

1 Londonderry, NH Planning Board, ***WOODMONT COMMONS THIRD PARTY***  
2 ***REVIEW INTERVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF THE***  
3 ***January 17, 2012 MEETING IN THE Moose Hill Council Chambers***  
4

5 Present: Leitha Reilly; Mary Soares; Scott Benson; and Rick Brideau, CNHA, Ex-  
6 Officio  
7

8 Also Present: Community Development Director André Garron, AICP; Town Planner  
9 Cynthia May, ASLA; Director of Public and Engineering Works Janusz Czyzowski;  
10 Assistant Director of Public Works and Engineering John Trottier; GIS Manager John  
11 Vogl; Community Development Secretary Jaye Trottier.  
12

13 **I. Call to Order**  
14

15 L. Reilly called the meeting to order at 3:07 PM. She explained the schedule to the  
16 Sub-Committee members and said that in consideration for the presenters and their  
17 prearranged time frames, questions would only be entertained from staff and Sub-  
18 Committee members. M. Soares asked if the developer's representative in the  
19 audience, John Michels, would be allowed to pose questions to the Sub-Committee  
20 prior to the start of the meeting. L. Reilly replied that since other interested parties  
21 were not afforded that opportunity, comments and questions would be restricted as  
22 previously explained. She then described the interview evaluation score sheets to  
23 be filled out by each member at the end of each of the presentations. The scores  
24 would be entered into a spreadsheet by the Community Development Department  
25 Secretary to identify the highest scoring consultant team at the end of the  
26 interviews. Individual criteria under each main category would be used on the  
27 scorecards for a more detailed assessment (see table below). Scoring was limited  
28 to three numbers; 10 for "Exceeds Expectations" (Demonstrates better than  
29 average knowledge and/or skills), 5 for "Meets Expectations" (Demonstrates  
30 adequate knowledge and/or skills), and 1 for "Does Not Meet Expectations" (Does  
31 not demonstrate adequate knowledge and/or skills). Interviews were scheduled for  
32 one hour time frames which would include both the presentations themselves as  
33 well a question and answer period. The 15 minutes between interviews would allow  
34 members to fill out their score sheets.  
35

36 A. Garron explained that the five staff members present would also fill out score  
37 sheets, although staff scores would not be included in the tabulations. Their input  
38 would therefore strictly be verbal. If Sub-Committee members wanted to change  
39 any of their scores based on discussions *after individual presentations*, they could  
40 do so, however no scores could be changed in comparison to subsequent  
41 presentations. Following the four interviews, the Sub-committee would be  
42 identifying the consultant group that would be recommended to the full Planning  
43 Board at a special meeting on January 19.  
44

45 **II. Woodmont Commons PUD Review Services - Consultant Interviews**

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78

The four firms presented to the Sub-committee in the following order:

1. Shook Kelley (Charlotte, NC)  
In partnership with:  
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.  
Cushman & Wakefield  
Karen S. McGinley, Divine Millimet Attorneys at Law
2. Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. (Boston, MA)  
In partnership with:  
ICON Architecture, Inc.  
RKG Associates, Inc.  
Robinson & Cole
3. Resource Systems Group, Inc. (Concord, NH)  
In partnership with:  
The Cecil Group  
CMA Engineers  
RKG Associates, Inc.
4. Hawk Planning Resources LLC (Concord, NH)  
In partnership with:  
Jack Mette, AICP, Mette Planning Consultants  
Steve Cecil, AIA, ASLA, The Cecil Group  
Julie Campoli, Terra Firma Urban Design  
Lucy Gibson, P.E., CNU, Smart Mobility Inc.  
Dennis Delay, Economist  
Chris Nadeau, P.E. Nobis Engineering Inc.

Following each presentation, Sub-committee members filled out weighted scorecards using the following criteria in five separate categories:

<b>Project Approach (15%)</b>
1. Visioning Process/Public Participation
2. Master Plan Format/Organization
3. Commitment to Organize & Lead Process
4. Reasonable Project Schedule
5. Commitment to Multiple Meetings
6. Implementation Strategy Addressed
7. Approach that Fits Londonderry
8. Integration of Economic Impacts of Planning
<b>Responsiveness to the RFP (10%)</b>

1. Complete and Comprehensive
2. Community and Regional 'Knowledge'
<b>Experience and Personnel (40%)</b>
1. Complete Team w/Expertise in Critical Areas
2. Single Project Contact/Lead
3. Commitment of Key Personnel over Project Duration
4. Local Representation
5. Effective Communication Skills
<b>Proposal Format and Quality (10%)</b>
1. Organization, Clarity, Comprehensiveness
2. Graphics that Explain and Support Text
3. Innovative Design and Layout
<b>Knowledge of Innovative Land Use Techniques (25%)</b>
1. PUD Experience
2. Knowledge of New Urbanism and Traditional Neighborhood Design Concepts
3. Knowledge of Preservation and Resource Protection
4. Familiarity with Wholistic Planning Principles

79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98

**III. Discussion, Final Rankings, and Recommendation**

After the last presentation, the Sub-committee discussed the presentations.

1. Shook Kelley

Comments:

- They had a tremendous amount of experience (R. Brideau), however other firms displayed more of what they could do bring to the project (S. Benson);
- They have an impressive amount of familiarity with this kind of project, but did not communicate their specific knowledge the way other firms did (A. Garron);
- Their focus seemed to be more on designing this kind of project rather than reviewing it (J. Vogl);
- Their methodology in and of itself was convincing, but whether they could make it a reality was not (A. Garron);

1. Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

Comments:

- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- 124
- 125
- 126
- 127
- 128
- 129
- They anticipated the questions the Planning Board and staff would have, but it was not clear to what extent they would work with *both* the Planning Board and the developer to ensure mutual success (L. Reilly);
  - They seem intent on answering all questions at the Master Plan level when some can wait until the technical review (M. Soares);
  - They understand that such planning issues as traffic should be dealt with now so that the Board and the town are prepared when development actually occurs (J. Trottier);
  - They seem prepared to create a flexible code that will guide the development into the future (J. Vogl);
  - They identified the red flags about the project up front (J. Vogl); and best addressed what is missing in the documents submitted by the applicant so far (J. Czyzowski and A. Garron);
  - They understand the kind of agreement that would be needed with the developer so that Londonderry's interests pertaining to the project's impacts are protected (J. Czyzowski);
  - It appears they would work well with both the Board and the developer so the two can achieve cooperation (J. Czyzowski);
  - The entire team is well versed in what needs to be addressed in order to make the project a reality (A. Garron);
  - Rather than promoting themselves in the manner other firms did, they proved themselves by demonstrating the amount of research they performed and understanding what will need to be addressed (J. Vogl and J. Czyzowski);
  - They acknowledged the need to address the associated impacts when put in the perspective of the community's vision of Londonderry and its future, echoing questions posed by residents since the project was first introduced (A. Garron);
  - They clearly understand that the Planning Board will make the decisions (J. Czyzowski and J. Vogl)

130 3. Resource Systems Group, Inc.

131 Comments:

- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- Their presentation was not as impressive as their written proposal (J. Trottier and S. Benson);
  - Their presentation was more impressive than their written proposal (L. Reilly and C. May);
  - It would be preferable for one of the collaborators to instead be the team leader (S. Benson);
  - There was only one standout member on the team (C. May);
  - They addressed engineering aspects, which are as important as the design aspects (A. Garron);
  - CMA Engineers are very capable of reviewing the significant traffic impacts, both within the project and beyond its borders (J. Czyzowski);

144 4. Hawk Planning Resources LLC

145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161

Comments:

- They were the least impressive of the four groups (M. Soares);
- Roger Hawk and Jack Mette can provide a wealth of knowledge, but it's not clear whether it can be translated into this project (L. Reilly);
- It did not seem that Nobis Engineering had as much experience with a project of this scale (J. Vogl) or of this kind of mixed use (R. Brideau);
- The environmental experience that Nobis has would be pertinent to the project (M. Soares);
- Their choice of economist would bring a lot of insight to the review process (A. Garron);
- Their choice for transportation specialist seemed to be more theoretical and focused on design rather than practical and focused on the impacts outside of the project (J. Vogl and J. Czyzowski);

During this discussion, the scorecards were tallied by the Secretary. The final scores were:

<b>Shook Kelley</b>	<b>37.16</b>
<b>Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.</b>	<b>46.56</b>
<b>Resource Systems Group, Inc.</b>	<b>43.37</b>
<b>Hawk Planning Resources LLC</b>	<b>42.75</b>

162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172

The highest scoring firm was therefore Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. The consensus of the Sub-committee was to make a recommendation to the Planning Board on January 19 to consider hiring Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. to act as third party consultant on the Woodmont Commons Project.

#### IV. Other Business

There was no other business.

173 **V. Adjournment**

174

175 The meeting adjourned by consensus at 9:02 PM.

176

177

178 Respectfully submitted,

179

180

181 Jaye Trottier, Community Development Secretary