

# HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Wednesday, May 31, 2006 7:30 PM  
Hopkinton Town Hall

## MINUTES

---

### PRESENT:

Mark Abate, Chairman, Planning Board  
R.J. Dourney, Vice Chairman, Planning Board  
Sandy K. Altamura, Planning Board  
John H. Coolidge, Planning Board and Land Use Study Committee  
Jaime Goncalves, Planning Board  
Joe Markey, Planning Board  
Claire Wright, Planning Board  
Finley Perry, Chairman, Land Use Study Committee  
Mavis O'Leary, Land Use Study Committee  
Muriel Kramer, Land Use Study Committee  
Nancy Peters, Land Use Study Committee

Brian Morrison  
Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

### **1. East Hopkinton Master Plan**

Mr. Perry asked if Planning Board members have an objection to Brian Morrison sitting at the table with the group, noting that he is a former member of the Land Use Study Committee (LUSC) and they have asked that he be reappointed by the Bd. of Selectmen. He noted that Mr. Morrison attended the consultant interviews on May 24, 2006. The Planning Board asked Mr. Morrison to join the boards.

Mr. Perry noted that the reason he called the meeting is so that the two groups could go over the references and come to a consensus so a recommendation can be made to the Planning Board for its June 5, 2006 meeting. The selection criteria contained in the RFP were distributed to those who needed copies.

Ms. Lazarus distributed copies of the references responses to the questions developed by the group at the previous meeting. The responses were read and discussed.

Mr. Perry asked each to say who and why they recommend be hired for the project.

Ms. Altamura stated she is concerned that Judi Barrett, Community Opportunities Group (COG), who has done wonderful work for the Town, may be overexposed and people may not pay attention to the project.

After discussion, it was decided to distribute the price quotes for each consultant team.

Ms. Altamura stated that after reading the RFP responses and attending the interviews, she has ranked ICON#1, Sasaki #2 and COG #3. She stated she thought ICON made the best presentation at the interviews, but she likes Sasaki's approach the best. She stated she is concerned that the price for Sasaki is \$15,000 more than budgeted.

Mr. Abate stated it would be nice to have a group with new ideas and access to different ideas. He stated that COG's past projects were of a different magnitude than the other teams, and he feels that a project this size could be out of their league. He stated he likes the Sasaki approach best, and liked their software. He stated he would lean toward Sasaki, but he would be ok with ICON and COG, but ranks ICON #2.

Mr. Coolidge stated he thinks Sasaki's presentation was too slick and he has some experience and knowledge about the Makepeace project and the failure they had there. He stated that ICON didn't make the best presentation, but he likes the fact that FST is on the team. He stated that COG has worked in Hopkinton a lot, but others on the team are new to Hopkinton. He noted that all of the consultants had put together good teams, and he ranks COG #1.

Mr. Markey stated that he likes ICON and he was initially concerned about how Sasaki would be perceived at a public meeting in Hopkinton, but he thinks the references clearly show how Sasaki has very successfully managed complex public engagement forums. He stated he ranks Sasaki #1, ICON #2, and COG #3.

Mr. Goncalves arrived at this time.

Ms. Peters stated she did not attend the interviews, but after reading all of the proposals, she ranks ICON #1 and Sasaki #2.

Mrs. O'Leary stated that Sasaki demonstrated professionalism and expertise and she liked their model. She stated they addressed the issues of revenue that the Town is concerned about. She stated she liked ICON, but only one person did most of the talking and they were never able to hear from the others on the team. She stated she did like their growth management approach. She stated that COG seemed too casual in their presentation. She stated she wonders if they could do this project, and is concerned that their time may be too stretched. She stated she liked the rural design expertise on their team. She stated that she ranks Sasaki #1, ICON #2, and COG #3.

Mrs. Kramer stated she did not attend the interviews, but after reading all of the proposals, she ranks ICON #1, Sasaki #2, and COG #3. She stated she thinks the Town needs someone who can stretch us a little bit.

Mr. Morrison stated that all made excellent presentations. He stated that Sasaki is a huge firm and he has concerns about that. He noted he counted the number of public engagements planned in the responses, 3 to 4 for COG, 2 for ICON, and 4 for Sasaki. He stated he had an uncomfortable feeling about the ICON group and their ability to work together. Mr. Morrison

stated it seems like ICON is more comfortable in an urban environment. He stated the Town has worked with COG before and the team expands on Ms. Barrett's experience. He stated he ranks COG #1 because he feels they would do an excellent job, know more about the Town, and there would be more value for the money. He stated he ranks Sasaki #2.

Ms. Wright stated that Sasaki seemed dynamic, engaging, and held her interest. She stated they focused on consensus building, working with the community and coalescing around goals. She stated she liked Glen Garber's experience with unified permitting. She noted that she is concerned about ICON's urban focus, but they are professional. She stated she wants an entirely new team for this project, noting that COG has done a great job for the Town, but this is a new type of project. She stated that COG seems to be public policy oriented and she wants more than just a report. She ranked Sasaki #1, ICON #2, and COG #3.

Mr. Dourney stated he has previous business experience with Sasaki, although with one specific division. He stated he was a client for 4 years with respect to an architectural process for a retail use in another part of the country, and the experience was not positive. He stated they are big, move slowly, and have expertise in some areas. He stated that this project is different than the one in his experience. He stated that after reviewing the selection criteria, he ranks ICON #1, COG #2, and Sasaki #3.

Mr. Goncalves stated that it seemed like some of the ICON individuals did not get along with each other. He stated that COG has done a great job for the Town, worries about time commitments, but likes their end product and focus on zoning changes. He noted that the team does have good resources. He stated that the Sasaki team are experienced professional team players who have the tools that the Town needs. He stated that every firm has had failures. He ranked Sasaki #1, COG #2, and ICON #3. He stated that he is concerned about the cost, however.

Mr. Perry relayed that Andy Brantz, LUSC member, could not be here, but attended the interviews. He stated that he wanted Mr. Perry to convey that he prefers Sasaki.

Mr. Perry stated that he ranks ICON #3. He stated he likes COG, but he is concerned that they are a primarily public sector operation. He stated he likes that Sasaki is essentially a private sector entity and this projects needs to bridge the market and town interests. He stated the Town needs to create a plan that recognizes the market. He stated he believes that Sasaki will attract the market. He stated that both COG and Sasaki will continue to be active in Town whether they are hired for this project or not. He stated he ranks Sasaki #1 and COG #2.

Mr. Perry asked for feedback from Robert Foster, resident of the study area. Mr. Foster stated that in his experience it is important to look at how each member of the team would be used on the project and to think about why they were brought into the team. He noted that sometimes people are brought into a team for name reasons. He stated that how they are set up to do the project should be looked at and also how the Town communicates to them. He noted that the selected team will need direction, at least philosophical, from the Town.

After tallying the rankings, Sasaki was ranked #1 by 6 people, ICON was ranked #1 by 4, and COG was ranked #1 by 2.

Ms. Altamura asked about the \$15,000 difference between Sasaki's bid and the funding available at the present time. Mr. Morrison stated the Town needs to decide if there is enough extra value in that amount. Mr. Perry stated that all three teams are different and the value is in the entity. Mr. Goncalves noted that Sasaki indicated they could complete the project in 10 months, which adds value. The question was asked whether the Town can negotiate the price. Ms. Lazarus stated that in a conversation with the state Inspector General's office today, they stated that the price cannot be negotiated and the Town cannot sign a contract for more funds than it has budgeted. She noted that in order to hire Sasaki, the Town must determine that their proposal is most advantageous to the Town and must obtain the additional funds.

The issue was discussed further. It was the consensus of those present that Sasaki's proposal is most advantageous to the Town because in addition to meeting the selection criteria, it would involve a shorter process, they have the best scope of services, best/most knowledgeable personnel assigned to the project, best tools available, and all of the team members have worked together before as a team.

Possible avenues of funding were discussed, including Mass Development, donations from land owners and companies in the area such as Liberty Mutual and Mass. Laborer's Training, grants, and the Chamber of Commerce. It was decided not to pursue non-governmental sources of funding to avoid conflicts of interest.

Mr. Perry stated that the Town will need to form a working group to work with the consultant, noting it could be 4 people. He stated they will have to give strong direction to the team. It was noted this would be discussed further by the Planning Board.

Adjourned: 8:55 PM

Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

Approved: June 19, 2006