1. **Welcome and announcements.** Introduce new student Terranova Tasker. David Ziomek announced upcoming relevant meetings and events: Housing Market study presentation on 12/12/13 at 7 pm in the Town Hall, and the Campus Master Plan forum on 12/4/13 at 6pm in the Campus Center Room 174. Nancy announced that the website will be live by the end of the week.

2. **Discussion of Scope revisions.** David Ziomek outlined the changes made to the Scope and the committee agreed that the revisions accurately capture the discussion from the last meeting. Rolf Kolstrom outlined his modifications and additions to the draft RFP, highlighting the emphasis on the border neighborhoods, a need for cost/benefit analysis, and further exploration of industry/academic partnerships that benefit the town. David Ziomek directed the conversation to the first section entitled “housing” and the committee agreed that adding the word “neighborhood” when discussing student housing would help the consultant to focus on positive integration into existing communities, rather than simply identifying areas of adequate space for student housing. Savannah said she agreed with sections 1C and 1D, but asked how the “desirability” of neighborhoods would be determined. In reference to 1C and 1D, there were also questions about whether $60,000 would be an adequate amount for what was outlined. Stephanie O’Keeffe contended that the community itself has the resources to assess how student housing will affect neighborhoods after the consultant identifies specific parcels for development, noting that Section D of Rolf’s proposal is more of a community exercise than an expectation of the consultant. There was some disagreement with this, and much of the committee felt that since the consultant is required to have expertise in assessing impacts of students in college towns it would be beneficial to let them do the assessment here. Andy Churchill stated the need for the consultant to look at the town and campus as a system, not as separate entities. Sandy Pooler expressed some skepticism about asking for a cost/benefit analysis because certain numbers may not be knowable, and because getting a specific number from the consultant wouldn’t be helpful if we can’t determine what that number means. It was agreed that the term “relative cost/benefit analysis” would be more beneficial since it would result in impact analysis rather than a specific number.

The committee decided to remove the word “parcels” from the document, and use the words “zones” or “sites” instead, feeling that these words better encompassed a systemic, neighborhood approach while still keeping the scale small enough to be actionable. Andy Churchill suggested setting up a rubric of criteria to use as a means for evaluating any of the proposed areas for development.

3. **Proposal review.** David Ziomek noted that most of the RFP is UMass “boiler plate” language and that the committee is adding only a few paragraphs about the expectations, including a brief overview of Amherst. It was determined that the majority of the committee agrees what the end product should look like, but needs to form a consensus about what the town and university needs to do in order to get there jointly. Neil la Cour suggested this can be achieved at the policy level, since communication and trust is formed through this process.

In terms of edits to the document, it was agreed that the dollar amount of $60,000 should be included in the proposal since it is public knowledge. The paragraph that describes the scope needs to be updated to include systemic housing, and economic development proposals. It was also decided that the second paragraph under “deliverables” is more important than the first and that the two should be switched. This section will also have an addition that includes language that asks the consultant for suggestions on how to meet the public engagement goals.
Rolf Karlstrom suggested that information about Gateway be added to required reading as an example for the consultant. Stephanie O’Keeffe said that the Amherst Planning Board does not need to review/sign off on the RFP.

It was determined that the subcommittee for reviewing proposals would be Nancy Buffone, David Ziomek, Niels la Cour, Rolf Karlstrom, Ken Rosenthal, David Webber, John Kuhn, and Phil Jackson. Comments on edits to the draft should be sent by Wednesday 12/4/13 at 5:00pm and a hybrid/updated version will be distributed later in the week. An email poll will be sent around to determine whether the next meeting will be Monday 12/9 or Tuesday 12/10.

John Kuhn suggested that some of deliverables better fit into the scope of service, and Rolf Karlstrom suggested that the impact analysis be moved into the scope section. There was some discussion about whether regional impact should be considered, and whether a regional approach would be a beneficial result. John Kennedy made the point that any decent consultant would recognize the unique geography of the region, and be able to identify any positive or negative impacts this may have on what we are asking them to do. It was decided that the Rosenberg Study (which was regional) should be added to the required reading.

4. **Public Comment.** John Fox said that the most important decision the committee makes is choosing the consultant, and he criteria should be the biggest issue. He asked whether there is any flexibility in budget, and whether if we can give the consultants all the “boiler plate” so they don’t have to spend time finding it. He stressed the importance of understanding UMass’ assumptions about the growth of the student population.

Walter Wolnik recapped his email about the Springfield satellite campus.

Paige Wilder stressed the importance of making sure the outcome “looks like Amherst” and that the consultant pay specific attention to the demographics of the town. She cited the Gateway and North Amherst studies as successful because the outcomes looked like Amherst, while other studies do not. Paige also brought up the “70% student population” statistic, and Tony Maroulis stressed the importance of clarifying what this statistic means and deciding on numbers the committee can use that are accurate and consistent.