. There was discussion about if an abutter serves on the steering committee would this be a conflict of interest. Stephanie will look into this. If a disclosure is needed, we need to make sure that the disclosure is on file with the town clerk. The authority agreed that the provided list included a good cross section of residents. The MRA can only have two members on the steering committee due to the rules about having a quorum at another meeting.

Member Downing does not want to be on the steering committee since he wants to maintain his role on the MRA.

The Steering committee will guide in the preparation of the Urban Renewal Plan. There will be two or three public forums. The Committee requirement should be approximately 6 months, meeting approximately 8 times.

Stephanie indicated that she will help to solicit people and explain what the expectations of this committee are. Once the list is established, Ray will call those interested and explain their role. There will be a scheduled kick off meeting at the Thayer House. The date and time will need to be determined. Member Himmel will be facilitating this meeting.

Stephanie indicated that there are various social media venues to provide information to the public.

Request for Proposal:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority is in receipt of the most recently revised Request for Proposal for the Urban Renewal Plan dated February 5, 2015.

The scope of work for the Urban Renewal Plan is almost complete. There was language added that the consultant “will utilize the URP Steering Committee consisting of a cross-section of stakeholders, as a sounding board and to review activities.”

Stephanie Mercandetti indicated that the suburban community population number has been revised to 13,100. Another change was in scope of services. Language added was to “provide employment and economic development that will benefit the residents of Medway.” The reference to the low and moderate income households was taken out. The proposal evaluation criteria matrix was included. This will allow each member of the proposal evaluation team to review and assign a rating to each non-price proposal. The non-pricing ratings together with the price proposals shall decide the proposal that is in the best interest of the MRA.

The MRA is still wanted further clarification about contracts. Stephanie indicated that any contracts must be signed by the Board of Selectmen and Town Counsel. The Town Accountant, Carol Pratt will also be looking at the contract. The hope is that she comes back with a positive recommendation and then this can go out to bid.

Questions for Carol Wolfe:

- What are the biggest stumbling block with an Urban Renewal Plan?
- What is working relationship like with other Committees?
- What would you have done differently?
- What was given for funding and how is this handled?
- How do other communities utilize counsel?

Budgeting Discussion:

Member Yorkis was wondering if there should be a warrant article to transfer the funds to the Redevelopment Authority. The money for this is currently with a budget line item under

Stephanie's budget. There was a concern that with the current town counsel, there is a relatively slow response to questions in relation to the Rt. 109 Committee. The process in which you need to seek counsel is such that you must go through the Town Administrator.

It was communicated that the annual warrant is already closed so logistically we cannot move this money, but it is something that can be looked at for the fall.

If this money is moved, will the treasurer need to be bonded?

Medway Redevelopment Authority Meetings:

The members were presented with a copy of the upcoming meetings. The meeting will typically be held on the fourth Wednesday of the month at 7:00 pm at the Medway Senior Center.

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Paul Yorkis, the Authority voted unanimously to approve the meeting schedule for 2015.

It was suggested that the media be invited to come to the Redevelopment Authority meeting on April 22, 2015. After further discussion, the consensus was that it is too early to get the media involved.

Carole Wolfe will be attending the Redevelopment Authority meeting on April 22, 2015 meeting. There will be a site visit at 6:30 pm. The regular meeting will follow the site visit.

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Paul Yorkis, the Authority voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary

Medway Redevelopment Authority
Wednesday, April 22, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X	X	X	X	Remote Participation

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development

Amy Sutherland, Recording Secretary

Carol Wolfe, MA Department of Housing & Community Development

Member Paul Yorkis is participating remotely.

March 18, 2015:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to approve the minutes from March 18, 2015. (Mike Griffin abstained)

Community Revitalization Coordinator, Carol Wolfe:

The Redevelopment Authority was informed that Stephanie Mercandetti, Andy Rodenhiser, Mike Griffin and Carol Wolfe did a site visit of the bottle cap lot area.

Carol Wolfe presented the members with a document entitled “What is Urban Renewal M.G.L. Chapter 121 B”. She began her presentation by explaining that the Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) administers the urban renewal program. This includes assisting municipalities to establish and strengthen urban renewal entities along with providing technical assistance to prepare and implement the urban renewal plans.

The Redevelopment wanted Carol at their meeting to address some of their questions. Some of these Include: Does the redevelopment authority have separate counsel from the town and at what point was counsel retained? Does the redevelopment authority have liability insurance, and when was it secured? Does the redevelopment authority have funding and from what sources and how is it handled? What are the biggest obstacles when developing an Urban Renewal Plan?

Stephanie Mercandetti provided the authority with a document which contained responses from various towns regarding how they have utilized counsel, and liability issues around urban renewal plans. This document will be updated as more information from various towns is gathered.

Carol advised the authority that the best way to get these answers is contacting a variety of communities.

Stephanie has reached out to the following communities: Southbridge, Stoughton, Ashland, Plymouth, Webster and Hatfield. The responses gathered varied from each town.

Carol responded that areas such as Worcester, Palmer and Greenfield have revenue sources. Some authorities have their own staff, and legal counsel. Towns such as Carver, Fitchburg and Springfield have their own legal counsel. She further emphasized that the agenda for the URP should be parallel with the town. As elected parties, you should represent the community, but you are an independent body. The town of South Hadley just allocated \$90,000 for redevelopment. Carol explained that any revenue to the town would come with sales of the parcels.

The authority expressed concern about endorsing contracts along with receiving property that we have no claim to. Carol explained that with the urban renewal plan, it is easy to clear title. This would need to be done. DHCD reviews the land acquisition price under the urban renewal plan.

The authority is concerned about being sued individually. Carol will ask her counsel if individuals can be sued individually. She did explain that authorities have been taken to court. The City of Attleboro was taken to court and they lost, and the authority owed money. The City of Worcester was also taken to court for land acquisition. The URP will identify the parcels to be acquired.

The authority also wanted to know if they can put language in the URP that the town agrees to back the RDA with full faith liability. Carol will speak with her legal counsel about this.

The URP is appraisal of property and it should not come as a surprise to the Town. The plan should list a total value and include appraisals. There needs to be two independent appraisals. It was suggested to do an estimate of a cost of the property in a less costly manner.

Carol recommended speaking with the Town of Springfield. They have 32 Urban Renewal Plans. The URP went through many different revisions. These plans had a 40 years duration. Today, if you have an URP, there is a 20 year duration.

The MRA wanted to know what happens if town meeting does not fund a settlement. Carol responded that this needs to be addressed prior to town meeting.

The MRA wants to meet with the Town Administrator to discuss some of the procedural items.

Member Yorkis wanted to know if there is any liability in terms of accepting property which has been gifted to the board. Carol does not know why there would be any liability if the land was gifted. The statute notes that you can take land as a gift. The title needs to be clean and needs to be held in escrow and there needs to be a formal taking. Carol suggested that if the members have any further questions, they can email her.

The MRA wants to know if they have authority to sign contracts. Carol responded that this is different in all towns. Whoever oversees the contract has the authority to sign it. There IS sometimes added language in a memorandum of understanding.

The language of the URP plan needs to be as specific as possible. There is also a requirement to have citizen input group. Stephanie will find out which towns use insurance companies to inquire about the cost. There also may need to be a discussion with the finance committee about the funding mechanism for this. The MRA would like to have this information relatively early in the process. They do not want to do anything prematurely.

The discussion next moved to steering committees. Carol explained that the purpose of the steering committee is to help direct the development. The people need to buy into the URP 100%. She recommended that the City of Fitchburg be consulted in regards to how they use their steering committee and how they utilize this committee.

Carol further explained that there is an internal review process of the application for the URP. Once the MRA chooses the consultant and the Urban Renewal Plan is drafted and submitted, there are several colleagues from her agency which can tell right away if it is a well written URP. The town can work with the staff on drafts closely and there is a partnership created over time. There is an instruction manual for the submittal which needs to be followed in the order as requested. If the plans are really written well, the turn-around does not take long. It could be 24 hours if well written. The administration has 60 days act on the submitted URP. Plans can be amended through the process if there are conflicts. The administration is not anti-development, it should be smart development. There is money available for funding resources. Inviting various state leaders is always important when implementing the URP.

A question was asked if there are any impacts as a result of governor's executive order regarding regulations. Carol is not aware of any federal statute which would effect this. The regulations

were streamlined. Stephanie is familiar with the programs and has worked to utilize the tools. The URP is the scheduling. The appropriation from town meeting is \$80,000. Carol recommended that references be checked of the consultants who apply to do the URP.

Request for Proposal:

The authority is in receipt of the final Review of Draft Request for Proposals. There have been no comments or proposed revisions since the last meeting. The document was reviewed by the town accountant and based on her comments, we have everything needed to post it in the goods and services central registry.

Carol recommended that the boundaries need to be reviewed and confirmed. There should be another scenario if something changes, in a minor or major modification. The plan can reference that there is an alternative and if it people want to opt out and there is a change to plan, this would be a minor change but the plan should be the full area. The Board of Selectmen and Planning Board would need to vote to change this. The URP is a catalyst for developers. When there is a disposition of property, there must be a land disposition agreement and we need to make sure the appropriate language. There is grant money to help build the infrastructure. A question was asked if we can use grant money to buy capacity. This needs to be researched.

Steering Committee:

Member Himmel indicated that there is no update regarding the steering committee. The list of 30 people has been narrowed down to 19. The kick off meeting will be led by consultant and facilitated by member Himmel.

Future Meeting Date: **Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 7:00 pm**

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Mike Griffin and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Medway Redevelopment Authority adjourned their meeting at 9:00 pm.

Medway Redevelopment Authority
Wednesday, June 3, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	Remote Participation	X	X	X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development
Barbara Saint Andre, Town Counsel,
Michael Boynton, Town Administrator
Amy Sutherland, Recording Secretary

Member Andy Rodenhiser is participating remotely due to emergency.

April 22, 2015:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Paul Yorkis, the Redevelopment Authority voted by roll call vote to approve the minutes from April 22, 2015.

Roll Call Vote:

Ray Himmel	aye
Michael Griffin	aye
Doug Downing	aye
Paul Yorkis	aye

QUESTIONS FOR TOWN COUNSEL:

Liability Insurance:

The authority wanted Town Counsel present at their meeting to discuss individual liability as an MRA member. At the last meeting, Carol Wolf did explain that authorities have been taken to court. Town Counsel did recommend that the Medway Redevelopment Authority insurance. The type of insurance and company to go with would need to be explored. The Town Administrator is in agreement that liability insurance is needed.

The authority was provided with a chart at the last meeting which included which towns have insurance. The results of the research vary greatly.

The funding options of the insurance policy needs to be researched. There may be money in the Town Administrator budget. Stephanie also communicated that there is money in the line item which was set aside for Consultant Hubbard. She would like clarity on what this money can be used for. She will speak with the Town Accountant. Stephanie will provide quotes at the next meeting.

Contract Endorsement:

The MRA wanted clarity from Town Counsel about the endorsing of contracts. The Board of Selectmen are responsible for signing the contracts, but the MRA could be in charge of the implementing of the contract.

Update on responses Redevelopment Authorities:

The Director of Community and Economic Development informed the authority that she is continuing to collect information from surrounding towns about how their authorities work. This information will be compiled and provided to the authority.

Request for Proposal:

Stephanie informed the authority that the final Review of Draft Request for Proposals is ready. She will send out another email seeking last and final comments. The authority would like to act on this at their next meeting which is scheduled for Wednesday, June 17, 2015. The document was reviewed by the town accountant and based on her comments, we have everything needed to post it in the goods and services central registry.

Steering Committee:

Member Himmel indicated that he is comfortable with the narrowed down list of the recommended 19 steering committee members. These members will need an overview about their role in this process. This meeting will be scheduled once a consultant is selected.

Future Meeting Date: **Wednesday, June 17, 2015 at 7:00 pm**

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Mike Griffin and seconded by Doug Downing, the Medway Redevelopment Authority adjourned their meeting at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary
Approved July 29, 2015

Medway Redevelopment Authority
September 30, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X	X	PARTICIPATED REMOTELY	X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development

The Chairman called the meeting of the Medway Redevelopment Authority to order at 7:00 pm.

There were no citizen comments.

August 19, 2015:

On a motion made by Doug Downing, and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Authority voted unanimously to accept the minutes from August 19, 2015 with the amendments.

It was recommended to remove the last two sentences on page four regarding Trotter Drive.

Vice Chairman Griffin joined the meeting and participated remotely by telephone, due to geographic distance, at 7:05 pm.

Request for Proposals:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was informed that three responses to the requests for proposals have been submitted. Members have been provided with the proposals and evaluation sheets. Each member will separately review and score the proposals, and provide their score sheets back to Stephanie Mercandetti by Wednesday, October 14, 2015. The MRA discussed who will be responsible for checking the references. Chairman Rodenhiser did make the MRA aware that Ms. Mercandetti was listed as a reference by one of the bidders so she should not contact the other references listed in that proposal. The MRA discussed having the Chairman call those references.

Reference Checks:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Medway Redevelopment Authority voted by roll call vote to have Stephanie Mercandetti conduct the reference checks for the bidders where she is not a reference and the Chairman contact the ones in the proposal where she is listed as a reference.

Roll Call Vote:

Mike Griffin:	aye
Ray Himmel	aye
Paul Yorkis	aye
Doug Downing	aye
Andy Rodenhiser	aye

Important Dates:

Deadline for score sheets:	Wednesday, October 14, 2015
Interviews:	Wednesday, October 28, 2015

Vice Chairman Griffin will be picking up his package on Tuesday October 13, 2015. The timeframe for interviews will be about 30 to 45 minutes. The Medway Redevelopment Authority will then deliberate and make a recommendation.

Member Yorkis wanted to know if it is ok to write notes on his packet for interviewing of candidates.

Stephanie explained that she only wants the score sheets. In regards to writing on the documents for your own personal use, it is ok. She also explained that if the score sheets come back and two of the candidates stand out over the third, the MRA may not want to interview the third. The goal is to have the contract executed by the Board of Selectmen in November 2015.

Steering Committee:

Member Himmel informed the MRA that the letter seeking interest in the steering committee was sent out on August 24, 2015 to 17 residents. Once the evaluation process is complete, Ray will send out another letter about the next steps with a timeline.

House Bill H3361:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was made aware that the House Bill H3361 had its second read in the Senate on September 24, 2015 and has been sent to Bills in Third Reading. Member Yorkis will provide the Authority on any updates.

Resources and funding:

Stephanie provided a spreadsheet of potential resources and funding incentives. This list was expanded from what was provided by Carol Wolfe. There are some grants, tax incentives, and zoning concepts such as 40R that could be applied to incentivize development. There are also some incentives for developers. Member Rodenhiser suggested that we may want to include the treasurer and town administrator and inform them of such opportunities. These are just some of the resources that the MRA and town together can bring to table to make the project cost more feasible.

It was recommended that the spreadsheet be shared with the Town Administrator for ranking on what is appealing from the town's perspective

Member Yorkis explained that at some point through this process, the MRA will be the owners of some of the land and will be awarded development rights, it would be helpful if the list could be specific in regards to what falls under the purview of the MRA and which does not.

Vice Chairman Griffin left discussion at 7:40 pm.

Exelon Proposed Project:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority would like the Exelon project placed on their next agenda for October 28, 2015. The meeting will begin at 6:00 pm with this as the first topic. It would be beneficial to have the liaison from the Board of Selectmen to be present. Stephanie will check to see if Selectmen Trindade is able to attend.

Insurance:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was made aware that they are insured for a two year term.

Future Meeting Date: **Wednesday, October 28, 2015 at 6:00 pm**

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Ray Himmel and seconded by Doug Downing, the Medway Redevelopment Authority adjourned their meeting at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary
Approved October 28, 2015

Medway Redevelopment Authority
October 28, 2015
Medway Senior Center
76 Oakland Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X	X	X	X	X

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development
Michael Boynton, Town Administrator

The Chairman called the meeting of the Medway Redevelopment Authority to order at 6:00 pm.

There were no citizen comments.

Exelon:

The Town Administrator provided an update on the Exelon's project. There was a public meeting held on Wednesday October 21, 2015. The forum presentation went through the following topics: air quality, noise, and health. The applicant provided a detailed power point presentation. Air Quality Associates was in charge of the reporting the air quality information; Acentech presented the noise; and Kleinfelder Associates presented the water. The town was able to address the majority of the questions. The meeting was ended early due to a bomb threat in the women's restroom. The only question that needed to be answered by Town Counsel was in regards to the ability of the town to enter into an agreement with the Town of Millis for water. This question has since been answered and The Town of Medway is able to enter into an agreement with the Town of Millis for water. The town has decided it will not provide water from its well to Exelon. Exelon plans to get the water from the Town of Millis. The Town of Millis does have the capacity under its permit. The water would be transported via Medway's water mains. There will be a full evaluation of impacts or improvement which will be needed. There has been initiated discussions with Millis and Mass DEP about the potential water purchase by Exelon. Exelon will pay for all costs relating to any improvements needed as per Host Community Agreement.

Member Himmel talked with businesses to see how negative or positive this type of project is to the Town from a business standpoint. The facility manager from Cybex was favorable of this project; but some of the smaller companies were mixed in their opinion.

The Town Administrator has spoken with the Town of Bellingham about their plant and the impact on the businesses. There has been no hard evidence that property values have dropped from this type of project.

Andy Rodenhiser responded that this project is something we cannot stop, but we can mitigate some of the impacts.

Member Yorkis is questioning why the Board of Selectmen signed an agreement and then held the public forum. The community needs to understand what is going on. There is a projection that the Board of Selectmen are acting without the citizens view and that a decision is being made without their knowledge. He wants the community to be respectful and understanding of a process and that they were given the greatest opportunity to participate.

There has been a webpage dedicated to being able gather any information regarding the Exelon project.

Minutes:

September 30, 2015:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Doug Downing, the Medway Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to accept the minutes from September 30, 2015.

Potential Interview Questions for URP Consultants:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was in receipt of a series of questions that will be asked to the finalists who submitted Urban Renewal Plan proposals.

The three finalists are BSC Group, Cecil Group and Fuss & O'Neill. Each finalist was provided with a time slot for their interview.

Questions:

1. Describe your knowledge about the Urban Renewal Program, developing Urban Renewal Plans and your relationship with the MA Dept. of Housing & Community Development regarding the review of such plans.
2. In our Request for Proposals, we asked for proposer to describe the qualifications and experience of staff expected to work on project. Has the proposed firm/team ever worked together before? Do you believe the proposed team is appropriate for what we need to accomplish with this project.
3. Throughout the project, you will be meeting with the Medway Redevelopment Authority and an Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee, Town Staff, etc. How will input and insight be gathered

through these meetings? How will you collect criticism? Most importantly, how will you bring folks to consensus?

4. Does the project team have experience in a public meeting setting describing what they are doing a layman's terms (compared to experience presenting at technical conferences?)
5. When asked to identify similar projects you identified projects for the most part were urban and or already developed. This project for all intent purposes is vacant land. It is a blank canvass. How would you go about filing in this canvass?

BSC Group:

BSC Team:

Principal-In-Charge:	David Hayes
Project Manager:	Russell Burks
Planning:	Jeff Fusser
Kevin Hively	Market Analysis

BSC group provided each of the Medway Redevelopment Authority members with an eight page colored packet which included titled pages; an organizational charts; Oak Grove Feasibility Study Informs the Development of an Urban Renewal Plan, Urban Renewal Plan Preparation Experience; Urban Design and Infographics Help; Market Validation and Financial Implementation Strategy, and concluding sheet. The BSC also had a power point presentation.

Russell Burke next explained that BSC is familiar with the site and knows what could be done in relation to site assemblage. BSC informed the members that they can start on this project start right away, since there is no learning curve. The data and knowledge of the site is already there.

BSC continued by explained that the site assemblage is unique; since 1/3 of parcels are town owned and 1/3 are owned by Mr. Williams and the last 1/3 are scattered. Those parcels are located in clusters. BSC indicated that they are familiar with the infrastructure and sewer extension. The applicant also indicated that the work undertaken to date for this can be used, but additional information must be collected and assembled to meet the DHCD requirements for a full Urban Renewal Plan.

BSC is very familiar with the Urban Renewal process and the requirements. The applicant discussed that there would have to be interaction with abutters and citizens. The applicant is familiar with this process and has already had this interaction with the residents of Medway.

Kevin Hively will be doing the market analysis as part of the project. He indicated that a market study describing current commercial and residential trends has already been completed but it would need to be updated. Kevin Hively has worked on this team for other urban renewal projects. One of the examples mentioned was in Gardner, MA (old brownfield site).He will also assisted with devising an implementation strategy with marketing and planning principles.

The goal is to make something happen on this site. BSC noted that there will need to be some leveraging done with some of the properties. The intent is to have graphics available to the public to view. Examples of this were shown.

The interview was opened up to questions from the redevelopment authority.

Question #1:

Describe your knowledge about the Urban Renewal Program, developing Urban Renewal Plans And your relationship with the MA Dept. of Housing & Community Development regarding the review of such plans.

The team responded that they are familiar with requirements and have worked with DHCD and in particular Carol Wolf for many years. With the retirement of Carol Wolf, BSC has already formed a relationship with Ashley Emerson. It is important to engage DHCD early in the process to get input and feedback. BSC mentioned that the project in Everett had a note from DHCD indicating that it was one of the best plans they had ever read.

Question #2:

In our Request for Proposals, we asked for proposer to describe the qualifications and experience of staff expected to work on project. Has the proposed firm/team ever worked together before? Do you believe the proposed team is appropriate for what we need to accomplish with this project.

BSC indicated that they have a total of 300 employees. This particular team has worked together on many projects. The qualifications and experience were provided in the power point presentation.

Question #3:

Throughout the project, you will be meeting with the Medway Redevelopment Authority and an Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee, Town Staff, etc. How will input and insight be gathered through these meetings? How will you collect criticism? Most importantly, how will you bring folks to consensus?

BSC responded that there needs to be a buy in from the public. There will be agendas and minutes from all the meetings. DHCD wants to see that there is public participation. It is important to have a good cross section on the steering committee.

Question #4:

Does the project team have experience in a public meeting setting describing what they are doing a layman's terms (compared to experience presenting at technical conferences?

BSC responded that they use many graphics and 3D modeling in their presentations to the public since it is easier for residents to visually see the concept plan. A photo inventory of buildings can be done. At the public meetings, information is gathered on how the committee wants the data collected and communicated back. BSC responded that they do not use jargon and technical terms with the public but instead use visual preference surveys, along with breaking into discussion groups. BSC wants the public to feel comfortable that they are representing the public's views. BSC also indicated that transparency is important and this begins at the first public meeting. Any information at the meetings can be provided to public by website, at library, or Facebook page.

Question#5:

When asked to identify similar projects you identified projects for the most part were urban and or already developed. This project for all intent purposes is vacant land. It is a blank canvass. How would you go about filing in this canvass?

The process would determine, the finish product which will come as a result of the process. This is not for BSC to determine. The process will evolve. This site is unique with the floodplains and wetlands.

Russ indicated that he took a ride in the area and saw “for sale” signs near Trotter Drive. He wonders if the boundary of the possible URP could extend to include other possible parcels. He would recommend the Authority to look at this.

The Cecil Group:

The team was introduced and it included:

Steven G. Cecil – Principal in Charge

Emily Keys Innes – Project Manager

Frank Mahady – FXM Associates

Robert Salisbury – Bonz & Company

Stephen Lecco Aicp – GZA

The Cecil Group provided to the MRA a two-paged colored document which included the introductions, project understanding, selected relevant experience, the project team structure and project timeline.

Steven Cecil began the presentation by explaining that he would be the principal in charge, and Emily Keys would be the Project Manager. He explained that the location of the site is great due to its relativity to Rt. 495. This is also a challenging site since the grouping of the parcels are like what you might see in Florida. There would need to be a review of the real estate economics and decide how to value for acquisition. GZA is complete a complete engineering company and is ready to handle this project.

The project manager explained three key points.

1. Accomplishing the land deal (strategy to assemble, vision community support to move ahead, determine how much of land is needed, put enough together to have leverage and do not need to assemble all land, know the market conditions and opportunities from revenue standpoint.
2. Community Vision: Translate the desires and needs to physical form
3. Tool Creation – Moving from planning to implementation.

The Cecile Group would put together a business plan for a greater return and make sure the scenarios will result in a positive return. One of the projects referenced was the Hingham Shipyard.

The MRA next opened the interview up to questions.

Question #1:

Describe your knowledge about the Urban Renewal Program, developing Urban Renewal Plans And your relationship with the MA Dept. of Housing & Community Development regarding the review of such plans?

Emily explained that she has been doing Urban Renewal Plans for 15 years. The towns they have worked in include Lawrence, New Bedford, Stoughton and Somerville. The Cecile group is very familiar with the representative of DHCD. The rules for URP are rules are laid out and the Cecile group provides drafts early in the process.

It was explained that there are certain specializations that the Cecil Group offers. Emily will be the contact person to make sure the interaction among the various consultants is taken care of. She will also make sure the project goals and deadlines are met. She will coordinate every step.

Question #2:

In our Request for Proposals, we asked for proposer to describe the qualifications and experience of staff expected to work on project. Has the proposed firm/team ever worked together before? Do you believe the proposed team is appropriate for what we need to accomplish with this project.

Frank Mahady is the economic consultant and will do the market research and fiscal assessment for the Urban Renewal Plan. He is familiar with transportation planning work and has worked on projects in Ashland and Framingham. He won an award for the work done for the Rt. 495 corridor study. The Cecil Group knows this area very well.

Robert Salisbury completes the appraisals and market studies to determine what the land is worth. They have done work throughout Boston, Bristol and Plymouth County and determine what things are worth and the price points needed. This might include costs for engineering and infrastructure works. Stephen Lecco from GZA how to put the pieces together. He is a planner and will be involved early in the process. We will build on previous concerns with environmental constraints. This site does have

constraints on the east side which may cause some limitations. There can be development of open space trails, create dog parks, and develop amenities to future development. When the plan is developed, the Cecile group will address permitting hurdles and how to streamline the process.

Question #3:

Throughout the project, you will be meeting with the Medway Redevelopment Authority and an Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee, Town Staff, etc. How will input and insight be gathered through these meetings? How will you collect criticism? Most importantly, how will you bring folks to consensus?

Emily indicated that the public input is critical in their ability to get this done successfully. We will have public meetings which could define a list of stakeholder, town officials, developers, and residents. From the public forums they will just listen and make sure we hear what the group is saying. One example noted was the Town of Stoughton where we needed to balance parking and open space. An exercise was done at the public meeting to look at the issues and define and then we brought back the information to summarize and look at patterns about concerns. There will be two people at the meetings. This information needs to be the public needs to be involved and documented. Criticism can be difficult, but we would rather hear this during the process then when it gets to the approval stage.

Question #4:

Does the project team have experience in a public meeting setting describing what they are doing a layman's terms (compared to experience presenting at technical conferences?)

The goal is to try to design the meeting format simply. For example, if we were looking to design buildings, we would provide models and ask how many buildings? How much parking? We keep the questions simple. We give models from other places which have been successful. This includes using terminology that people can understand.

Question#5:

When asked to identify similar projects you identified projects for the most part were urban and or already developed. This project for all intent purposes is vacant land. It is a blank canvass. How would you go about filing in this canvass?

The example that was referenced was Londonberry, New Hampshire. There were 603 acres and it was an apple orchard. We needed to figure what was the highest and best use of land which meets the towns needs. A project in Clinton, CT was referenced as a blank canvas site.

A follow up was asked in relation to what was the most successful kick off meeting. The applicant

responded that it was a project in Winsor, CT. At the initial meeting we asked the residents what their vision and ideas were and to see that the end result was similar to what the initial ideas were.

Fuss & O'Neill:

The team was introduced:

Sarah Lewis, Fuss & O'Neill

Chris Ferrero, Fuss & O'Neill

Craig Seymour, RKG

Sarah Lewis from Fuss & O'Neill began the presentation by explaining that she understands that there has been work on the property and her role will be rechecking the goals and directions that have already been set. She will also look at the infrastructure analysis to make sure that it is still valid from the public standpoint. The Urban Renewal Plan will have a process which is a checklist. There are specific requirements which need to be followed by state statute. The goal is to move to implementation.

Chris Ferrero explained that he will work on the development side. He will interact with consultants along with contractors for public and private development. Chris has made non-productive properties productive. One of the goals is to remove the unknown and quantify this. Fuss & O'Neill will update the vision, look at and verify the market analysis and consolidate the divergent parcels. The team knows development finance. They will come up solutions and have a sequencing plan. The MRA needs to know what the capital expenditures might be and the cost associated with this revenue. All of this information will be put into a sequencing plan.

Craig Seymour from RKG is the number guys. He explained that a good plan has two parts: first, accurate market information for revenue stream and second, good cost numbers. The numbers for a project need to work out to make a project viable.

An effective URP must be based on sound and current market analysis, rational cost estimates, and realistic objectives in order to accurately forecast revenues. Fuss & O'Neill would take the plan and develop it so that the deal makes sense for both parties. Acquiring and assembling land or also parcelizing the land into development pods. There need to have a lot of flexible zoning with a look at form based zoning.

Question #1:

Describe your knowledge about the Urban Renewal Program, developing Urban Renewal Plans and your relationship with the MA Dept. of Housing & Community Development regarding the review of such plans.

Fuss and O'Neil has the experience of being a member of a teams with a variety of consultants. They have a good relationships with DHCD. One of the success projects was the Belchertown State Hospital

Redevelopment Plan.

The goal is to bridge the vision and reality by having a balanced vision market and physical feasibility. This included positioning the properties for success, strategic sequencing, encourage project for private development incentives and public private partnerships.

Question #2:

In our Request for Proposals, we asked for proposer to describe the qualifications and experience of staff expected to work on project. Has the proposed firm/team ever worked together before? Do you believe the proposed team is appropriate for what we need to accomplish with this project.

The team explained that they have worked together for over 20 years. There are 280 employees with Fuss and O'Neill. There are many technical representatives such as site, civil, and surveyors. Eric Moss is the environmental representative and will be part of the team. RKG are up to 11 professionals. Judi Barrett is in charge of the Quincy office.

Question #3:

Throughout the project, you will be meeting with the Medway Redevelopment Authority and an Urban Renewal Plan Steering Committee, Town Staff, etc. How will input and insight be gathered through these meetings? How will you collect criticism? Most importantly, how will you bring folks to consensus?

Chris explained that part of this process is establishing relationships with the steering committee. Steering committees work best when populated with representatives of special interest groups such as open space members, zoning board of appeals members, and conservation commission members. All of these groups have constituents behind them. The steering committee needs to get the stakeholders. The steering committee members are the champions and leaders of moving a project

Sarah explained that the first meeting might be "hands on" getting people to draw on maps, understand the site itself, and we will create the baseline of education about the site. The audience then can have informed conversations among diverse parties about the site. During these meeting, we must listen and hear since everything is symbolic. Fuss and O'Neil then builds the maps which are then tangible. The first meeting might not be consensus of all, but the second forum is feeding what we heard from the public, and figuring out how to tweak the elements and create the excel spread sheets. There are going to be some give and takes about what the plan will have. There should be consensus at the end of the process. The meetings are to refine in the direction that has started. Once the model is built, the public will understand the action. The Windsor Lock Project in CT was referenced.

It was suggested that the location of Oak Grove might want to do something controlled at the street, since it is a gateway location that would include working with the design guidelines and then expand

the flexibility for the expanded industrial park. Depending on what businesses want to come, there could be more flexibility. This type of development will take a couple years. The bridging vision and reality is a balanced vision of market and physical feasibility, while positioning Properties for success, strategic sequencing (catalyst project), private development, and public private partnerships.

Question #4:

Does the project team have experience in a public meeting setting describing what they are doing a layman's terms (compared to experience presenting at technical conferences?)

The first presentation to public should not show the full plan. This scares people. This meeting will include simple dialogue and verbiage between all parties.

Question#5:

When asked to identify similar projects you identified projects for the most part were urban and or already developed. This project for all intent purposes is vacant land. It is a blank canvass. How would you go about filing in this canvass?

One of the project that was urban included Monson State Hospital. This was in a very rural and low income area. The property had 150 acres. This was a very challenging redevelopment. Another example was the Town of Ashland who asked for assistance for a redevelopment strategy for land within the train station area. The most important thing to do now is market this property

The visioning of this project would include: characteristic, area eligibility, project objectives, cost estimates and financing plan, local approvals, site preparation, public improvements, relocation, redeveloper's obligations, property disposition, citizen participation.

Discussion:

The Committee discussed the interviews. It was consensus that BSC was the most prepared. BSC had a power point presentation with handouts. The Cecile group principal dominated the presentation and knew a lot of information about this type of project, but he will not be the project manager. Fuss & O'Neil had a good technical presentation, but it was unclear on how well they will work with the steering committee. The MRA communicated that BSC would relate better with residents and appeared to be a step ahead of the others.

Recommendation:

On a motion made by Paul Yorkis and seconded by Doug Downing, the Medway Redevelopment Authority voted unanimously to recommend BSC group as the Consultant for the Urban Renewal Plan.

Future Meeting Date: **Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at 6:00 pm**

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Mike Griffin and seconded by Ray Himmel, the Medway Redevelopment Authority adjourned their meeting at 9:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary

December 16, 2015
Medway Redevelopment Authority
Town Administrator's Conference Room
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

Members	Andy Rodenhiser	Ray Himmel	Michael Griffin	Doug Downing	Paul Yorkis
Attendance	X	X	X	X	

ALSO PRESENT:

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Amy Sutherland, Recording Secretary

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Minutes:

October 28, 2015:

The minutes from October 28, 2015 will be tabled until the next meeting.

Urban Renewal Plan Development Process:

Schedule:

The Medway Redevelopment Authority was provided with an Oak Grove Urban Renewal Plan project schedule. The public engagement will include two public forums and one public hearing.

The following is a tentative schedule drafted by the BSC group:

- The date for the first public engagement will be March 2016.
- The site analysis and URP boundary analysis will be done December through February 2016.
- The URP preparation will be completed from March 2016 through June 2016.
- Plan Approvals will be June 2016.
- Environmental Notification Form August –September 2016.

The Medway Redevelopment Authority discussed if they could purchase land prior to having the Urban Renewal Plan (URP) in place and run a parallel process of gathering some land. The process of doing the taking would require making sure the titles on the land are clean. The MRA was reminded that the URP needs to be in place prior to being able to utilize any funding resources available. The MRA also discussed that they may not need to buy any of the parcels since a developer might want to assemble the parcels a specific way. There is a requirement that

there needs to be two independent appraisals of the parcels. This is a requirement of the URP. The town currently has one appraisal completed. It was recommended that an RFP be sent out to complete get another appraisal of the land.

A map of the Oak Grove Parcels Category was reviewed.
It included the following:

- Town of Medway as record owner (229 parcels) (color green on map)
- Richard Williams as record owner (369 parcels) (color orange on map)
- Lots requiring further research (169 parcels, 64 different owners) (color red on map)
- Lots with record owners other than Richard Williams (254 Parcels, 14 different owners) (color yellow on map)

Steering Committee:

The MRA discussed finalizing the list for the steering committee members and sending out an email informing all about the steps which have been taken to date along with what steps will be taken in the future by this committee.

House Bill 3361:

The MRA was made aware that Chapter 140 of the Acts of 2015 was approved on November 25, 2015. This act is relative to the taking of property by eminent domain by the Medway Redevelopment Authority. The MRA shall be exempt from section 40 of Chapter 79 of the General Laws when acquiring land or an interest in land by eminent domain.

The MRA recognized Mr. Yorkis for his stewardship in getting this bill passed.

Future Meeting:

- **Wednesday, January 20, 2015 at 6:30 pm.**

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Doug Downing and seconded by Michael Griffin, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary
Approved

Minutes of December 16, 2015 Meeting
Medway Redevelopment Authority