

## **MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**August 2, 2011**

The meeting was opened at 7:42am in the Town Hall Meeting Room by Chairman Joe Hutchinson

Present: Joe Hutchinson (citizen at large), Kara McGuire Minar (PB), Tim Clark (BOS), Michelle Catalina (CPC), Jim Breslauer (Concom), SusanMary Redinger (School Comm.), and Liz Allard (Land Use Admin)

#### **Discussion of Request for Proposal - Scope**

Hutchinson reported on reading other town Request for Proposals (RFP). Hutchinson believes that all of the RFP's are similar in that they include:

- Statement of purpose
- Background info on Town
- Scope/deliverables
- Meeting schedule/project timeline

Additionally, there is a lot of boilerplate related to the contract and selection process.

Hutchinson distributed the Lancaster RFP, which is very succinct. Acton's RFP is very lengthy. A copy of Acton's RFP will be made available in a Drop Box with other documents.

The Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) will need to determine the phasing scope of the entire project in concert with Planning Board.

#### **Request for Proposal Phasing**

Members discussed the phasing of the project. Phase 1 would consist of visioning, goals with community engagement. Members wondered if there are there firms that are good at that piece. Many towns had different consultants for this phase as compared to the data intensive analysis phase.

Members discussed having the RFP broken into two parts. Members questioned whether costs associated with Phase 1 and 2 should be requested so that the Committee can go to Annual Town Meeting (ATM) with real numbers. Additional, the RFP could be worded that any bidder could bid just one of the two phases or both.

An alternative approach suggested was for Phase 1 only that would have the consultant write the RFP for Phase 2. Catalina suggested that an independent professional helping to draft Phase 2 may build credibility with the public. Breslauer added that a consultant can confirm/concur that original RFP scope is complete or make recommendations for amendment.

The process of Phase 1 will require the engagement of the public and community upfront. Questions the Committee needs to answer include:

- What else can a consultant do to build interest and support for Master Plan(MP) and Phase 2
- How do we integrate Devens Economic Analysis Team (EDC), Economic Development Committee and School Committee to get credible feedback/buy-in on these components that are evolving concurrently

- How to integrate the discussion of Devens which can have a dramatic effect on local economics and policy

Phase 1 needs to validate/modify goals of existing MP and be realistic about the implementation of the vision of the public vision. Should the consultant construct some significant survey and facilitate charrettes or workshops? McGuire Minar and Catalina believe that if Boards, for example EDC, are pursuing objectives that differ from the existing MP then the update can be the vehicle where priorities of committees are identified, confirmed or reconciled with public interests defined in the visioning process.

Breslauer made a motion for Hutchinson and Catalina to draft a RFP that outlines a scope of work for Phase 1 and Phase 2. Redinger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

The RFP will clarify that existing funding is limited for Phase 1. Projected pricing for Phase 2 to be requested to be used for appropriation request at 2012 ATM. RFP scope of work also includes work necessary to confirm/critique/re-draft RFP for Phase 2. The Committee will likely re-bid the contract if addition funds are obtained at 2012 ATM.

### **Public Participation and Engagement**

Beyond work guided by the consultant for goals/visioning, members of the Committee asked what additional publicity/education is needed to inform the public in advance of ATM and develop support for funding Phase 2. Clark suggested reserving a certain sum of the funds received at the 2011 ATM for additional activities such as mailings and surveys. The members agreed to hold at least \$2500 back for mailings and other outreach activities.

Hutchinson suggested the Committee connect to school populations through students - senior projects or other service. Hutchinson also suggested leveraging other colleges or policy institutes as well for assistance.

### **MPSC work to be done before consultant comes on Board**

MPSC needs to prepare summary of existing plan and map out its success. What elements have emerged, stagnated, or are no longer a priority and why. This information should be vetted out with through the input from the Boards/Commissions/Committees.

Redinger suggested being specific as possible, the clearer it is, the easier (and more quickly) boards/commission/committees will respond. The current request being circulating is still too vague. For example, the School Committee's forecasting is too cloudy for looking ahead 10 years. MPSC would like Boards to articulate what the choices are - what are the opportunities, present the pros and cons to engage the public in the decision process.

What are the tipping points? What you'd like vs. what you would need to preserve/improve the community? What do you value about the Town and how your personal economics fit into that? Catalina believes there needs to be data to support or defeat the perceptions. Redinger added that the Boards/Commissions/Committees should know what the hot buttons are for their particular interests and what the issues that they are working on.

Clark asked if the Committee should do a briefing of the consultant, summarizing existing hot spots and identify levers to be tipped by the public. Does MPSC define the balancing act or does the Committee let the consultant guide process for participation of public in the cost/benefit analysis?

McGuire Minar suggested that the MPSC pull media history on such hot button items such as Devens 2B, the re-use of the gravel pit on Stow Road, and Green Communities. The identification of levers and public sentiment at critical points in time would be very helpful.

### **Old Business**

Breslauer questioned what is a quorum for MPSC? Approximately twelve Boards/Commissions/Committees and citizens at large have been invited to provide representation. However, not all have been appointed and/or not all will attend meetings regularly. The MPSC currently has no formal charge or charter created by PB which defines a quorum. MPSC will function as a subcommittee of PB, subject to open meeting law. It was suggested and agreed upon that at least 4-5 representatives must be present for a meeting to be conducted.

MPSC agreed Allard does not need to attend every MPSC meeting, but will continue to provide office and other support as requested. Clark will supply minutes when available to attend, otherwise Allard will do so.

### **Action Items**

- Allard to re-send contact list with emails and phone numbers
- Allard to reformat draft minutes of last meeting and distribute
- Allard to post next meeting
- Hutchinson/Clark to set up drop box for document distribution
- Hutchinson/Catalina to draft RFP
- Hutchinson to get Harvard Press Grid of Critique of MP
- Hutchinson/Clark convert into a document a request to the Boards/Commissions/Committees in which they can respond to on providing input

The next meeting scheduled for August 16, 2011 7:30am Town Hall meeting room.

Meeting adjourned 9:10am

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Clark  
Board of Selectmen Representative