

**GREAT BARRINGTON
AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND (AHTF)
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES**

Thursday, May 27, 2021 at 6:00 PM via ZOOM video conference

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Clark, Chairman; Bill Cooke, John Katz, Garfield Reed

OTHERS: Carolyn Valli of Habitat for Humanity, William Domack & Katelyn Pekar, Mary Pat Akers, Eileen Mooney, Shep Evans

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 6:12 PM and read the Governor's March 12, 2020 Order. He noted that though Trustee Larissa Yaple was traveling and could not attend, there was nevertheless a quorum in attendance.

Mr. Clark announced that the purpose for this meeting was to review the proposals that the Trust had received from applicants for the property at 40 Grove Street according to the guidelines created in the Request for Proposals (RFP) document. There were proposals from William Domack & Katelyn Pekar and from Habitat for Humanity. He shared his screen and summarized these guidelines as: the Affordability of the applicant's proposal; the applicant's Experience with such rehabilitation projects; the Financial Feasibility of the proposal; the Purchase Price being offered to the Trust; and the Overall Quality of the proposal.

Mr. Reed disclosed that he knows Bill Domack & Kate Pekar.

Mr. Clark reminded that the Board must follow the criteria in the RFP and that he has produced a spreadsheet to record and summarize the Board's evaluations. Each of the criteria were to be evaluated by each member of the Board present as "Not Advantageous", "Advantageous" or "Highly Advantageous" to the mission and objectives of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and would be assigned respective scores of zero, one or two. He then proceeded according to the roll call to gather evaluation scores from each Board member on each criterion for both proposals. In the end, the Habitat for Humanity proposal scored higher than the Domack & Pekar proposal. *(Please see the attached tabulation sheet for details.)*

Mr. Cooke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Clark, to accept the proposal of Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Reed suggested that the Trust might help Domack & Pekar to work with Habitat.

Mr. Cooke commented that the Trust could not make Mr. Reed's suggestion a condition of the transaction.

Mr. Clark asked for any other discussion on the motion.

Mr. Katz asked whether the Board could allow Domack & Pekar to improve their proposal.

MINUTES, May 27, 2021

Page 2

Mr. Clark remarked that one must treat both applicants equally, and to do that the Board would have to start the proposal process over again from scratch. He felt that in terms of Experience, Financials and Overall Quality the Domack & Pekar proposal could not compare to the Habitat proposal and he called for a vote on the motion.

The roll call vote was unanimous in favor of accepting the Habitat for Humanity proposal, and Mr. Clark said he would inform Mr. Rembold of the Board's decision.

Mr. Clark raised the question of funding for engineering at the North Plain Road property. There was \$14,000 CPA money available. Mr. Cooke had gone to the CPC and they voted to put the question of re-appropriating the \$14,000 on the annual Town meeting warrant. Mr. Rembold had submitted a grant proposal to MassWorks for \$50,000 for engineering and has been told that it is likely the grant will be awarded. It was generally agreed by the Board that the \$14,000 will enable the Trust to get some surveying done which will get a head start on layout and preliminary engineering.

Mr. Clark raised the question of meeting over the summer. He will send out a poll to see who is available and when. He also wants to have a meeting to review all dollars received and expended by the Trust. Construct has been very successful with their rent assist program and has raised a substantial amount of money from other sources in addition to the funding provided by the Trust. He wants to go back to the CPC for funding to continue the rent assist effort, keeping in mind that those funds are a loan and not a grant.

Next meeting will probably be in late June. Mr. Clark will send out a Doodle Poll and asked that members with agenda items should forward them to himself and to Mr. Rembold.

Adjournment: Hearing no objections, **Mr. Clark adjourned the meeting at 7:14 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Shepley W. Evans
Administrative Support



RFP Proposals Evaluation

5/27/2021

40 Grove Street

1. Affordability

Not Advantageous: all units at 100% AMI or less

Advantageous: all units at 100% AMI or less and some units at 80% AMI or less

Highly Advantageous: Units for 100% AMI or less and some units reserved for 60% to 80% AMI

2. Experience

Not Advantageous: The developer has never produced an affordable home

Advantageous: The developer has produced an affordable home in the last five years

Highly Advantageous: The developer has produced multiple affordable homes in the last five years

3. Financial Feasibility

Not Advantageous: Project budget has significant gaps

Advantageous: Project budget meets industry standards for financial feasibility

Highly Advantageous: Financial feasibility is more than adequate to address the projected finding needs

4. Purchase Price

Not Advantageous: A transaction with no evidence that it will create affordable housing

Advantageous: A transaction with some evidence that it will create affordable housing

Highly Advantageous: A transaction that describes in detail how it will create affordable housing

5. Overall Quality of the Proposal

Not Advantageous: Proposal complete and responsive to some but not all items in RFP

Advantageous: Proposal well written with clear visual and graphic format and responsive to all items in the RFP

Highly Advantageous: Proposal is of outstanding visual and written quality, responsive to all items in the RFP

Evaluation scoring: Not Advantageous= 0 Advantageous= 1 Highly Advantageous= 2

	F. Clark	B. Cooke	J. Katz	G. Reed	L. Yapple	Total
<u>Domack/Perkul</u>						
1. Affordability	0	0	0	0		0
2. Experience	0	0	1	1		2
3. Financial Feasibility	0	1	1	2		4
4. Purchase Price	2	2	1	2		7
5. Overall Quality of the Proposal	1	1	0	1		3

16

	F. Clark	B. Cooke	J. Katz	G. Reed	L. Yapple	Total
<u>Habitat for Humanity</u>						
1. Affordability	1	1	1	1		4
2. Experience	2	2	2	1		7
3. Financial Feasibility	2	2	2	2		8
4. Purchase Price	1	2	0	0		3
5. Overall Quality of the Proposal	1	2	2	1		6

28