

# Worcester Redevelopment Authority

Michael P. Angelini  
Chair

Peter Dunn  
Chief Executive Officer



## WORCESTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Thursday, September 8, 2022

9:00 A.M.

City Hall, Levi Lincoln Chamber  
Worcester, MA 01608

### CALL IN INFORMATION:

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll  
Access Code: 23072301274

### Present:

#### *Worcester Redevelopment Authority Board*

Michael Angelini, Chair  
David Minasian, Vice Chair  
Sherri Pitcher

#### *Staff*

Peter Dunn, Chief Executive Officer  
Michael Traynor, City Solicitor  
Alexis Delgado, WRA Finance Manager  
Julie Lynch, Public Facilities Director  
Paul Morano, Office of Economic Development  
Greg Ormsby, Office of Economic Development  
Jane Bresnahan, Office of Economic Development

Pursuant to a notice given (attached), a meeting of the Worcester Redevelopment Authority was held at 9:00 A.M. on Thursday, September 8, 2022

### 1. Call to Order

Mr. Dunn called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M.

### 2. Roll Call

Mr. Dunn called the roll – Ms. Pitcher, Mr. Minasian and Chair Angelini. Chair Angelini advised all votes will be taken by roll call.

### 3. Approval of Minutes: August 8, 2022

Mr. Minasian made a motion to approve the minutes.

Ms. Pitcher seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved 3-0 on a roll call.

## **New Business –**

### **1. Review Draft Request for Proposals**

Mr. Dunn introduced the item. At the last meeting, we had the vote for the acquisition of the Denholm Building, which has been completed and recorded at the Registry of Deeds on August 23, 2022. At that meeting, it was our goal to present at this meeting a draft Request for Proposals, move along identifying a development partner for the site, and reduce the time as much as possible in terms of how long the WRA will need to own the property. Included in your packet is the draft Request for Proposals for the property sale and development of the site. It is a lengthy document with introductory terms and conditions consistent with the city of Worcester. One thing I would like to point out and should be all settled, by the time we post the RFP, where we identify the map, block, lot number. Obviously when it was a condo there were map, block, lot numbers for all the condo units and that is in the process of being consolidated with the Assessing Office and should be completed by the time we post the RFP, expecting to be an October timeframe. The October timeframe is really due to one last piece that we are waiting on to give as much information as possible to prospective developers and that is an ALTA survey, which is underway right now. In the introduction part of this RFP and when we talk about the property detail there will be a lot of reports that will also be posted with the RFP on our website so that we get as much of the information out to the proposers to help them with some due diligence and de-risk this as much as possible to get competitive proposals. This will include the previous condominium reserve study, which is the existing conditions of the building that we have reviewed and are familiar with and commissioned by the Trust. It includes a draft hazardous materials building survey, so there is an understanding that there is asbestos in the building and other potential hazardous building materials that will need to be handled properly. It will include the appraisals that we have done on the property, title examination as well as a specimen title insurance policy to make sure that they will have a clean title delivered with the property. There are some encumbrances as any title examination would reveal and will be there for their review as well. It includes a Phase I Environmental Assessment by Wilcox and Barton, which is an environmental firm, and lastly, the survey we are waiting on. There are standard terms and conditions, but most helpful to the Board and of interest would be the evaluation criteria and feel free to interrupt.

The minimum criteria are really the contents that we need and the items are expectations of the contents that are needed from the developer to make sure we have enough information about their proposals to adequately review the proposals. This includes a Letter of Intent, a clear statement that they are interested in purchasing and developing the property and a commitment that they have read the RFP and will comply with the terms and conditions of the RFP. A commitment in good faith to proceed expeditiously if they were to be awarded. Once we select a preferred developer, we would start to negotiate the Land Disposition and Development Agreement and a draft is included so that they are aware of what looks like and know what the expectations are for that LDDA included as an exhibit in the RFP.

Description of the Buyer/Developer(s) - who are they, what is their past experience and what kind of development have they done in the past, what kind of qualifications they have, who is part of the team that would be part of this project in the city and could be a local developer or out of state developer. It includes a list of those projects and a description of that experience,

description of financial capacity to implement projects of this size and scale. Other items included in terms of size and scale as well as tax compliance and good standing.

Once we receive information about who they are, we ask for their proposed project and reuse of the site. As we have discussed in the past, a potential project to adaptively reuse the building or proposal for demolition and new construction. The minimum expectations would be to describe what they are looking to do with the property and how that is consistent with our Urban Revitalization Plan which will be posted with the RFP. We need a description of the size and scale. Being downtown in our Central Business District, we expect to see projects that are in keeping with the size and scale of the surrounding land uses and expect to six or seven stories or more, as well as a description of the intended use of the surface parking lot. The property comes with a surface parking lot in back of the building on the hill and could be used as surface parking to support the use of the primary parcel on Main Street or provide other ideas and include as a statement as to what their intentions are with the surface parking lot. Brief information about their intentions and schedule for the proposal and design considerations. The next section in the minimum evaluation criteria is the economic impact to understand what the economic impact will be to the city of Worcester, including the private investment to complete the project, and an overview of proposed tenants. We are able to consider both residential and commercial uses. For office space, who are the commercial tenants. If proposing residential, what kind of residential will they be doing, condos, rentals, market rate housing, mixed income. Essentially a description of who the users are of the property once they complete the project. Any jobs that will be created at the property and any other economic impact to be considered. List of references, straightforward.

For the finance plan, we are looking for a pro forma based on the description that is provided and private investment, development costs and what is that in terms of hard and soft construction costs. A sources and uses statement - where they would get the funds to complete this, probably including debt and equity. The pro forma would help ensure the project is feasible from an annual operating perspective. We ask if there is any intent to apply for any federal, state or local incentives or subsidies. Not only knowing that is helpful, but if they intend on applying for incentives or subsidies, it can also influence the timeline when public sources come into the mix. A zoning determination - it is very likely that most if not all of the proposals will be by-right and there are no off-street parking requirements. We will receive information of how they are providing parking for the marketability of the property - will they be using the surface parking lot or they might be interested in working with the city regarding Federal Plaza Garage across from Hanover Theater. More details on the timeline for the project so that may be evaluated.

Furthermore, making sure that they have read and are committed to and demonstrate an understanding of the WRA's Responsible Employer and Inclusionary Participation Policy (REIPP), followed by the Price Proposal. The category of topics that I mentioned are the expectations that we have for the content of the proposal making sure we get enough information so that we can adequately evaluate those proposals.

Moving on to the next stage of the comparative evaluation criteria. Mr. Dunn paused for a moment to see if there are questions about the minimum criteria, if not, will move onto the comparative.

Chair Angelini stated I have given suggestions, modest changes to these. Would you like to set a date and time for other members of the Board to provide suggestions and how would you like to handle this. Mr. Dunn responded we do not intend on releasing or posting until October, but if you would like to set a deadline of September 30, 2022 to gather any comments that the Board members might have and want to send directly to me. We also have a couple of other

colleagues/departments looking at this and had some initial feedback that I have incorporated from different perspectives like our Sustainability and Resilience team, Zoning and Planning team, and certainly Mr. Traynor. If we can get all the feedback by September 30, 2022 that would help us continue with the goal of releasing this in mid-October.

Chair Angelini advised the agenda calls for a vote today to authorize advertisement, do you want to defer that until our next meeting and have an opportunity to collect suggestions from the WRA Board and we can vote on this for our October meeting? Mr. Dunn replied that we can share a final draft at that meeting and proceed with a vote and accepted by the members of the Board in attendance.

Ms. Pitcher added, as it relates to parking and this is often brought up when looking at new development opportunities, I am wondering how that is going to affect who will be going into the building. There is no parking requirement for this particular building are we in this RFP offering any other information about parking options? I feel that is going to affect that is going in there. For a developer that is not familiar with Worcester and does not know what parking options could be explored it might restrict the responses we get back. Mr. Dunn replied in the introduction area we can provide a link where the RFP posted on the website a link to parking garages and lots. We would not advertise private parking. Ms. Pitcher stated I would like to have options as that is always bought up in early conversations and we would not want that to be prohibitive from someone not coming in with a really good project. Mr. Dunn agreed. Chair Angelini replied, good suggestion, thank you.

Mr. Minasian for the list of past projects, it stated five to ten years. I think that is good, but sometimes you can cherry pick your projects. I do not think we want a comprehensive list of the last ten years, but I do not know if we want to think about how to handle maybe the last five years or three years of everything they have done with a reference attached to it. I have seen that happen before where respondents will obviously tell you the best parts of what they do not everything of what they do. Related to that in terms of and related to the Responsible Employer Policy can we get a sense of not only the references on the financial side but also on the construction side? Who they have used how that played out and if we are able to obtain a schedule? Were they able to go from idea to finished product in a good timeline? Maybe we have not reached the topic yet, but are we having a point system and is there discretion in that decision? If someone responds to the RFP and someone has not paid taxes, are they disqualified? Mr. Dunn replied are you saying if they have not paid taxes to the city because they do not own property in the city? Mr. Minasian clarified if they are delinquent. Mr. Dunn responded that they must be in good standing to be qualified. Mr. Dunn advised there is a certificate of tax compliance, and we can search our records as well to make sure that is accurate in addition to signing under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Mr. Dunn continued with respect to the REIPP compliance it's a combination of the minimum and comparative evaluation criteria. On the minimum criteria we require that they include a commitment to the REIPP as well and an understanding of the REIPP because it is so important. And to your point it is actually one of the criteria for comparative evaluation as well, including their actual plan for compliance to give more information with the strategies around ensuring that things do not go awry during that process in terms of nonpayment. In addition to some of the requirements about being a responsible contractor there are some of the goals we have for local and diverse participation. Information regarding strategies for that as well as past experience and that will be part of this comparative evaluation, but to your last point in terms of making it contractual, it is in the Land Disposition Agreement as well, so it includes the full policy as an exhibit. There is also a section within the Land Disposition Agreement that I'd call out for you that talks about submission of certified payroll "submission of falsified certified payroll

documentation by a contractor or subcontractor at every tier may be referred to the Office of Attorney General” and the REIPP is present throughout this entire RFP document.

Mr. Minasian responded that’s good to hear. Most likely the respondent to this is not going to have a construction arm, they will hire a series of contractors to do this work. I think focusing in on how they get involved in that process and not wash their hands of it is something that I would be looking for as a Board member to sort of look at both the diversity front, M/WBE, workforce but also on the misclassification and the tax fraud. We have X, Y and Z policies and put in X, Y and Z policies into our contracts and would go a long way for me. Mr. Minasian continued, I like the comparative approach and that allows discretion, and my head is a little in the CM at Risk Public bidding world and I know that is not what this is. We are looking at some tangibles and intangibles with certain things in a proposal like the schedule or the scope of work that might really outshine other parts of other proposals and do we have discretion here to kind of choose based on really terrible answers in one section or really great answers in another section?

Mr. Dunn replied, I will start and if Mr. Traynor wants to elaborate, and I know Mr. Angelini wanted to make sure that our discretion was more clearly stated, so maybe we enhance the language around that to make sure proposers know that level of discretion. Mr. Dunn advised the way the scoring works for the comparative evaluation it is highly advantageous, advantageous or not advantageous. But I think to your point on where the discretion comes in to play, is that if you have a potential criterion that is not advantageous but really alarming, would it be really not in our best interest to move forward even if they scored well in other categories. There could be areas where we emphasize, to your point, and weigh those criteria. We do not discuss an equal weighting and we do have that discretion, but I’ll turn to Mr. Traynor for any mischaracterizations. Mr. Traynor responded that was a good summary Mr. Dunn. I would start with the fact that as a redevelopment project we are not subject to Chapter 30B unlike other dispositions saying that we have some discretion. We have to be fair if we are setting up the rules of engagement of the RFP. It is a collective decision for all the different criteria and we would make the decision of what is the most advantageous proposal out of all of them. Some of these categories are going to weigh heavier than others and some may be deficient, but it is the collective decision of each proposal where they rank. Chair Angelini replied thank you Mr. Traynor.

Ms. Pitcher added, I have not read every page of the RFP, but I believe that this is a huge opportunity for the city, and I feel we could tell a better story about what has been happening. There is no mention of Main Street Reimagined, Court House to Court House investment that the city has made, the Common, The Grid was not included, and John McGrail has done a lot of investment with MG2. If this is going to be representing this opportunity to outside developers, we really need to tell a compelling story and be a little bit stronger. It could have been in there, but I did not see when I reviewed the highlighted projects. We cannot include everything, but I feel like the investment that the city has made in infrastructure is really, really important to show to an outside developer. Mr. Dunn replied that’s good point and I think you can pick up on some of the highlighted projects and initiatives included in the introduction where the WRA had an active role. I agree in creating a compelling case, and we can include other private investments and other city investments where the WRA did not have an active role. We can elaborate on that.

Chair Angelini continued, I have a question, it did not occur to me until recently, to talk about the design considerations (p. 816), which discusses the design should include first floor retail or something similar. That is obviously desirable, and I have thought about it, often walking from the new courthouse down to City Hall with the number of vacant storefronts and we discussed before. It’s not a grave concern, but has been unfilled and I wonder if insisting on the

establishment of further first floor retail is perpetuating a vacancy of existing first floor retail outlets. I am not articulately as best as I would like, but we have a surplus of street level retail opportunities in Worcester which are not being filled and I wonder if we should be adding to that by insisting on further first floor retail space as part of the design criteria. I do not have the answer to that and raise for you to think about. Ms. Pitcher replied I think if we do not say it, we are at risk of putting another law firm on the first floor of a corner in the Central Business District, but I understand what you are saying.

Mr. Dunn reviewed the comparative evaluation. The first criterion is straightforward of how well the project will advance the Urban Revitalization Plan. The second comparative evaluation is relative to the site preparation particularly, with the potential of demolition at the property. As we have discussed, there is certainly the ability for proposers to submit an adaptive reuse development of the existing structure. We have talked before about how our opinion is that it is unlikely because of the challenges and condition of the building. We are aware of the depth of the building and how it limits natural light and a potential residential conversion of that building. But we keep the door open if you will if someone submits a proposal for adaptive reuse. As it relates to potential proposals that include demolition and new construction, we ask whether they are willing to take on the demolition activity. We had discussed before that there is only so much land value for this kind of size site. When we had requested the loan order from the City Council to do the acquisition and some of the other activities, we felt that we might have to undertake demolition. We did include \$2.5 Million Dollars for demolition. This comparative evaluation criterion on demolition and whether they are willing to undertake the project is a bit of risk management for the WRA. While we have the resources to potentially do that, I think it would be in our best interest to highly rank proposals that are willing to take that on themselves. To further that point we have the highest evaluation as someone who is willing to take on the demolition and at their own costs. Since we did intend, or had the option, to potentially help with that and do the demolition with the estimate of \$2.5 Million Dollars, the next level would be a proposal that is willing to take on the demolition but a credit against their price proposal. We know the land only has so much value, so if you are incurring \$2.5 Million of costs on the front end to prepare the site for what they will do after, it could be tough to swallow. The last tier, a not advantageous proposal is one looking for us to do demolition. That's the thought process behind that criterion.

Mr. Dunn continued, the next one because of how the Urban Revitalization Plan is written and our initial vision for the property. We have always contemplated this site being open to residential or commercial uses and we expect to receive more proposals on the residential versus commercial due to the fact what the pandemic has done to office space as well as vacancy in the downtown for office space. For residential uses, based on the size of the site, we think a project that would develop 125 or more residential units is the right scale that we are discussing. Also due to ongoing discussions around inclusionary zoning at the City Council level and the need for affordable units in the city as well as our philosophy regarding mixed income. The highest ranked proposals will include not less than 20% affordable units in the mix and we have a huge need for accessible units in the city as well. A project here by law would be required to do 5% ADA units. The highest ranking here would be for projects pushing that further to 10% ADA units. The next tier down the same scale 125 or more units, but maybe does not include that level of affordability. And the last tier for not advantageous proposals would either be fewer than 125 units or not including affordable or accessible beyond what is required by law. Mr. Minasian asked, I am curious how you got to the 125 units and why is that the bottom? Mr. Dunn replied, looking at the acreage and the existing building there today is two hundred thousand square feet, we think it is pretty reasonable to expect a building built in its place would be to accommodate at least 125 units. This relates to some of design considerations in the later criteria but keeping with the scale of the surrounding uses and Central Business District. A property that might be six

stories, I think is very easy to fit 125 units or more. If the Board felt like seeing even more and put that 125 up a little bit that would be reasonable. Mr. Minasian replied that sounds good and I am fine with 125 units. I agree with you, it seems like a good amount for a starting place and if someone wants to come in higher, we will view that as a better proposal.

Chair Angelini asked do you see room in these criteria for a combined commercial and housing development? Mr. Dunn replied, we talk about mixed-use as it relates to the first-floor retail and have that expectation. Chair Angelini continued, for the sake of imagination if we we could attract a single commercial developer or tenant that would occupy the first three or four floors for commercial use by a company, and the upper floors were residential, it would seem to me that would not be an unfortunate development, and I want to make sure these criteria are articulated in such a way that it is not commercial or residential but could be commercial and residential. Mr. Dunn replied, I appreciate that. What we could do, and what we did with the previous one, was include an introduction to that criterion and qualify that we are open to mixed use and to make sure they are not viewing as being boxed into one or the other. Mr. Dunn advised I do not see that example as a very common proposal and could be tough to put the pieces together as well as obtain financing, but we can make sure they know there is some flexibility and discretion for those options. Chair Angelini continued, we want to attract someone with imagination and ideas that may have not occurred to us.

Mr. Dunn continued, similarly on this subsection, if it were commercial use of a certain amount of square feet. The existing building that is there right now is 200,000 square feet. When we speak of a highly ranked proposal of at least 150,000 square feet and certain level of job creation. What we see in an office setting is about one job for every 300 square feet. Knowing that is kind of changing a little bit with the pandemic effects, we stated here if it were 150,000 square feet and at least 200 full-time jobs, that's very doable for highly ranked proposal. The other tiers would be smaller square feet and fewer jobs. As we have discussed before, based on what we are seeing in the market right now and the existing supply of office space in the city, we expect most of all proposals will see this on the residential side of the equation. Chair Angelini agreed.

Mr. Pitcher added, what about a hotel, heard there were some hotel developers looking? Mr. Dunn replied, the hotel use is not specifically called out in our vision with the Urban Revitalization Plan. There are also other hotels we are looking to get accomplished and do not want to negatively impact that. As you know, the WRA still has the pending proposal with Washington Square and want to make sure that we get that completed as we are still in active conversations with them about that. Also across from the Ballpark, there is a plan in place in terms of Madison Properties for a hotel there. Chair Angelini replied, I agree with that but wonder if somewhere here we should recognize someone might have an imaginative idea that has not occurred to us, and we do not want to foreclose it. I cannot imagine what that imaginative idea might be, and you never know. The world is changing rapidly and full of creative people, so we need to draft this in such a way that we do not exclude someone with a novel thought. Mr. Dunn replied, we can include that in the introduction to that criterion.

Mr. Dunn continued, the financial plan we spoke about with minimum criteria was to obtain enough information to review and assess their financial plan. This comparative criterion takes it to the next level by comparatively looking at them to see the strength of their financial plans. A proposal that has very firm commitments and letters demonstrating their financial capacity to complete the development would be ranked high. Others that maybe have financial interest that reasonably demonstrate the ability to carry it out, or not advantageous and does not have any kind of letters or expressions letters of financial interest in the project, or otherwise does not demonstrate the developer's financial capacity. We want to make sure that we are always

keeping that in mind regarding the viability of the project and getting the financing to accomplish the project.

Mr. Dunn continued with the development plan schedule. Obviously, we want to see a project move along expeditiously, including the ability to secure their permits and entitlements, assemble the financing quickly, so that we can successfully transfer the land to the developer. A schedule that shows the development commencing expeditiously, so that we start to see the new tax generation from that, along with the activity and vibrancy that will be created there. Looking at projects that are willing to commit to a certain timeframe will be evaluated favorably. Based on what it typically takes to put together the land use permitting, the financing we feel like a proposal that includes a reasonable commitment to commence construction within 18 months from the time they would sign the Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) and then complete that project within 24 months would be favorable. The evaluation goes down from there in terms of taking a little bit longer and how that would not be ranked as high as those that could achieve that schedule.

Mr. Minasian I might be putting the cart before the horse let's say we rank someone highly advantageous, and we move ahead in this regard, and they have not hit the milestones. I do not think there is anything in the RFP process that we can do anything about that, but is there something later and what options do we have? I do not want another agenda item soon to be a project we are excited about and then for whatever reasons it stalls. Is there a way to have the taxes go up at a certain point in time similar to what we did with the left field office building or some kind of incentive or disincentive to ensure the timeframe table is met? Mr. Dunn replied. that is more specific in the Land Disposition & Development Agreement (LDDA), which includes benchmarks and specific timelines every step of the way. In this evaluation, what we will probably do is not transfer the land until they meet certain milestones, so we feel confident about their closing. If they stall, we want to continue the control of the land so that we can then decide what's next, rather than having transferred the land as it gets a little more complicated. Mr. Dunn also mentioned that they could lose deposits, having earnest money committed, so the WRA would not be left wasting their time and to have some compensation through surrender of certain deposits.

Mr. Dunn continued, we have the Green Worcester Plan in the city and include a criterion about low impact development and sustainability. We may receive additional feedback from our Sustainability and Resilience team regarding some of the language in the document. The Green Worcester Plan has a number of recommendations and principles, so we will look at how well proposals are achieving some of those goals of the Green Worcester Plan in this criterion. Next are design considerations and we spoke of the first-floor retail aspect already. Design review has been brought up in the past and this project is a conspicuous location on Main Street in our Central Business District and historic corridor of Main Street. We will review their design approach to make sure it is aesthetic and well planned, consistent with our design guidelines and architecturally complementary to the other buildings along Main Street. As we know with other developments, there are some cost limitations, but there are creative ways to approach the design where you are still cost effective, but being responsive and sensitive to the surroundings, land uses and architectural features of the other buildings on Main Street. We are optimistic that we will find the right balance, but obviously there are some limitations in terms of building materials costs and otherwise.

Mr. Dunn continued, lastly and related to the earlier question, a more detailed plan for their compliance with the REIPP. This detail will allow us to match up the proposals from their past experience dealing with similar requirements and goals around local and diverse participation, and how well they articulate a plan or strategy for achieving that. Some may know of the best



practice called the Massport model. Massport used this approach with piece of land in Boston and we wanted to take from that best practice. It's not just acknowledging that the REIPP policy exists and will comply but giving us some more information and what is their plan or strategy for achieving it. We can use that as one of our criteria to make sure that we get a project that does well with what we expect from this policy. Mr. Minasian responded, I appreciate that, but it must be an oversight that the other part of the REIPP is not in here regarding the misclassification, insurance fraud and not following wage and hour laws and would like to see that included which is also a major component to the REIPP. I'd like to see something here around how they are acknowledging that or preventing and perhaps how they will be passing that down the chain. We have seen this in other areas where the developer commits and for whatever reason has not communicated down the chain to the general contractor in the subcontracts. Not sure if there is a way to tighten that up, but I can send over comments in writing. Mr. Minasian continued that the diversity looks good and I just think we are missing the other piece of the REIPP. Mr. Dunn replied, Chair Angelini to your earlier suggestion we can continue the item to next month and take the vote on the final draft when we have the comments. Chair Angelini I recognize the responsibility and we have all made comments during this call and submit in writing to Mr. Dunn to make sure we are not missing anything. The deadline will be at the end of this month to do so and communicate to the other Board members who are not on the call and take up the vote at our October meeting. Chair Angelini there has been a lot of work done, Ms. Pitcher and Mr. Minasian thank you, fantastic, exciting stuff. Chair Angelini, Ms. Pitcher a huge opportunity before the city and devote ourselves to making sure we take advantage of it.

**2. Authorize Execution of Amendment 1 to the Design Services Agreement with Nault Architects, Inc. in the amount of \$132,882.00 relative to Union Station**

Mr. Dunn explained last month we had a very small amount of services at the time the contract was presented totaling around \$11,000.00. This amendment is more comprehensive as we look through this year what are some of the miscellaneous improvements needed at Union Station. This includes the additional roof repairs design work related to roof repairs, the Building Management System (BMS) including Johnson Controls and help with building management, generator, lighting along with ice melt system and exhibit we would put as part of Amendment 1 outlining these activities as well as associated fees there is a sub consultant involved so it is Nault as well as the sub consultant that will be working with our public facilities team on that. Ms. Lynch is on the call if there are more technical questions on the proposal.

Mr. Minasian offered the following vote:

**Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chair or vice-chair to execute Amendment Number 1 to the Design Services Agreement with Nault Architects, Inc. in the amount of \$132,882.00 relative to Union Station.**

Ms. Pitcher second the motion.

The item was approved on a 3-0 roll call.

**3. Authorize Execution of a Cleaning Services Agreement with Paixado, Inc. d/b/a KleenRite Services in the amount of \$504,795.00 relative to Union Station**

Mr. Dunn explained the corporation is named Paixdo, Inc. d/b/a KleenRite Services. We did Request for Proposals and received pricing back and the lowest qualified bid is KleenRite Services with detail provided with the vote, which includes their services and consumables i.e., cleaning supplies. Mr. Dunn noted that this is a minority business

enterprise, which is great to see that we have the contract going to a minority business enterprise. This is our typical RFP for cleaning services at Union Station both the public and nonpublic areas. Chair Angelini did we receive other bids. Mr. Dunn we did. Chair Angelini asked for the scope of the bids in terms of dollars and range of bids. Ms. Lynch I do not have that information at the meeting KleenRite was the lowest qualified bidder and in the middle of the pack, their references were checked. There were some that were much higher and I believe one lower but not a qualified bidder. Chair Angelini do you know why they were not qualified. Ms. Lynch we had worked with them in the past and had issues paying their employees. Thank you.

Ms. Pitcher offered the following motion:

**Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chair or vice-chair to execute a Cleaning Services Agreement with Paixao, Inc. d/b/a KleenRite Services in the amount of \$504,795.00 relative to Union Station.**

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion.

Mr. Minasian KleenRite do we look through similar any violations of wage and hour laws or any past issues with debarment with the contractor. Ms. Lynch replied the contractor is registered through SAM.gov that means they have been verified in those categories and this is a contractor that has performed cleaning services at the Springfield Union Station and I checked their references as well as visiting the site, which was extremely clean and well maintained. Mr. Minasian awesome you answered by follow-up question and Springfield Union Station is a liked building.

The item was approved on a 3-0 roll call

#### **4. Reorganization of Officers – Vice Chair & Secretary**

Mr. Dunn will turn to Mr. Traynor and something we do annually, have a vote of the officers in terms of Vice-chair and Secretary, and have on file for this year. Mr. Traynor the bylaws call for a reorganizing of the first meeting of July and amiss in not doing this for the past couple of years. Chair Angelini asked who are the existing Vice-Chair and existing Secretary – Mr. Traynor Vice-Chair is Mr. Minasian and the Secretary is Ms. Gaskin.

Ms. Pitcher offered the following motion:

**Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby elects the following slate of officers for the 2023 fiscal year:**

**David Minasian, Vice-chair**

**Jennifer Gaskin, Secretary**

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion.

The item was approved on a 3-0 roll call.

#### **5. Financial Update Report**

##### **a. Report on Prior Month's Executed Contracts and Payments**

## **b. Report on Downtown Urban Revitalization Plan Expenditures**

Mr. Dunn advised not a whole lot of expenses for the period August 6, 2022 through September 6, 2022 total expenditures just over \$4 Million Dollars with \$3 Million Dollars for the acquisition of the Denholm Building along with the latest requisition on the Garage. They are in punch load mode with the Garage there was \$715,000.00 requisition from Gilbane Hunt and the lion's share of the \$4 Million Dollars.

## **6. Status Reports**

### **a. Union Station**

### **b. Downtown Urban Revitalization Plan.**

Mr. Dunn on Union Station, MBTA continues with the center platform project and we executed the lease as the Board approved with the restaurant across the Grand Hall from Luciano's, and getting ready with their building plans to pull their permits for buildout. October will bring in the Food Hub lease proposal. Downtown as we have discussed Denholm is certainly the focus on the RFP. M. Minasian do we have the lease proposal for the Food Hub prior to construction bidding. Mr. Dunn yes and hoping to bring in in October as they are still wrapping up design and it is not out to bid and bring the lease terms to the Board in October.

Chair Angelini noted the meetings are now the second Thursday of each month at 9:00 a.m. The next meetings are October 13<sup>th</sup>, November 10<sup>th</sup> and December 8<sup>th</sup>, Chair Angelini will be out of the country and wanted to make sure there is a quorum and if any Board member has a problem with that date that might interfere with having a quorum or any problems with respect to the meetings, I listed let us know as soon as possible if there is not a quorum and make alternate arrangements.

## **7. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Dunn called the roll to adjourn the meeting at 10:09 A.M. Chair Angelini great meeting Mr. Dunn.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Dunn  
Chief Executive Officer