

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF THE WOODMONT RFP SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING OF January**
3 **10, 2012 AT 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 Works and Engineering Janusz Czyzowski,
10 P.E.; Assistant Director of Public Works and Engineering John Trottier, P.E.; GIS
11 Manager John Vogl; Community Development Secretary Jaye Trottier.
12

13 **I. Call to Order**

14
15 L. Reilly called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.
16

17 **II. Review of Woodmont RFP Proposals**
18

19 L. Reilly reported that 10 proposals from a variety of professional organizations
20 were submitted in response to the Request for Proposals for third party review
21 Planning and Engineering Review Services for the proposed Woodmont
22 Commons Planned Unit Development (PUD) Master Plan. Sub-Committee
23 members were asked to read through all the proposals and fill out their
24 scorecards prior to this meeting, rating each category on a scale of one to ten
25 (one being the lowest and ten being the highest). The categories and their
26 relative weight were: Experience and Personnel (40%); Project Approach
27 (15%); Knowledge or Innovative Land Use Technique (25%); Proposal Format
28 and Quality (10%); and Responsiveness to the RFP (10%). Proposals would be
29 reviewed alphabetically at this meeting with Sub-Committee members providing
30 their input, followed by Town staff. After completion of the reviews, a break
31 would be taken and members would be able to change any of their scores based
32 on the discussion. After the break, the scores and rankings would be assessed.
33 Staff's rankings would count as 20% of the overall scores. L. Reilly explained
34 that this was a quality based review, whereby the aforementioned criteria are
35 used to rank the proposals as opposed to using the bids of each firm. Bids, in
36 fact, will not be opened until interviews with the top firms are completed.
37

38 Comments regarding each proposal were as follows:
39

40 **Brown Walker Planners, Inc. (Newburyport, MA)**

41 In partnership with:
42 Fay, Spofford & Thorndike, Inc.
43 AER, Inc.
44 Kaplan Thompson Architects

- 45 • The proposal included a positive cover letter and it was obvious the firm
46 did their homework regarding Londonderry, but they were not a top

- 47 choice in the end. They offered two contacts for the Planning Board and
48 the RFP specified the preference for a single contact person (M. Soares);
49 • The firm has not worked on projects of this scope before (R. Brideau and
50 S. Benson);
51 • The proposal provided some interesting ideas (e.g. using context sensitive
52 solutions to ensure the project is compatible with the community, but was
53 light on experience (L. Reilly);
54 • The proposed team is a good one, but other teams are stronger in
55 comparison and they lacked the experience needed for a project of this
56 complexity (staff)

57
58 Following these comments, L. Reilly recognized a member of the audience
59 who wished to speak. John Michels, representative for the applicant, asked
60 to make remarks on this proposal. The consensus was to entertain those
61 comments. J. Michels commented that the applicant would agree with staff's
62 comments relating to Brown Walker Planners, Inc.

63
64 **Devine Millimet & Branch, Professional Association (Manchester, NH)**

65 In partnership with:
66 Union Studio Architects and Community Design
67 Morris Beacon Design
68 Smart Mobility, Inc.
69 RKG Associates, Inc.

- 70 • Their list of partners was a mix of strengths and weaknesses. They were
71 not qualified as a whole compared to other teams (R. Brideau, M. Soares,
72 S. Benson, and L. Reilly);
73 • Their project approach was not convincing (M. Soares);
74 • The proposal format was lacking (M. Soares);
75 • The project lead person has a background that would make one think they
76 could better anticipate the kind of information Londonderry would be
77 seeking (as a member of the Bedford, NH Planning Board and a Bedford
78 representative on the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission),
79 however the firm seems to have represented many owners and
80 developers as opposed to municipalities (L. Reilly);
81 • The firm seems to have represented many owners and developers, not
82 municipalities (L. Reilly);
83 • The lead attorney is experienced with this type of development (staff);
84 • When compared to other teams, the team has not had as much
85 experience with this kind of development and its scope (staff)

86
87 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
88 applicant. He stated that the lead attorney is certified in New Urbanism

89
90 **Fougere Planning & Development, Inc. (Milford, NH)**

91 In partnership with:
92 Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.
93 Jeff Taylor & Associates, Inc.
94 Ms. Karen Fitzgerald, RLA - FitzDesign

95 Stephen G. Pernaw & Company

96 Bruce C. Mayberry - BCM Planning, LLC

- 97 • Note: Bruce Mayberry has consulted for the Town in the past regarding
- 98 School, Police, Fire, Library, and Recreation Impact Fees (L. Reilly);
- 99 • The proposal included some good points but it was not outstanding and
- 100 there was not much reference to New Urbanism (R. Brideau and S.
- 101 Benson);
- 102 • They consider Task One to be "more than just a checklist," yet their
- 103 description of it seems to treat it as a checklist (M. Soares);
- 104 • Their approach was confusing at times and they did not seem to have as
- 105 much experience as other proposals (S. Benson);
- 106 • Their cover letter acknowledged the magnitude of the project and they
- 107 appeared confident, however in the end, the size and scope seems to be
- 108 beyond them (L. Reilly);
- 109 • Staff is very familiar with the work of many of the team members, but in
- 110 comparison to others, the team is not as strong overall for a project of
- 111 this size (A. Garron)

112
113 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
114 applicant. He stated the applicant would agree with staff's comments.

115
116 **Hawk Planning Resources LLC (Concord, NH)**

117 In partnership with:

118 Jack Mette, AICP, Mette Planning Consultants

119 Steve Cecil, AIA, ASLA, The Cecil Group

120 Julie Campoli, Terra Firma Urban Design

121 Lucy Gibson, P.E., CNU, Smart Mobility Inc.

122 Dennis Delay, Economist

123 Chris Nadeau, P.E. Nobis Engineering Inc.

- 124 • Note: This firm made the short list of the recent Master Plan Consultant
- 125 interviews, although they were not ultimately selected (L. Reilly);
- 126 • The background knowledge of the team regarding Woodmont Orchards
- 127 and Londonderry was impressive, as was the proposal as a whole (M.
- 128 Soares);
- 129 • The team appears to have a strong core with regard to urban design/New
- 130 Urbanism and have experience with this type of development (M.
- 131 Soares);
- 132 • The project approach was impressive (M. Soares and S. Benson);
- 133 • The proposal was not impressive overall (R. Brideau);
- 134 • The team's experience with mixed use projects is notable and relevant (S.
- 135 Benson, L. Reilly, and staff);
- 136 • They demonstrate a concern for urban sprawl (S. Benson)
- 137 • They offered clear expectations that coincide with those of the Planning
- 138 Board and staff (L. Reilly);
- 139 • They have an optimistic approach that is capable of seeing the bigger
- 140 picture and all its aspects (L. Reilly);
- 141 • Unlike other firms, the team includes an economist (L. Reilly);

142

143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190

L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the experience of the team leader specifically regarding this type of development is not as strong as others and the development noted in Nashua was completed +/-20 years ago.

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. (Boston, MA)

In partnership with:

ICON Architecture, Inc.

RKG Associates, Inc.

Robinson & Cole

- Notes: This firm participated with Community Opportunities Group who interviewed for the Master Plan Consultant position (although was not ultimately chosen). The team member in charge of transportation engineering (Kerry Pike) has worked in Londonderry on the Pettengill Road project (L. Reilly);
- The proposal was impressive and makes the firm seem very capable (R. Brideau);
- Their experience with projects of this scope is much stronger and more relevant than other candidates (S. Benson and staff);
- The proposal reflected the effort made to 'do their homework' with regard to Londonderry and the overall project (S. Benson and M. Soares);
- There were no negatives to their proposal (M. Soares);
- They understand the importance of land as a resource and subsequently the importance of decisions made about its use (L. Reilly and M. Soares)

L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the applicant. He agreed the team's experience with projects of this scope is much stronger and more relevant than other candidates.

Nitsch Engineering (Boston, MA)

In partnership with:

Union Studio

RKG Associates

- Note: This firm partnered with Paul Lukes Architecture on their proposal to be the Town's Master Plan consultant (L. Reilly);
- They demonstrated a sense of urgency related to their task of reviewing the owner's application as complete (R. Brideau, S. Benson);
- In their outline of services, they limited their attendance to four public hearings, but more may be required (M. Soares);
- They offer two points of contact when the RFP specified a preference for one (M. Soares);
- The team showed some strong components but the team leader specifically did not reflect the same level of experience (M. Soares);
- The team seemed well qualified, but not as much as other candidates (S. Benson);
- They appeared very confident with their depth of resources to be able to handle the short turnaround time, their scope of services includes what

191 was requested, and they demonstrated some experience, but overall, the
192 proposal lacked the information needed to convince the reader they could
193 follow through (L. Reilly);
194

195 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
196 applicant. He stated the team leader does not appear to have experience with
197 this type of development
198

199 **Provan & Lorber Inc. (Contoocook, NH)**

200 In partnership with:

201 Christopher N. Carley, AIA, C.N. Carley Associates, Architects and Planners

202 Jeffrey Donohoe Associates LLC

203 TEPP LLC

- 204 • The application was not impressive overall compared to others (R. Brideau
205 and S. Benson);
- 206 • New Urbanism concepts were not addressed at all (M. Soares);
- 207 • They are experienced with plan reviews specifically for other NH
208 municipalities, but did not appear to be with regard to a project of this
209 magnitude (L. Reilly and staff);
- 210 • Their project costs eliminate miscellaneous expenses up front, so if the
211 project scope changes, their overall cost could increase (L. Reilly);
- 212 • Attendance of only one public hearing was noted (M. Soares);
- 213 • Their completion schedule was vague (L. Reilly and M. Soares)
- 214 • They demonstrated some experience with the impacts of increased
215 density, but not with mixed use projects (L. Reilly);
216

217 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
218 applicant. He agreed that they are experienced with plan reviews specifically for
219 other NH municipalities, but did not appear to be with regard to a project of this
220 magnitude.
221

222 **Resource Systems Group, Inc. (Concord, NH)**

223 In partnership with:

224 The Cecil Group

225 CMA Engineers

226 RKG Associates, Inc.

- 227 • This firm was involved with a Market Basket related project in Seabrook
228 and the applicant has ties to that company (L. Reilly)
- 229 • This is an impressive team with a significant amount of mixed use
230 experience (R. Brideau, M. Soares, S. Benson, and L. Reilly);
- 231 • Their plan to execute the requirements of the scope of services is not just
232 a checklist (M. Soares)
- 233 • They have specific questions they would like answered about this kind of
234 project (M. Soares)
- 235 • They will attend all meetings required (M. Soares)
- 236 • They are experienced with interpreting requirements of municipal land
237 use regulations (L. Reilly)

- 238
- 239
- 240
- 241
- 242
- 243
- 244
- 245
- 246
- 247
- One could expect concise and actionable responses would be provided to the Planning Board (L. Reilly)
 - There is some concern that they have already drawn some conclusions about the project (L. Reilly), although others felt it showed their desire to familiarize themselves with this kind of development and their readiness to take on the associated tasks (M. Soares, R. Brideau, S. Benson, and staff)
 - The team has a knowledge base that provides relevant experience for a project this size (staff);

248 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
249 applicant. He stated that the team leader has no experience with a project like
250 Woodmont Commons.

251

252 **Shook Kelley (Charlotte, NC)**

253 In partnership with:

254 Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

255 Cushman & Wakefield

- 256
- 257
- 258
- 259
- 260
- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- The team is interesting, but it appears they would review the application for acceptance with a simple checklist (M. Soares)
 - Their level of experience was impressive and relevant, but they do not have any in New Hampshire specifically (R. Brideau, S. Benson, and L. Reilly);
 - They understood the need to perform their review for application acceptance quickly (R. Brideau);
 - There was some concern with their statement concerning application acceptance that it is "not necessary to address planning, Urban Design, transportation or market issues associated with the development" (L. Reilly);
 - They added a retail consulting firm to their team which will look beyond whether the development is possible to whether the commercial aspects can be successful (L. Reilly and staff);
 - The team appears to have a good amount of relative experience and is a good mix of expertise (staff);

273 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
274 applicant. He agreed with the comment about the retail consulting firm and with
275 staff's comment about the team having relative experience with a good mix of
276 expertise. He added that the firm has represented both developers and
277 municipalities

278

279 **Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Auburn, NH)**

280 In partnership with:

281 Kevin Obrey, Wright-Pierce

282 Russ Thibeault, Applied Economic Research

- 283
- 284
- 285
- Notes: Stantec provides technical design review to the Town of Londonderry and K. Obrey is Londonderry's Waste Water consultant (L. Reilly);

- 286 • The proposal was solid and demonstrated some good experience, but they
287 lack experience with mixed use projects (R. Brideau, S. Benson, and
288 staff);
- 289 • The proposal was very specific but limiting in scope (M. Soares);
- 290 • They state they will only attend one public hearing (M. Soares);
- 291 • Their presentation of associated costs makes one think they could
292 escalate if the project scope changes (M. Soares);
- 293 • Their scope of services was complete and detailed topics such as
294 communication with all entities involved and their inspection schedule (L.
295 Reilly);
- 296 • They offered a commitment to mitigate or prevent conflicts of interest (L.
297 Reilly)

298
299 L. Reilly recognized J. Michels who wished to comment on behalf of the
300 applicant. He stated that the team leader does not have experience with this
301 kind of development.

302
303 Laura Aronson, 38 Boyd Road, stated her apprehension to consider familiarity
304 with the concept of New Urbanism as a positive criteria. She asked that it be
305 balanced against the views of those residents who are not convinced of the
306 benefits of New Urbanism and are concerned with the impacts of density that
307 accompany the concept. It was explained to her that the reason it was viewed
308 as a positive when reviewing applications is because of the need for the
309 consultant to understand New Urbanism as it relates to this kind of project and
310 its Master Plan. She also questioned viewing the need for expediency as a
311 positive quality of the applicants when a project of this scope and its impacts
312 would require a significant amount of time to thoroughly review. Staff explained
313 that a firm's understanding of the need to act quickly related to the 65 days in
314 the State statute that requires the Planning Board has to act on a submission
315 once they have accepted an application as complete. The Planning Board,
316 however, is anticipating a lengthy and detailed review process overall. C. May
317 added that since an application was submitted in October, the Planning Board is
318 looking for expediency in the sense that the consultant will need to review the
319 submission and make a recommendation as to whether the application is
320 sufficient in a relatively short period of time. M. Soares noted that after the
321 Master Plan for this project is approved and more specific site plans are
322 reviewed by the Planning Board, there will be ample opportunity for concerns of
323 residents to be addressed and potentially mitigated.

324
325 Following the discussion of the merits of each proposal, the Sub-Committee took
326 a brief recess at 5:40 PM. Any changes to their scores based on those
327 discussions were recorded by staff. When the meeting reconvened at 5:47, the
328 following results were reviewed:

329
330
331
332
333

334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381

| PROPOSAL TEAM | Sub-Committee | | | PB Only Rankings | Town Staff | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | PB Total Score | PB & Staff Combined Ranking | # of Re-viewers | | Staff Total Score | Staff Only Rankings |
| Brown Walker Planners, Inc. | 6.6 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 6.46 | 9 |
| Devine Millimet & Branch, PA | 7.9 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 7.49 | 7 |
| Fougere Planning & Development, Inc. | 7.3 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 7.01 | 8 |
| Hawk Planning Resources LLC | 8.2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 7.74 | 5 |
| Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. | 8.9 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 8.52 | 1 |
| Nitsch Engineering | 7.8 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7.89 | 4 |
| Provan & Lorber Inc. | 5.7 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 5.41 | 10 |
| Resource Systems Group, Inc. | 8.5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 8.14 | 3 |
| Shook Kelley | 8.1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7.65 | 6 |
| Stantec Consulting Services Inc. | 8.0 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 8.43 | 2 |
| | | * | | | | |

(* Interview Recommendations are Based on the Total Rankings of the 4 Planning Board Sub-Committee Members Combined with a Staff Ranking Representing 20% of the Score)

The Sub-Committee then determined how many applicants they would recommend be interviewed. The consensus was that the top four candidates should be invited to an interview with the Sub-Committee and the decision would be presented to the Planning Board at their January 11 meeting for their approval.

III. Other Business

There was no other business.

L. Reilly said the next meeting of the Woodmont RFP Subcommittee during which interviews will be held will take place on January 17, 2012 at 3:00 PM and will be open to the public.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

382

383 Jaye Trottier, Community Development Secretary