

Public-Private Partnership Sub-Committee ("P3")
of the
Dover Community Center Building Committee

Minutes

September 11, 2007

Attendance: Voting Members: Samantha Burman, Justine Kent-Uritam, and Doug Scott (all sworn in by the Town Clerk) and Rick Henken and Bob Rinaldi (not yet sworn in). Liaison: Joe Melican.

The meeting began at 7 PM.

1. Election of the Chair

Upon the motion of Doug, with a second by Samantha, Justine was elected chair by a 3-0 vote of the confirmed members with the 2 unconfirmed members ineligible to vote.

2. Election of the Clerk

By a 3-0 vote of the confirmed members, P3 unanimously voted to approve the rotation of the position of Clerk (the Taker of Minutes) among the members. Justine volunteered to take the minutes today.

3. Discussion of Past Caryl School Building Projects

Given his extensive experience with past Caryl School committees, Doug gave an overview of the history of past project proposals for the site. Per Doug, Caryl #1 in 2002 was a proposal to rehab and add on to the existing Caryl School that was defeated at Town Meeting. Caryl #1 would have cost about \$5 million and was a mixed-use project (elderly affordable housing, gymnasium, and meeting rooms).

The defeat of Caryl #1 led to the creation of a committee (co-chaired by Doug) in 2004 that surveyed town residents as to what they wanted to see happen at the Caryl School site and how much were they willing to pay for it. The residents' first choice was a minor renovation of the building with their second choice being a major renovation. Doug's committee submitted their report to the Selectmen without any recommendations.

Caryl #2 was a "build new" project costing about \$18 million. The proposal was withdrawn prior to the 2007 Town Meeting primarily because of the high price tag. This project consisted of meeting rooms (both for the public and commercial tenants), a "great hall" and a new gym.

With the withdrawal of the Caryl #2 proposal, the Selectmen have now created new groups to consider options for the Caryl School site (with P3 being one of the sub-committees).

4. Background Materials

The group noted that not all members had the same reading materials. Samantha volunteered to Xerox missing documents and to distribute them to members at our next meeting.

5. Scope of Work

There was confusion as to whether or not the report entitled "The Report of the Committee to Study the Future of Caryl School" (which members have) is the same report entitled "The Committee to Study the Future of Caryl School Real Estate Sub-Committee Report" (which

members do not seem to have and which was included in the scope of work). Samantha volunteered to research this matter.

6. Definition of Public-Private Partnerships

There was extensive discussion as to what form a “public private” partnership might take. Some models are these:

- a. Town retains fee simple ownership of all or part of the Caryl School land and rents all or part of the land to commercial parties (such as a retail store or a restaurant) or to not-for-profit organizations (such as the YMCA or a housing group) under a long term (25-50 years) ground lease. The lessee then constructs a building on site to be occupied by various combinations of businesses/not-for-profits/municipal entities with or without the right of the town to purchase at the end of the lease. (“Hold-Commercial/Municipal Lease” Option)
- b. Town sells some or all of its fee simple interest in the land to commercial or not-for-profit entities which then construct a building on site which the Town then agrees to lease from the developer. (“Sell – Municipal Lease” Option).
- c. Private donors make tax-deductible gifts of land, money, or buildings to the Town in order to supplement or replace Town Meeting appropriations for the possible demolition and/or construction/renovation of a building on site. The Town retains ownership of the fee simple interest in the land and town entities occupy the site. (“Private Donations” Option).

7. Possible Products/Services On Site

The group discussed possible “products” or “services” that might be located on the site, which ranged from affordable housing (to satisfy 40 B requirements) to mixed-use buildings (that is, retail on the ground floor with housing on the second floor) to commercial uses (such as a restaurant or pub on site) to a municipal community center (with or without various amenities).

8. Survey of Other Towns

The group decided to research facilities in semi-rural towns with similar demographic and income levels, such as Bolton, Carlisle, Harvard, Lincoln, Sherborn, Stow, and Weston. Group members volunteered to begin contacting other towns.

Justine adjourned the meeting at 8:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted, Justine Kent-Uritam, Rotating Clerk