1. Welcome and overview of first meeting. David Ziomek summarized the first meeting and suggested steering the conversation for this meeting towards more specific categories of what is to be expected from the consultant in terms of deliverables.

2. Announcements. Nancy Buffone went over details of the planned website. The next meeting was tentatively planned for either November 25th or December 2nd depending on availability. An email will be sent out when the website launches.

3. Discussion of RFP Deliverables. David Ziomek outlined how the deliverables were organized into three categories: outcomes, process, and qualifications. He suggested this meeting focus on the “what”/outcomes, saying we should expect “action steps” that rectify problems rather than just identifying areas that need improvements.

Rolf Karlstrom mentioned that the consultant should be expected to assess the current need as well as a projected need, including potential draw/migration of people from other towns because of these improvements. Neils la Cour suggested the 1990 Rosenberg study should be required reading for the consultant in reference to this issue.

Discussion of “housing” section:

Ken Rosenthal summarized the email he sent to the committee. The general response was that off-campus housing is something that the committee feels should be considered because of the taxable income it can bring to the town, overwhelming student desire to live off-campus, and various studies/data that supports this.

Tony Maroulis brought up the “70% of Amherst is students” statistic, and mentioned that this should be clarified for the consultant. Greg Stutsman agreed, and also tied this in with Dennis Swinford’s suggestion to clarify the lexicon of what the term “student” actually means.

The committee agreed to streamline the RFP into two main sections: housing and economic development. It was noted that all the other parts can be merged accurately into these sections, and that some categories are implicit in every area of concern. Categories such as public safety and transportation are related to both housing and economic development, and should be considered throughout the entire process rather than separately as their own categories.

On the topic of public safety, the committee agreed that the overall goal should be to improve quality of life for both students and the community. It was decided that public safety and transportation issues should be a required consideration for any suggestion put forth by the consultant.

Discussion of “economic development” section:

It was decided that the expectations for the consultant in terms of economic development were primarily to address services the community could provide for students that would generate revenue, ways the campus could funnel business related to on-campus events to the town, generating more tourism that is Amherst-
centric rather than UMass-centric, and using key research areas of UMass to spawn similar developments in the town.

David Ziomek suggested that this be fit into the RFP for next meeting to form the basis for what the committee expects the consultant’s study to conclude.

4. **Review of hiring process/timeline.** David Ziomek recommended that the hiring process begin with having candidates review the RFP and submit their proposals with the Town-Gown Steering Committee, then reviewing their proposals and making a short list, interviewing, and deciding on a consultant. Review of proposals would occur sometime around mid-January, with the proposals being public for approximately 2-4 weeks. Dennis Swinford suggested having a pre-proposal stage where candidates could ask questions and get clarifications before making their proposals. The committee decided this would be best done as either a teleconference-type meeting with candidates, or through direct Q & A with the committee chairs. On the topic of public process, the committee felt the best course of action would be to let the consultant determine when/where public meetings would be most useful (within some form of committee-determined guidelines), and then run these ourselves as to avoid using the consultant fee for something the committee is capable of doing.

There will be a new draft timeline at the next meeting, whenever that may be (as determined by an email poll).

5. **Public Comments.** Walter Wolnik mentioned that a public/private partnership has been considered before, and should be considered here.