



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 SUMMARY OF MARTHA'S VINEYARD
9 HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY COMMITTEE

10
11 May 16, 2012
12 MVC Stone Building

13 *DRAFT*

14
15 **Attendees:**

16 Christina Brown, MVC's Appointee
17 Bob Clay, Edgartown Selectmen's Appointee
18 Ewell Hopkins, Oak Bluffs Selectmen's Appointee
19 Dan Seidman, Tisbury Selectmen's Appointee
20 Adam Wilson, Aquinnah Selectmen's Appointee
21 Ann Wallace, Chilmark Selectmen's Appointee
22 David Vigneault, DCRHA's Appointee

23
24 MVC: Christine Flynn and Mark London

25
26 Meeting opened at 3:04 pm.

27
28 **1. Welcome and Introductions:**

29 MVC Staff Christine Flynn opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. Ms. Flynn thanked everyone
30 for their time and commitment to the Martha's Housing Needs Assessment project. Members then went
31 around the table to introduce themselves as well as mention the appointing board. Ms. Flynn noted that
32 Joanne Scott had agreed to be the West Tisbury AH representative to this project but Ms. Scott had not
33 confirmed if she would be able to attend today's meeting. It was further noted that Ms. Scott would be
34 appointed by the West Tisbury Board of Selectmen at their next meeting. Mr. Wilson also noted that he
35 and Richard Skidmore agreed to be alternates for this project and would be appointed by the Aquinnah
36 Board of Selectmen at a future meeting.

37
38 It was mentioned that this project had a beginning, middle, and an end. Hopefully if all things went
39 according to schedule the project would be completed by March 2013.

40
41 **2. Review Study Committee Roles and Responsibilities:**

42 Ms. Flynn noted that the committee roles and responsibilities had been added to the agenda and would
43 be included in all meeting agendas in order to provide a clear reminder of the Study Committee's
44 purpose and where the focus should be during each meeting. The following were the roles and
45 responsibilities that had been outlined in the meeting agenda:

- a. Draft the Request for Proposal (RFP) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- b. Review proposals, interview candidates and select a consultant
- c. Endorse the consultant's contract and authorize payments consistent with such
- d. Periodically meet with the consultant and provide information as needed
- e. Provide periodic updates to Selectmen
- f. Review the draft report and approve the final report
- g. Present report to All Island Selectmen

Members reviewed items a through g as outlined on the agenda. Overall members seemed pleased with the outline. The following two suggestions were recommended and agreed to change by the Study Committee:

- It was suggested and agreed that item d, the following wording be added from the RFP, page 4, line 146 "and will help the consultant identify and facilitate the involvement of other stakeholders"
- It was suggested and agreed that item e, after the word "Selectmen" add "and town Affordable Housing Committees"

3. Organize Committee and Select a Chair:

Ms. Flynn reported that all meetings would be in conformance to the Open Meeting Law and that the Study Committee is a decision making body with clear responsibilities and a time line to complete the designated tasks outlined in Agenda item # 2. Ms. Flynn noted that she staffs and chairs the Joint Affordable Housing Group but it would be inappropriate for an MVC staff member to be Chair of the MVHNA Study Committee. Ms. Flynn then asked for a nomination for Chair from the members.

Mr. Ewell Hopkins nominated Bob Clay who declined the nomination. Mr. Dan Seidman nominated Ewell Hopkins who also declined the nomination. Mr. Clay then nominated Adam Wilson who hesitated to accept the nomination because he and Richard Skidmore were to be alternates for this project. Mr. David Vigneault mentioned that if Mr. Wilson was reluctant then perhaps Ann Wallace would be a good choice for chairman but Ms. Wallace wanted to hear from Mr. Wilson first. After some discussion, Mr. Wilson accepted the nomination and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hopkins. Ms. Flynn asked for a voice vote and it was unanimous. Mr. Wilson is chairman.

4. Review Tentative Work Program and Meeting Schedule:

Mr. Wilson asked for a brief explanation of the draft work program and meeting schedule. Ms. Flynn explained that the handout was based on the possibility that if the Draft Request For Proposal (RFP) was approved and posted by June 1st on the state's website. It was noted that the RFP had to be posted for a minimum of 14 days but 30 days might be recommended for this project. Either way the 14 or 30 days would alter the time line for the project but essentially the study committee's meeting schedule from today would be at least once a month and sometimes twice a month through March 2013 to complete the tasks outlined in the work program.

Mr. Wilson asked for discussion of the Work Program and Meeting Schedule. Members asked if the RFP would be posted on other media outlets in addition to the state's Central Register. Staff mentioned that the RFP could be sent out on the Massplanners list serve and that the RFP has to be advertised for

1 two weeks in the local newspapers. It was suggested that staff could also send the RFP to potential
2 consultant bidders as well. Members seemed satisfied with the advertising process and inclusion of the
3 \$30,000 cost ceiling to be included in the RFP. Members did request that the RFP be posted for at least
4 30 days to give potential consultants ample time to reply and provide a timeline that would outline their
5 availability to start the study. Mr. Wilson asked for a motion regarding the 30 day posting which was
6 motioned by Mr. Vigneault and seconded by Ms. Brown. The committee then voted to approve the
7 motion. Ms. Flynn also clarified that the next Study Committee meeting would be Wednesday May
8 30th from 3:00 – 4:00 pm at the MVC. Staff also noted that Wednesday afternoon’s seemed to work
9 for everyone present.

10 11 **5. Discuss the Draft Request For Proposal (RFP) for the Martha’s Vineyard Housing** 12 **Needs Assessment:**

13 Mr. Wilson asked for discussion of the Draft RFP. Members complimented staff that the Draft RFP was
14 very comprehensive and thorough. The following are discussion highlights and recommended changes
15 to the Draft RFP:

- 16 • There was some discussion regarding the term Homelessness.
- 17 • Page 2, Section 2, line 76 remove the words “due to substance abuse”
- 18 • It was noted that Homelessness due to the Island Shuffle was also referenced on page 3,
19 line 97. Members were satisfied with the explanation on that line.
- 20 • Page 5, Section 4, Line 183 It was suggested that language to a “Disclaimer” be added
21 that conveys the Study Committee’s right to reject all bids without an explanation.
- 22 • It was noted that it’s more important to know when the consultant can start as opposed to
23 the length of time needed to complete the study.
 - 24 ○ It was also noted that it’s equally important for the consultant to be able to
25 provide comparables to other communities as well as demonstrate expertise by
26 providing samples of other studies.
 - 27 ○ It will be helpful if the consultant can provide some insight regarding the
28 organizational capacity of the current housing organizations while utilizing the
29 existing professional staff of the MVC, DCRHA, IHT, IEH, MVHF, Habitat and
30 other organizations in addition to state and federal information as resources.
 - 31 ○ It was noted that in order to make this effort really cost effective the consultant
32 should utilize as many resources as possible but other members felt that we were
33 going beyond the scope of the RFP. The consultant will be empowered to make
34 certain choices based on their experience.
- 35 • One member asked to go back to Section 3.5. There was some discussion regarding
36 3.5 on page 4. One member requested to modify the wording for the reasons that there
37 is a risk that consultants would make a recommendation that further study is needed
38 simply because the RFP has indicated that there is money available for further studies.
39 After several minutes of discussion the committee agreed to modify Section 3.5
 - 40 ○ Page 4, Section 3.5, line 172 replace “Additional Work” with the words “Hourly
41 Rate”.
 - 42 ○ Page 4, Section 3.5, line 172 reword the entire sentence to “If the Study
43 Committee identifies additional work beyond the scope of the initial contract,
44 funds permitting. The Study Committee reserves the right to hire a consultant to

1 do additional work please provide a daily or hourly rate for such additional
2 work.”

- 3 ○ Staff noted that it would be preferable to avoid having to do another RFP if
4 additional work needs to be done.
- 5 • Page 7, Section Attachment A, Certificate of Non-Collusion: One member mentioned
6 that he was asked to serve on this project as a watchdog for the town and expressed the
7 importance that hidden agendas should be avoided at all cost. The member further
8 asked if a consultant wins a bid for this study how can they be prevented from gaining
9 favor to preface certain types of projects. Members were not completely clear of the
10 question or even the concern.
 - 11 ○ Staff asked if the member was referring to a situation that occurred with Middle
12 Line Path where the consultant who was hired to do the specs for the project was
13 then not allow to bid on the actual project.
 - 14 ○ One member mentioned that if there were a direct line to bid on a development
15 project that followed this study then I would be concerned but since this is a one
16 time committee we can better address this issue during the bidding process.

17 18 **6. Possible Vote to approve the Draft RFP for the Martha’s Vineyard Housing** 19 **Needs Assessment Study:**

20 After discussion had been concluded, Mr. Wilson asked for a motion to approve the RFP. Staff asked if
21 the motion could include all of the amendments as well as some flexibility for staff to modify the dates if
22 necessary. Ms. Wallace made a motion to approve the Draft RFP as amended and to allow staff to
23 modify dates if necessary. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vigneault. Mr. Wilson then asked for
24 discussion seeing none. The Chair asked for a voice vote to approve Ms. Wallace’s motion. The
25 motion passed unanimously with on objections or abstentions.

26 27 **7. New Business:**

28 It was asked if the committee should begin to ponder the idea of What am I looking for in a consultant,
29 why are we here or have a general discussion similar to a sharing circle. It was mentioned that staff
30 would draft an evaluation sheet based on the criteria outlined in the Draft RFP. Staff noted that the
31 JAHG will be asked to provided a list of two or three questions for the Study Committee to then ask the
32 consultant. It was then asked is the interviews could be done by teleconference. The Chair said that
33 could be up for discussion but seemed reasonable.

34
35 The Chair then asked for a motion to adjourn which was moved and seconded.

36
37 Meeting adjourned at 4:07 pm.

38
39 Meeting summary was prepared by Christine Flynn.