



Public Body: Greenfield Redevelopment Authority
Date: June 2, 2020 @ 4:00 p.m.
Remote meeting Via WebEx

Members present

Adam Provost
Nancy Hawkins
Charlene Golonka
Jean Wall
Bill Mason

Members absent

None

Also present:

MJ Adams - Director, Community & Economic Development Department
Robin Fordham - Grant Program Assistant, Community & Economic Development Department
Roxann Wedegartner - Mayor of Greenfield

Peg Barringer - FinePoint Associates
Beth Murphy - MassDevelopment

Linda McInerney - Chair, Friends of the First National Bank

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

April 28, 2020 minutes – Ms. Wall moved to accept the minutes. Ms. Golonka seconded. Minutes approved 5-0.

FNB study update

Ms. Adams provided an update to this point. MassDevelopment helping to fund a market study, for creative flex space for the FNB, in order to get sense of market demand, and then whether/how to proceed. Peg Barringer/FinePoint Associates has been touching base with local organizations to get a sense of demand.



FinePoint presentation

Peg Barringer presented on findings to date, and next steps, including the User Demand Survey. Had originally planned to present at the 3/23/20 meeting, but had technical difficulties. Presenting a DRAFT report here.

Working with MassDevelopment to conduct feasibility study. Would there be market demand, what would be ability to generate revenue to cover costs?

To start process, clarified concept, proposed features, users, operating structure. Reviewed Taylor & Burns plans, cost estimate. Building & site assessment. Next to garage and transit center, good assets. One issue of note, no loading lane, makes front entrance challenging. Rear of building also challenging, steps to get up to grade, then narrow passage way to doors. Challenging for equipment etc. Plan for Court Square for more open space would not improve loading for FNB, might exacerbate problems, forcing more cars onto Bank Row.

Original concept was 150-seat theater. Asked architect, what would be maximum? Possible to go to 276 seats. Option for telescoping seats.

Performed comparative facilities research. Identified seven other facilities that were comparable to FNB concept. Profiled all seven, operations, operating costs, structure, etc. Other facilities all emerged from organizations already engaged in arts - groups with an established use looking for site, vs. FNB site looking for use. Role of facilitating-managing group of property varies. Pricing structures ranged across organizations. Since FNB is seeking to be "revenue neutral" spent time asking about budgets. All operate on a combination of earned revenue/fundraising. Mean 55/45. Uses include arts programming, exhibit space.

Review of items specific to non-profits. Benefits to being a 501(c)(3). Difference between commercial and 501(c)(3) theater, as there is an obligation to fulfill artistic and community mission (can't be just any programming).

Market overview/findings to date. Area is home to large number of arts/culture organizations. Profiled organizations in the immediate area. Two spaces similar in size in immediate area. A lot of potential users for space, but whether they can bring audience, fees not clear. Most facilities not used every day - tighter availability during peak times.

Demand analysis: \$125k potential, with a market area between 5.4 and 8.7 million. Primary market area 30-minute drive time; 40-minutes secondary.



Demographics: large # college age; arts attendance increases with higher education, lower age; spending increases with income and education - spending and income are lower in FNB area.

Question or comments so far?

MJ Adams: Why 40 minute drive-time radius for market area?

PB: other facilities cited 30 or 40 minutes as their market area.

MJ Adams: Was dining out in addition to entertainment focus part of market analysis?

PB: No, not factored in. Could be a part of further study.

Ms. Golonka: how to address challenging parking in front of building?

PB: It is state highway, don't know about regulations.

Mayor Wedegartner: If that became a real issue, could discuss with DPW to get info into the report.

Linda McInerney: sidewalk is quite wide; would it work to pull onto sidewalk to load/unload?

Mayor Wedegartner: possible.

Remaining tasks for FinePoint market assessment:

- User analysis - interviews (done)
- User analysis - surveys (to come)

User Survey instrument is in draft form, with excel spreadsheet of possible distribution. Additionally, there is a community survey, can have more discussion around that.

Last piece will be preliminary revenue and cost projection.

Requesting feedback on the user demand survey instrument, distribution list. Intent of survey is to get quantifiable demand. Aim to finalize instrument by next week.

Comments/feedback? Positive, satisfied with survey and list. June 10th deadline for additional comments.

End of FinePoint presentation



Ms. Adams addressed the possible use of a community survey. The City has applied for and received a MA Downtown Initiative Grant, to do economic analysis and market study of downtown; Peg Barringer/FinePoint will be the consultant. Aim is to combine surveys between these two efforts. However, need to give people more time as COVID reopening progresses, especially in terms of how this sector (arts) will work. If the timing on community survey aligns with downtown initiative, two for the price of one.

Linda McInerney - we want true responses, confusion right now with COVID.

Ms. Adams addressed the earmark of \$3.5 million for the FNB; highly dependent on whether the state has money to allocate. Public spending under much scrutiny right now.

Peg Barringer gave a review of meeting with the GCC re FNB. GCC is very interested in downtown; however their mission and needs of community are more geared toward workforce development and entrepreneurship development, this category more likely than arts category. Do not currently have need for space for Seniors or Arts programs. Initially a possible partnership, but now not a big financial participant in current iteration of building. While they are supportive of downtown, they were clear about not relying on them as financial anchor. If innovation/entrepreneurship were to expand, might have use for space. Incubator space, open workspace, not theater w/stage.

Ms. McInerney brought up food and catering industry as possible building us. Ms. Barringer noted currently no gas line to building, not sure about propane, required for food facility (food demos possible).

I-91 Industrial Park Expansion Update

Ms. Adams reported on the first cost estimate on total restoration construction cost - how much to be done to get to baseline where subdivision can be built. (Tighe & Bond), came in at 9.2 million, not expected to be that high. Talked with engineers. There is nothing requiring the Mackins to restore the site. Went back to T&B, sketched out 2-unit subdivision alternative. Question to GRA, is it worth to proceed with a limited site? Need to think about whether it's worthwhile to pursue. Scale back and salvage what's possible (90k sq ft and 60k sq ft buildings), but this is not what was envisioned. Continue to pursue, cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Provost said that it was a terribly high number. Ms. Golonka, asked whether 2-lot subdivision could work? Ms. Adams said yes, that they had asked for a redesign,



something that would not require major site restoration. Ms. Golonka felt that it could still bring in 2 business with potential for job creation, project has gone this far, worth getting cost estimate for 2-lot subdivision, and recommendation. There was General agreement to get a cost estimate for 2-lot subdivision. Advanced manufacturing is aim for project. Ms. Adams said she would revisit with T&B, get preliminary costs, talk to Makin, and that MassDevelopment suggested appraisal.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Ms. Golonka moved that the meeting be adjourned, and Ms. Wall seconded the motion. The vote to adjourn was 5-0. The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.