1. **Announcements.** Website is up and running and can be found at www.umass.edu/town-gown. Agendas, meeting notes, and meeting dates will be posted there.

2. **Discussion of RFP draft.** Nancy Buffone discussed the changes made to the RFP since the last committee meeting. The committee members provided input about spelling errors and language changes. There was ongoing discussion about what data would be used to accurately measure the number of students relative to the town’s population. Rolf Karlstrom suggested using the Impact Factor Report and John Kennedy suggested simply letting the known facts and figures speak for themselves rather than qualifying impact.

   It was decided that the sentence about the Town of Amherst being “against growth” of the University be removed from the RFP. It was agreed that the Gateway traffic study that have been completed should be added to the “previous planning process” section.

   Nancy Buffone is working with UMass Procurement to include the correct “boiler plate” information in the RFP.

3. **Discussion of next steps and subcommittees.** It was determined that a subcommittee will select the finalists for interviews. John Kennedy asked if it was realistic to think that a consultant would be hired by the end of January, as stated on the timeline. It was then determined that the timeline would be updated to reflect the current schedule.

   After a discussion it was determined that the current version of the RFP was acceptable to vote on, assuming all discussed changed will be made.

4. **Public Comments.** Vincent O’Connor brought up possible census errors, and said that it was extremely important to differentiate between daytime and nighttime population. He also stressed that the town needs funding to repair the roads. His concern was mainly around economic development efforts, saying that university expansion removes taxable property from the town, and that this concern should be reflected in the RFP.

   Maurianne Adams recommended that the “net town revenue” be included in the RFP, and asked which networks the committee is using to solicit proposals.

   Paige Wilder addressed the 1st page section that read “increase in undergrad enrollment,” suggested caution against inaccurate information/data and expressed concern about the disagreement regarding population data. She suggested the committee look at the Office of University Partnerships (a division of HUD).

   John Fox raised concerns about a “secret” gateway traffic study.

   Larry Kelley brought up the success of the mutual-aid/joint-patrol system in the border neighborhoods, and suggested this information be included in the RFP.

   Jack Hirsch commented that public resistance to combined planning efforts is not high.

   Michael Alpert suggested the committee considers mixed-use development as an alternative for adding housing in isolated residential communities.
Joan Burgess suggested that a parallel-statement that defines what an “off-campus” student is should be included in the RFP.

5. **Vote.** David Webber made a motion to accept the draft RFP (including all changes discussed). Sandy Pooler seconded the motion.

Stephanie O’Keeffe proposed removing the statement about having the “3rd largest residential campus” on the 1st page, saying that we should qualify the population when we aren’t 100% sure of the data. Amilcar Shabazz said that the edits proposed today are under advisement and that the committee should trust that the scope of service will trigger the kinds of applicants the committee is looking for.

David Webber amended his motion to include the discussed changes. Sandy Pooler seconded the motion.

Everyone voted in favor of the draft RFP.