



Franklin Regional Council of Governments

Deerfield Senior Housing Development RFP 2024-2125

ADDENDUM 1 – April 3, 2025

Submitted questions and answers:

Q1: Has Town Counsel provided any guidance regarding the restriction on the property (quoted below) in the deed conveying the St. James property to Ms. Cuevas in 2013, and whether this restriction would prohibit any tenant selection, senior services or programming on site accessory to the housing use? *“Subject to a restriction running with the land providing that in no event shall the premises be put to any use that is inconsistent with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church as determined by the sole discretion of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield. Residential use of the premises is consistent with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.”*

A1: The property was taken by eminent domain by the Town and as such, all deed restrictions and covenants have been extinguished.

Q2: According to the Feasibility Study (attachment J), a parallel study with VHB explored reuse of the existing Town Hall lot for Senior Housing. Why was the St. James lot chosen over the municipal office lot for this RFP?

A2: The work conducted by VHB preceded the feasibility study of 83-85 North Main Street. Use of 8 Conway Street for housing would be contingent upon adaptive reuse of 67 North Main Street (the 1888 Building) for municipal offices. The focus on 83-85 North Main Street was in part intended to decouple senior housing from the 1888 Building project.

Q3: Can the Phase I ESA completed for the site be shared?

A3: The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is available [here](#).

Q4: Has the church or parsonage been tested for hazardous building materials?

A4: A home inspection performed in 2019 documented suspected asbestos in building materials. Details are included in the above-referenced Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. A 2023 Appraisal Report (available [here](#)) noted “[u]tilities include an antiquated, oil-fired asbestos-wrapped steam heating system...” No testing subsequent to these preliminary observations was undertaken within the scope of this project.

Q5: When does the Town plan to gain Town Meeting approval for the Selectboard to convey the property?

A5: Approval for the Selectboard to convey the property was obtained at the October 7, 2024, Special Town Meeting. The certified minutes of the vote for Article 6 are available [here](#).

Q6: DEP guidance suggests that the project may be required to provide off-site mitigation at a ratio of 2:1 for the degraded area which exceeds 10% of the Riverfront Area. Permeable paving within the project is considered degraded under this classification, as it results in the absence of topsoil.

Mitigation requires review and approval by the local conservation commission but could include:

- Off-site restoration of riverfront areas
- Conservation restrictions under G.L. c. 184, §§ 31 to 33 to preserve undisturbed riverfront areas that could otherwise be altered under 310 CMR 10.00
- The purchase of development rights within the riverfront area
- The restoration of bordering vegetated wetlands
- Projects to remedy an existing adverse impact on the interests identified in the Act for which the applicant is not legally responsible
- Similar activities undertaken voluntarily by the applicant, which will support a determination by the issuing authority of no significant adverse impact.

“Guidance from DEP: Degraded areas in the Riverfront Area are impervious surfaces from existing structures, or pavement, absence of topsoil, junkyards, or abandoned dumping grounds.”

According to the Feasibility Study, roughly 33.6% of the Riverfront Area is considered degraded according to MA DEP. What are the Town’s plans for funding and meeting MA DEP’s requirement for offsite mitigation at a ratio of 2:1 for the balance of degraded land within the Riverfront exceeding the 10% threshold?

A6: The Town has substantial land holdings abutting the project site along the Bloody Brook. Cultivation of dragonfly habitat, improvements to stream crossings and installation of vegetated areas between the road and sidewalks are among the options being considered for mitigation. An ongoing Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) grant (discussed below) will result in concepts for future mitigation projects to address these DEP requirements.

Q7: We understand the Town has contributed local funding for the purchase of the property and early feasibility. There will be a need for additional local contributions to make this project financially feasible. What amount of local funding is the Town able to contribute to this project?

A7: Further local contributions may include:

- Waiver of the full sale price and permitting fees
- Applications for grant funding including

- Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) for on-site inland flooding/wetlands impact mitigation as well as nature-based solutions for surrounding Town-owned areas of the Bloody Brook
- HousingWorks application for surrounding infrastructure including sidewalks, drinking water, wastewater and stormwater improvements and other public amenities
- One Stop application for site preparation including demolition of rectory/garage
- In-kind contributions such as the relocation of St. James Church by local volunteers

The selected developer could apply for more Community Preservation funds, but as the Town of Deerfield lacks a housing trust, the applicant would need to follow CPC guidelines.

Q8: We understand from the site visit that the Town is applying for an MVP grant to support the project. What amount is being applied for?

A8: The Town was awarded a roughly \$170,000 MVP grant in summer 2024 to undertake a hydraulic/hydrologic study of the Bloody Brook and develop concepts for associated green and gray infrastructure improvements to help mitigate inland flooding. Once concepts from the study have been developed, the Town will pursue further construction/implementation funding which could assist with on-site improvements (e.g., funding a percentage of porous pavement, installation of rain gardens, etc.) or nature-based solutions along the Bloody Brook elsewhere for the needed mitigation at a ratio of 2:1 for the balance of degraded land within the Riverfront exceeding the 10% threshold.

Q9: Will the project be allowed to connect foundation drains to the municipal drainage system in North Main Street?

A9: Yes. Prospective developers should review Chapter 155 of the Town's bylaws for specifics regarding Stormwater Permits from the Deerfield Planning Board. The Town is also in the midst of a stormwater asset management planning project that will involve assessment of existing stormwater infrastructure, including along North Main Street.

Q10: Will the Town be providing a full topographic and detailed survey of the parcel?

A10: A detailed survey was completed for the municipal campus in 2024 (available [here](#)). The property at 83-85 North Main Street was not included in this survey though wetlands and riverfront demarcations were extended across the parcel. Page 57 of the Feasibility Study (Attachment J) includes mapping of the site. No full topographic and detailed survey of the parcel is planned to be completed by the Town at this time.

Please acknowledge ADDENDUM 1 on the bid signature page.

All other provisions of the Invitation for Bids remain unchanged.

Laura Phelps
Franklin Regional Council of Governments
Chief Procurement Officer
April 3, 2025