

REGULAR SESSION MEETING MINUTES
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, March 03, 2016

EDC Chairman Richard Wallner called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm in room 03 at the Town Hall in the presence of:

Voting Members: Michael Prisco, William Bellavance, Peter Beal, Joseph Lauria, and Richard Wallner

Missing: Sean Delaney, David Ferreira

Associate Members:

Non-Members:

Chairman Richard Wallner opened the meeting at 6:05pm.

- 1.) The Committee started off the meeting by reviewing the proposals submitted for brokerage :
 - a. **TRA Brokerage:** The EDC Members gave TRA an overall score of 8.2.
 - i. The committee would like to ask the following questions for clarification:
 1. Please provide who "specifically" will be assigned to the project?
 2. Please provide who is the lead broker and who is going to be on your team?
 3. Do you have an estimated timeframe how long the Market Study will take to be completed?
 4. Please clarify what your process will be to market the property.
 5. Please provide the sample RFP and other documents as stated in section 3.3 in paragraph labeled "marketing and public solicitation strategy".
 - b. **Lincoln Properties:** The EDC Members gave Lincoln Properties an overall score of 3.6.
 - i. The Committee unanimously did feel it was necessary to obtain any clarifications based on the overall scoring.
- 2.) Chairman Wallner reviewed all actions items assigned and requested to set the next meeting date; which is Wednesday March 9, 2016 at 6:00pm in Town Hall.
- 3.) **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Prisco motioned to adjourn the meeting
Seconded by: Mr. Beal
Voted by:

Mr. Prisco	AYE
Mr. Lauria	AYE
Mr. Wallner	AYE

TOWN CLERK
NORTH READING, MA

2016 MAR 10 PM 12:44

RECEIVED
BARBARA STATS

Mr. Bellavance
Mr. Beal

AYE
AYE

UNANIMOUS (5-0-0) Mr. Delaney & Mr. Ferreira were absent.
ADJOURN 7:11 pm

3/9/2016

DATE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Prisco', written over a horizontal line.

MICHAEL PRISCO, CLERK

TRA Score : 8.2

Criterion	Highly Advantageous	Advantageous	Not Advantageous/ Unacceptable	Score and optional comments: 2 points=Highly Advantageous 1 point=Advantageous 0 point=Not advantageous
<i>Prior Experience</i>	Reports similar projects of a similar or greater size	Reports similar projects	Reports no similar projects	Bill - 1 Peter - 2 Joe - 2 Mike - 2 Rich - 2
<i>Past Performance</i>	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time, within budget, and with favorable feedback from owners.	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time and within budget.	Poor record of experience with similar projects, or unfavorable feedback from project owners.	Bill - 1 Peter - 2 Joe - 1 Mike - 2 Rich - 2
<i>Current Workload and Ability to take on the Project</i>	Demonstrates staffing capable of managing, and commits lead project manager and supporting staff.	Commits to having sufficient staff capacity to complete project.	Has insufficient staffing capacity to complete the project.	Bill - 1 Peter - 2 Joe - 1 Mike - 2 Rich - 2
<i>Staff</i>	Commits highest level staff/partners, with more than the minimum required experience, to manage project.	Commits mid-level and some higher-level staff to manage project.	Few or no mid- or high-level staff available to manage project.	Bill - 2 Peter - 1 Joe - 2 Mike - 2 Rich - 1
<i>Suitability to Town</i>	Demonstrates knowledge of North Reading and experience in Middlesex/Essex County commercial real estate market, as well as an understanding of the challenges facing a Town with limited utility infrastructure and limited	Demonstrates knowledge of Massachusetts commercial real estate market, with experience in Middlesex/Essex County area.	Does not demonstrate substantive knowledge of commercial real estate market in Massachusetts.	Bill - 1 Peter - 1 Joe - 1 Mike - 2 Rich - 2

TRA Score : 8.2

	highway access.				
--	-----------------	--	--	--	--

Additional comments:

- 1. Some would like to know the staffing a little more
- 2. Seems south of Boston but within the RFP Essex and Middlesex county
- 3. Had mixed user development for past experience which was nice to see
- 4. A little nervous of all the transit but some think this is a positive

Lincoln Properties **Score : 3.6**

Criterion	Highly Advantageous	Advantageous	Not Advantageous/ Unacceptable	Score and optional comments: 2 points=Highly Advantageous 1 point=Advantageous 0 point=Not advantageous
<i>Prior Experience</i>	Reports similar projects of a similar or greater size	Reports similar projects	Reports no similar projects	Bill - 0 Peter - 0 Joe - 0 Mike - 0 Rich - 0
<i>Past Performance</i>	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time, within budget, and with favorable feedback from owners.	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time and within budget.	Poor record of experience with similar projects, or unfavorable feedback from project owners.	Bill - 1 Peter - 1 Joe - 0 Mike - 0 Rich - 0
<i>Current Workload and Ability to take on the Project</i>	Demonstrates staffing capable of managing, and commits lead project manager and supporting staff.	Commits to having sufficient staff capacity to complete project.	Has insufficient staffing capacity to complete the project.	Bill - 1 Peter - 2 Joe - 1 Mike - 1 Rich - 1
<i>Staff</i>	Commits highest level staff/partners, with more than the minimum required experience, to manage project.	Commits mid-level and some higher-level staff to manage project.	Few or no mid- or high-level staff available to manage project.	Bill - 1 Peter - 1 Joe - 0 Mike - 1 Rich - 1
<i>Suitability to Town</i>	Demonstrates knowledge of North Reading and experience in Middlesex/Essex County commercial real estate market, as well as an understanding of the challenges facing a Town with limited utility infrastructure and limited	Demonstrates knowledge of Massachusetts commercial real estate market, with experience in Middlesex/Essex County area.	Does not demonstrate substantive knowledge of commercial real estate market in Massachusetts.	Bill - 1 Peter - 2 Joe - 0 Mike - 1 Rich - 2

	highway access.					
--	-----------------	--	--	--	--	--

Additional comments:

- 1. Lack of Land deals in RFP
- 2. Mostly Office on RFP
- 3. Didn't answer RFP content completely
- 4.