

2015

Powder House Community School



Technical
Advisory
Committee

RFP Recommendation

7/28/2015

Recommendations of the PHCS Technical Advisory Committee

To Mayor Joseph A. Curtatone,

It has been our pleasure to participate in the Powderhouse Community School (PHCS) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC has carefully studied the proposals applying individual expertise while weighing community opinions, as expressed both in prior public process and through the details of the Request for Proposal (RFP), in order to vet the eight development proposals. Many members of our committee served as a part of the focus group that was formed to discuss the future of this site, and most (11 of 13) served on the 2013 TAC that first selected the Tufts University proposal for development of the site.

As you are aware, the focus group developed a statement of standards and guidelines summarizing the intent for any reuse and development of the school prior to the 2013 RFP. The statement was later updated prior to the release of the 2015 RFP reflecting additional community interest and priorities. This statement, plus other key community values and priorities, was used to form the system for scoring RFP responses.

It is our hope that the recommendations contained herein will help you to make the best possible decision to ensure that the Powderhouse School and its site can be assigned to a development team that can partner with the City, work with the community and create a project of enduring value to all.

Recommendation Contents

Overview

Preferred Proposal

Other Interviewed Teams

Teams Not Interviewed

Appendixes

- o Evaluation Criteria Scores
- o TAC Comments
- o RFP Appendix – Standards and Guidelines

Overview

The eight responses received on the RFP were from:

Affirmative Investments, Inc.
Burkhard Corporation
ENS Partners
KSS Realty Partners, LLC
MarKa
Diamond Sinacori, LLC
Somerville Makers and Artists Inc. (SMART)
Trinity Powder House Limited Partnership

The TAC generally believes that the MarKa team stood out relative to other submissions in terms of overall quality, creativity, community interaction and proposals for open space.

The TAC met to review and score the eight proposals after they were submitted. The TAC scored all eight proposals based upon the score sheet in the RFP and made a determination to advance the top five teams to the interview stage, based upon their initial scores. The TAC then met individually with each of the proposing groups for an hour-long presentation and Q&A. The TAC followed up on both the RFP responses and the interviews by submitting written questions to be answered in writing by the applicants.

Through this process, the TAC convened six intensive meetings to discuss the technical details, veracity and merits of the proposals. While the committee has used the evaluation criteria set forth in section VII of the RFP in order to score and rank the proposals prior to interviews, the TAC provided an additional ranking on a range of 1 to 5 for each proposal after the completion of the interviews. This memo summarizes the scores. The appendix provides the information submitted on all score sheets, both before and after the interviews, including comments.

As with any group of this size, attaining 100% consensus on a particular proposal is difficult. But, after completing this process, there is a remarkable level of agreement amongst the vast majority of the committee members on key issues that drove this decision.

As a group, the TAC is recommending one of the eight proposals submitted as a first choice. As noted above, the TAC generally believes that the MarKa team stood out relative to other submissions.

The TAC did not come to a consensus to select a second choice. While the Affirmative Investments team had the next highest overall score, some on the TAC selected Diamond Sinacori as their first or second choice and felt their team would be a stronger alternative. At the end of the deliberations, the TAC agreed to submit a recommendation as follows:

1. The TAC recommends that you select MarKa and enter into the design and development process with that team.
2. Should we find ourselves in a position where the MarKa team 1) is deemed by you to not be the best choice for the community; or 2) is unable to come to terms with the city; or 3) chooses to withdraw at any point in time, the TAC could be requested to reconvene, discuss the circumstances surrounding the situation and be directed to provide you with an updated recommendation.

The current proposals include some teams proposing to reuse the building, and others proposing to demolish it. Of the short-listed teams that were interviewed, the TAC vetted each proposing team's reasoning for its respective approach. Each team presented its respective reasoning and determination that had found a cost-effective way to implement its proposed program and reach community needs.

The MarKa team proposes to keep sections of the building. In the event that, through the process going forward, it is determined that MarKa's approach and program will not work, the TAC recommends a re-evaluation of the remaining proposals by factoring in additional insights from the MarKa proposal.

Throughout the process there has been considerable discussion about the proposed publicly accessible open space that was called for in the RFP. The RFP asked the applicant to recommend a strategy for future ownership of the site, while also making it clear that the park site was to be developed by the applicant. After completing the 2013 interviews, there were a range of opinions on the ownership and maintenance of the space. In the case of many of the bidders, a majority of the TAC felt that the city should retain or accept ownership of the open-space. This was particularly the case where the end-state ownership of the development would involve a private condominium association. This issue remains of concern to the TAC. For the most part, the TAC would still prefer that the City becomes the eventual owner of the completed open space and manage the programming and use of the property.

There was full consensus by the TAC in ensuring that the site include the required open space (or more than the required open space), developed with high quality amenities, be available in perpetuity, ensure high quality maintenance and retain control of programming of the parcel. These objectives are worth considering when establishing an ownership and maintenance strategy for the future open space. From the RFP response and the interview, it appears that the MarKa team is supportive of efforts to develop a high-quality space that will be owned by the City upon completion of the project.

Overall, the TAC desires to ensure that the applicant share the community's goal of providing a minimum of 40% of the site as a high quality publicly-accessible open space. Beyond that, the TAC was seeking the best partner with a mix of development and design experience and a track record of collaborative community participation. There were many capable teams in the applicant pool, and they outlined unique program of activities in their respective proposals. But, the TAC concluded that the MarKa team best balanced the community priorities that have been set forth in the RFP.

The TAC recommendations on the individual teams are further summarized below:

Preferred Proposal: MarKa

<p>Pre-Interview Total Score: 1065/1300 Pre-Interview Rank: 2nd Post-Interview Score: 61/65 Post-Interview Rank: 1st</p>
--

The TAC selected this proposal for its overall ability to successfully meet multiple community needs and expectations. This proposal:

1. Provides for a unique and engaging open space
2. Reuses the building in a creative way
3. Provides art and community opportunities, including partners STEAM, Parts and Crafts and the Somerville Bicycle School
4. Creates housing opportunities including affordable housing
5. Creates arts loft space
6. Creates units for the ‘Community Living Project’, which provides cooperative living space for long-term Somerville residents and will likely open up family housing opportunities as these residents move from elsewhere in Somerville into the new cooperative living space

The MarKa team has a track record of development on both the east and west coast, and their financial support is strong.

The only significant drawback to the proposal was that members of the TAC were not convinced that the retail/restaurant space was a necessary part of the project. The TAC, much like the focus group, remains concerned about the capacity of the area to maintain retail users while still contributing to the vibrancy of Teele Square.

The TAC also expressed concern that planned live/work units in the building be used by those actually living and working in the space (i.e. working artists) and don’t simply become used as lofts for residential use only.

The proposal succeeds in the key areas of the evaluation criteria:

Qualifications and References: The team has experience on complicated urban sites and a track record in Boston of working with the community on difficult sites to accomplish unique solutions.

Project Narrative: The land use program and site design offer advantages. The design retains the building but offers to open the structure up to provide a more welcoming experience. The site plan retains significant open space and programs it for

neighborhood uses. The project also incorporates the Community Living Project group, focusing on providing a co-housing experience for current Somerville residents.

ENA / Purchase Price: The purchase price is acceptable for the site and based on the TAC's evaluation of the project and proposal, this project would not trigger any significant ENA modifications.

Financial Feasibility: MarKa indicates that it has access to capital.

Municipal Benefits and Impacts: The proposal will provide a high quality park space. The applicant has proposed to develop the park and return the land to the City for maintenance. While this adds to the fiscal impacts on the City, it was an option preferred by the majority of the TAC upon completion of the last RFP process, particularly in situations such as this where the project itself will be owned and operated by multiple entities.

The TAC's recommendations are based on certain understandings conveyed through the proposals and subsequent interviews of the developers. As you are aware, the Tufts team, after winning the 2013 RFP round, spent extensive time and effort on completing environmental analysis of the site and building. These reports were shared with all the teams in this recent RFP round. Given the complexity of these environmental reports, the TAC expects that the City and the community will continue to work with the applicant on the strategy to reuse the building, ensuring that it meets adequate environmental requirements. Equally important is the need to use the lowest level of the building for parking, which is necessary to maintain the remainder of the space as open space.

Overall, a significant majority of the TAC members recommended this applicant as their top choice. Eleven (11) of thirteen (13) members of the committee selected MarKa as a top choice (9 gave MarKa their top score, and 2 others had them tied for the top position). The other two members picked MarKa as their second choice (one of these two individuals had MarKa in a tie for second place). No member of the committee gave MarKa less than 4 out of a total of 5 points in the post-interview review.

The TAC praised the proposal for MarKa's unique mix of uses, creative ideas about building and site design, and significant involvement of community partners. For all these reasons, this team stood out as a group that would form a true partnership with the community and create a unique community asset.

Other Interviewed Teams

The TAC interviewed four other teams. While the teams are presented below in order of their total ranking points, the discussions about these teams were quite varied. The TAC did not see fit to recommend any second-choice team at this time, and would seek to reconvene and provide an updated recommendation if the MarKa team is not chosen or unable to go forward with the project.

The other interviewed teams are as follows:

Affirmative Investments, Inc.

**Pre-Interview Total Score: 1079/1300
Pre-Interview Rank: 1st
Post-Interview Score: 47/65
Post-Interview Rank: 2nd**

This team proposes to develop a project that prioritizes affordable housing. The proponent seeks to provide a percentage of affordable units that is greater than in other proposals. The applicant seeks to use the value of the market rate units to create further subsidies as possible or provide additional funds for affordable housing in the community.

The proposal includes a very low initial payment for the site, seeking instead to invest funds in providing additional affordability on or off the site.

The design was considered adequate by the TAC, providing quality open space with an ample budget and reusing the existing structure in a creative form. But, overall the proposal did not provide many of the unique features of the TACs first choice project. While the proposal also reuses the building, it does so in a manner that does not make radical design changes, and therefore retains many shortcomings of the existing structure. If partnering with this team, this issue would need to be addressed through community process.

The developer has significant experience doing similar strategies elsewhere and has adequate financing to be successful. The design team includes the firm that successfully worked on the park design with the community as part of the Tufts team in the 2013 RFP round. Overall, most members of the TAC felt that this proposal was a solid choice with a developer committed to community process and a quality open space.

Diamond Sinacori, LLC

**Pre-Interview Total Score: 1005/1300
Pre-Interview Rank: 3rd
Post-Interview Score: 42/65
Post-Interview Rank: 3rd**

The Diamond Sinacori team submitted a proposal that was similar in many ways to the one submitted for the previous RFP. It had very similar benefits, while adding some community art space. The project includes 35 residential condominium units be built in the area of the PHCS building while the current open area on the lot would be used as a

passive park, and an area behind the building as further open space and gardens. Overall, this created the largest open space of all of the teams.

The residential component is of a scale similar to the current neighborhood and the project includes one and two bedroom units. While the TAC would have preferred the development team include more family-friendly three-bedroom units, the developer has a proven history of executing projects of this size with quality results.

The TAC's concerns for this project relate to details of the open space, as it is separated into sections and the use of the spaces are proposed to be quite passive. The team seemed to want the open space to be as quiet as possible, and that may limit community uses. The proposal indicated that condo fees would be used to finance the ongoing park maintenance. There was some concern that the open space behind the buildings would be claimed by the owners, leading the TAC to discuss alternative layouts. Some had hoped that the team would present new design ideas, although in general the large contextual townhouse design is appreciated by most of the members of the TAC as it was in the last round. Yet, while the project had small gallery and retail space, it felt less integrated than arts uses in other proposals.

The developer has a track record of completing complicated projects in the Boston area with extensive community input. Of the proposals that required removal of the building, the TAC generally liked this proposal. This proposal had the largest variation in scores from the TAC. While overall the proposal scored third, two members of the TAC had this proposal in a tie for the first-place position while two others indicated it was their last choice amongst those interviewed.

Trinity Powder House Limited Partnership

<p>Pre-Interview Total Score: 994/1300 Pre-Interview Rank: 4th Post-Interview Score: 35/65 Post-Interview Rank: 4th</p>

Trinity's proposal included housing and a permanent home for the Artisans Asylum. Similar to the strategy of Affirmative to use market rate housing to finance more affordable housing, the Trinity proposal uses market rate and affordable housing to finance affordable space for makers. The proposal has an appealing element in that it provides the Artisans Asylum, a Somerville institution, with a viable long term home and ownership of their property.

The proposal was challenging for the TAC for a few reasons. First, the two uses don't particularly succeed in one shared building. The first process, with Tufts, led to significant community consensus for a one-building proposal for the site, and it seemed that both the TAC and the applicant struggled when faced with the challenge of how to get these two uses into a single building. The design implication of this challenge is a

less than ideal park layout. The two-building solution inevitably places the open space between the two buildings, making the space feel less public and less spacious. To reach 40% open space, the team's proposal used areas that might otherwise not be considered useable public open space. Therefore, the TAC believed that such a proposal would struggle to create community support around the open space, the one issue that has been most important to the community since the beginning of the process.

The second challenge with this proposal is the tax revenue. The applicant indicated that the project would require the Asylum property to be tax-exempt and pay no PILOT payment, at least in the early years. The collection of taxes was a fundamental issue of the community and the TAC with the first proposal, and this situation is not acceptable to many members of the TAC.

While the TAC would like to reinforce the importance of ensuring that the Artisans Asylum succeeds in the long-run, stabilizes finances and ensures a permanent place in Somerville, this proposal did not appear to be the most viable strategy to achieve those goals. The Asylum would benefit from a clearer business strategy going forward followed by a greater look at potential locations and configurations that will lead to success in a selected location.

Somerville Makers and Artists (SMART)

<p>Pre-Interview Total Score: 913/1300 Pre-Interview Rank: 5th Post-Interview Score: 25/65 Post-Interview Rank: 5th</p>

This proposal incorporates the opportunity to bring arts studio space and work space to West Somerville in a dedicated location. The proposal would turn the existing school building into an art studio space.

The TAC was interested in the idea of the project, but worried from the start about feasibility and community fit. Despite the 5th place scores of the project prior to interviews, the TAC felt it was important to interview this team and provide them with ample opportunity to address the concerns that the TAC had with the proposal.

But, at the end of the interview process, many of those concerns remain. The financial success of the project relied on a series of grants, leaving the TAC concerned that this project might end up in the same situation as the Tufts proposals, where there are great designs but no clear path to completion of the project in an adequate timeframe.

The design of the site and the open space in the initial proposal created problems for potential community support. The proposed location and operation of surface parking would likely require the loss of key portions of the open space. While these may be solved through the community process, the initial proposal did not establish that the team

had discovered solutions that can work. Furthermore, some members of the TAC felt that community process experience of this applicant team was not as strong as other teams.

There continues to be a need for quality art studio space in Somerville, and the TAC is aware of this situation. But, this particular solution to address that situation sacrificed more important goals, including the open space, thereby making it more difficult to recommend this proposal.

Teams Not Interviewed:

The following three teams were not interviewed by the TAC:

ENS Partners

**Pre-Interview Total Score: 883/1300
Pre-Interview Rank: 6**

This generally residential proposal did not seem to incorporate a full understanding of the interest in community activities, and did not provide evidence of an adequate strategy to create a collaborative park design.

KSS Realty Partners

**Pre-Interview Total Score: 881/1300
Pre-Interview Rank: 7**

While this team had been a preferred team in the first round RFP, and their second round proposal was virtually the same, the TAC felt that other proposals provided better opportunities to partner and create the right design of buildings and open space.

Burkhard Corporation

**Pre-Interview Total Score: 770/1300
Pre-Interview Rank: 8**

While the hotel use of this proposal was interesting, the overall effort on site design and the lack of unique community-centered features made this proposal unattractive to the TAC.

Conclusion:

For all the reasons listed above, the TAC recommends pursuing MarKa as the proposed development partner at this time. The TAC thanks you again for allowing us to provide assistance to you on this very important project.

Sincerely,

The Powderhouse School Disposition Technical Advisory Committee

George Proakis, Director of Planning

Katjana Ballantyne, Ward 7 Alderman

Jack Connolly, Alderman at Large

Carrie Normand, Ward 7 School Committee

Sunayana Thomas, Senior Planner, Economic Development

Sean Becker

Conor Brennan

Frances Fisher

Brian Harris

James Monagle

Michael Panis

Alex Pitkin

Richard Shortt

Evaluation Criteria Scores

VII. Evaluation Criteria

The Evaluation Criteria Form is based upon a **100 point** rating system. Points are allocated as follows:

Qualifications and References

1. Developer's prior urban infill project experience	10
2. Development team member's expertise with delivering a program	10
3. Development team's community engagement plan	5
4. Design team's prior experience with community engagement in design	5
Sub-total	30

B. Project Narrative

1. Program of Uses that fits the community vision	11
2. Timeline for completion	4
3. Additional Community Amenities offered, including use of open space	5
4. Site Plan Alternatives	3
5. Arts programs on site	4
6. Green Building Elements	2
7. Transportation, Parking and Circulation strategies	3
Sub-total	32

C. ENA / Purchase Price

1. Proposed purchase/lease price and terms for the Parcel advantages to the City	2
2. Limited Requests for modifications to the ENA and LDA	2
Sub-total	4

D. Financial Feasibility

1. Financial and management interests in the project	2
2. Banking references	2
3. Plan to secure financing	6
Sub-total	10

E. Municipal Benefits and Impacts

1. Net fiscal impacts	10
2. Number and quality of jobs	5
3. Mitigation against neighborhood impacts including traffic, noise, odor lighting, and shadow effects, both during and after construction;	5
4. Other benefits, impacts, or costs including contribution to community improvement projects-	3
5. Infrastructure improvements to be made by the applicant-	1
Sub-total	24

TOTAL 100

*Potential lessees will not be deducted points if the ENA/LDA must be converted from establishing sale terms to establishing lease terms.

**Pre – Interview
Scores and
Comments**

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
1 Affirmative Investments Page 1	Team Experience	26 Affordable Housing less necessary in ward; reuse of building - concerns if not feasible; project examples least relevant; poor commercial space; best park as drawn - uses groundworks team.	24 Individual experience, but no experience as a team. Proposal easy to read. Must have covenant which excludes non-profit ownership into perpetuity. Limits to what kind of work can be done on site = no labs check language	28 Demonstrated experience with community engagement, urban infill, green; previous experience to this project	24		29		26		18 The lead developer appear to have experience limited to lower density residential projects in suburban settings and one commercial building in Lowell.			
	Project Narrative	25 Best Open Space Plan	16 What traffic impact Teele Square. Like green roof. Don't like building cutting site in 1/2. Unclear about flex parking space on TAB lot. Reducing basketball. Don't like parklands being reduced. Has key elements, affordable housing but design is nothing special.	26		24		27		28	26 Recognize that reuse of the building limits potential for maximizing open space, but some concern regarding private features (i.e terraces) along the building that would be within what is deemed public open space. 2			
	Purchase Price	2	4 Need to walk through financial examples; what are sale projections; unclear financials - propose high \$ and low \$; don't leave math to us.	3 Hard to evaluate advantage for city with various pricing options	3		4		3		2 Purchase Price minimal			
	Financial Feasibility	9 Good	8 p.64 need explanation of what this means	10 Letter from bank securing financing	10		10		7		10 Good Backup			
	Municipal Benefits/Impacts	17	15 5. what are these? Run off? Flooding Broadway & Mason impact of 40 units of sewage? Office	22 Can't assume one person/room, could be couples; office jobs, typically with benefits but not spelled out.	19		21		18		16			
	<i>Total</i>	<u>79</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>72</u>						

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL		
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments			
1 Affirmative Investments Page 2	Team Experience	30		30	Based mostly on SCC's experience. Architect is known to be good at community interaction. Ground Inc. was excellent with Tufts process. I like how they described community process for each of their comparable projects.	26	Collaborative Approach; 40 units; common space; 56 parking spots; recycle building; open space 37,800; Tufts involvement?; green way; open lawn	27	See knows Somerville and knows how to hold meetings and determine community sentiment. Affirmative has extensive national experience with urban infill and housing	28		30	They have infill experience; the affirmative team is capable of delivering this project and SCC and Utile are both very familiar with our public process and have executed community engagement within the city.	346	
	Project Narrative	29	Residential condos; 10 affordable; commercial space; good open space suggestion; working w/ Tufts on connecting Path. Negative - Rent commercial space to Tufts - not community need, but Tufts need.	22	Open space is publically useable. The high percentage of affordable housing is a plus. So is the inclusion of 2+ and 3 bedroom units.	30		25		28		28	Open Space is inviting and has a public park sense of place; public amenities; activities; multi use park; They show site plan alternatives showing their willingness to change plan	334	
	Purchase Price	3		2	Easter Bank anticipates they will provide financing. The project is in line with their past projects. Nothing about the project seems shaky	4		4		4		4		42	
	Financial Feasibility	10	Track record of securing financing	10		8	100K price offer; tax gain 170,416	9	Good experience with financing parties	10		10		10	121
	Municipal Benefits/Impacts	22	Addresses community vision in a number of ways.	6	Based on city's assessment of income and their assessment of municipal costs, the project would cost the City \$80,000 per year. 11,000 sf of office space should provide some jobs.	18		20	Higher percent of affordable housing than requested. Profit sharing with city in support of city affordable housing and high quality jobs if leasing to Tufts.	18		24		236	
	<i>Total</i>	<u>94</u>		<u>70</u>		<u>86</u>		<u>85</u>		<u>88</u>		<u>96</u>		<u>1,079</u>	

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	18	(can't read comments) Civil moxie as civic engagement; scheme 2 blocks vista than to highland.	16	Concerned Khalsa Design doesn't have staff depth to manage community process	24	Developer has lots of hotel experience build in what appears to have been large open spaces, not urban infill	22		17		15		16	Limited experience by the developer in infill mixed use. Mostly single use hotel construction.
Project Narrative	15	Park deeds back to city is tricky w/ plans as submitted 2 structures - not positive	15	Developer has suburban design samples. Designs are unappealing.	16	Not much for broad community appeal or engagement, not much to draw community into space. Changes nature of predominately residential neighborhood.	17		18		18		21	Two curb cuts of Broadway for all scenarios and not at signal. Developemnt bifurcates site and doesn't create sense of publicly accessible open space.
Purchase Price	3		4	Limits cost to abate \$614K + abate/remediation/demo 15% above estimated costup to \$2.3 million	2		4		4		3		2	Purchase Price has limit of environmental expenses
Financial Feasibility	7		6		10	Experience with financing large projects	10		9		7		7	Lacked strong references and support for financing plan
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	15		16		12	Brings income to city but significantly changes neighborhood into more commercial; non-management jobs have low hourly wages for an expensive area, employees would be hard pressed to live in Somerville at those rates, benefits? Doesn't fit Somerville's live/work/raise a family mode.	20		14		19		15	Substantial new construction with driveways against neighbors and given the use and need for loading, lighting, etc. likely additional impacts during operation.
<i>Total</i>	<u>58</u>		<u>57</u>		<u>64</u>		<u>73</u>		<u>62</u>		<u>62</u>		<u>61</u>	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	26	Out of state experience	8	All but one of the example properties Burkhard shows are hotels. The architect did 1188 Broadway and the oversized Weston townhouses. Most of the properties shown by the architect are sketches rather than pictures of finished properties. While they discuss community engagement, they seem to stress that their project is right for the community.	26	2 plans; multi family;58% green space; 2 buildings in scheme; design team experience?; 4K civic space; 5 artist spaces;	17	As neighbor in Teele Square, I have not come across any resident that participated in planning of 1188 Broadway, little documentation of community engagement in prior projects.	19		17		241
Project Narrative	23	Rental Apartments, artist, live/work space and hotel(questionable if community wants hotel on this site) use of open space/meeting area by local non-profits; what type of traffic generated by hotel and how would it be handled?	13	Community has not expressed a need for hotel in this neighborhood. My concern is that the plan suggests 2x the use of other plans. The park appears to be overshadowed by the buildings such that it is hard to believe it will be publically useable. They would provide a significant community space (40,000 sqft)	29		15	Hotel is not appropriate on this site. Demand for a hotel near Tufts is minimal - Barbara Rubel- Tufts (on their studies of need)	20		17		237
Purchase Price	3		3		4	Tax gain 563,139	2	Purchase price conditional on abatement, remediation and demolition no greater than 15% of 2.3 million. Who covers excess?	4		2		40
Financial Feasibility	10	Doesn't appear to be issue based on history provided	10	Would use Fantini and Gorga, although they have banking references. Brookline Bank reference letter attached, although no statement they would be interested in this project.	10		4	Weak case for specific financial resources	9		9		108
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	20	Hotels impact on neighborhood and open space a concern on this site.	10	Based on city's assessment of income and their assessment of municipal costs, the project would contribute \$380,000 to the City per year. Obviously, a hotel would provide jobs.	19		12	Expenses for city are understated. Jobs mostly of low pay	17		16		205
<i>Total</i>	<u>82</u>		<u>44</u>		<u>88</u>		<u>50</u>		<u>69</u>		<u>61</u>		<u>831</u>

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	20	Sidewalk Retail not convincing use; concern with existing building reuse plan; sunkun court to retail is poor idea; lacks prescense on braodway; concern for commercial spaces (can't read comment)	18	Don't like 2 driveways; don't like surface parking; no to 2 buildings; basically residential design; no description of public process; only resumes with no description of community process	19	Didn't see community engagement plan; Not a lot specifics about project, may have lots of experience, but not enough info on this project.	24		20		27		25	Strong team with recent high quality experience in infill locations
Project Narrative	11		12	Says LEED; no talk about what commercial is; 2 building cut sit plus parking; passive open space; no numbers for housing rental or condos	17	No arts, not innovative, children's park few blocks from Hodgkins; not much green; no public space to bring community together.	24		22		27		14	Paving park space for parking and counting it as "open space"; Question whether 40% open space has been provided in design; Little though appears to have been given to the park and the associated design. Limited usage open space, mostly passive and decorative. I like the choice of deeding the open space back to the City.
Purchase Price	4		4		4		4		4		4		4	Strong purchase price with no stated contingencies.
Financial Feasibility	7		6	Residential units value \$275K-\$300K? How do they value rental? Condo? W7 values \$450-\$500K; need input from Marc Leyve.	3	No letters for possibly financing	10		10		8		9	
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	18.5	Most likely to become office spaces (with?)	10	Missing explanation of commercials; jobs; proposal seems to be missing info	13	"handful of full-time jobs," what kinds of jobs? Benefitted? Not enough information; Doesn't give specifics on how will mitigate impact on neighborhood.	20		15		19		21	Has commercial office component creating space for permanent tenants with employees. Somerville lacks quality office space. Reuse of existing building minimizes construction impacts. No additional infrastructure improvements noted other than park (such as sidewalks, lighting, etc)
Total	60.5		50		56		82		71		85		73	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	30		21	Two interesting housing examples in Cambridge as well as some work for Harvard. There is a statement that the architect has successfully engaged with the community in the past. There is no plan for this project.	24	Re-use; 40 units; public green space; LEED cont. 4,000,000 price!	13	No specific statements as to importance of open space or commitments to 40%. Does not address either history or plans for community involvement.	19		24	Michael McGee talks about community engagement in past project but no examples of multiple process. Although they allocated 1 year to community process.	284
Project Narrative	22	Apartments, commercial space, retail, café, inside and outside, parking (concern)	14	They approached the design trying to fit into the neighborhood. I like the idea of the sunken commercial space. No indication of the size of the residential units. There is still a lot of built space. I'd prefer it if they got rid of the separate retail building.	27		11	Does not address open space. No alternative plan. Arts Program? Green Building? Traffic Mgmt? Reuse of building, meet code?	23		19	No mention to arts use; would like them to elaborate on "commercial"; shows only one site plan; need calculation for open space; lack green building elements.	243
Purchase Price	4		4		4	4 million; tax gain 225K	2	Lots of unknowns	4		4	High Purchase Price	50
Financial Feasibility	10		4	They would finance up to 75%. They describe relationships with Cambridge Trust, First Republic Bank and Cambridge Savings Bank, but provide no references.	10		1	Poor presentation	10		10	Good.	98
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	23		9	Based on city's assessment of income and their assessment of municipal costs, the project would result in a contribution of \$100,000 to the City per year. 48,000 of commercial space should provide jobs.	21		5	Little jobs. Incomplete responses to questions	15		18	No guaranteed full time job number; no explanation on 3.; no mention of additional infrastructure improvements.	208
Total	89		52		86		32		71		75		883

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	20	Concern for "Hamlet" Scheme; Option C (can't read comment); two building option - execution/neighborhood issues	24	Rental; haven't listened to community.	22	Experience in Somerville with community engagement.	24		26		17		21	Recent infill experience, but limited.
Project Narrative	14	All residential schemes - (can't read comment)	16		24	No much mixed use; 3 alternatives, demonstrates flexibility.	25		24		10		14	Open space sliced up a fair bit in schemes A and B. Little focus on the open space design and interaction. Surface parking. Paving park space for parking and counting it as "open space." Question whether 40% of publicly accessible open space is available and included in design. Appears that open space is more focused towards a private layout. Two curb cuts.
Purchase Price	4		4		2	3 price options, how to evaluate?	4		4		2		4	Strong purchase price with no stated contingencies.
Financial Feasibility	6		6	Option 3 financing - need to know cost to maintain park	9		10		10		6		6	Loose plan in the scheme C to use building. Suggest potential to develop reuse scheme with Tax Credit Financing, but no clear plan and risk that the project doesn't get chosen in this round.
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	14		15	Generally proposal was vague	17	Not clear how many or what types of jobs created.	19		10		9		11	Lack of long term jobs, mostly residential.
Total	58		65		74		82		74		44		56	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	30		24	The comparable project they most highlight is Maxwell's green. It is OK, but not of outstanding quality. Of the other two, one is considerably larger 560 units. The other, Auburn Ct in Cambridge, has 60 units (and a magic fish sculpture). They described community process for comparable projects, but did not include a plan for this project other than stating it would take time.	30	Leed Certified	10	Hamlet Square Plan, place portion of open space within confines of housing units, where public may not feel "invited" Infill list only includes 2 examples. Based on Maxwell Green delivery on time is questionable. Community engagement is not addressed.	24		26	Infill experience is limited; hard to examine open space without square footage or % of the buildings.	298
Project Narrative	23	All the surface parking is a negative, but did suggest that some could be inside; all rental units.	13	The proposed design captures the "look" of the neighborhood, and the townhouses offer slightly more affordable housing than required. There is no description of the unit sizes. The public space is squeezed.	25		19	Open Space accessibility issues. If building is re-use, does it meet code?	23		25	Scheme C "Engaging the Past"; creates an open "public" park rather than a boxed in open space; need more art space & community amenities; no retail? Parking should be below grade or not viewable from public. Broadway to Holland pathway could be done better.	255
Purchase Price	4		3		4	Tax gain 215K	2	Size of units are unclear. Students in school may be underestimated. Schooling costs are low. Not all municipal expenses calculated. Commitment to contribute to park development limited.	3		3	No modifications; purchase price lower than appraised	43
Financial Feasibility	10	Have handles other projects in City (Maxwell Green)	5	They describe a reference from Sovereign Bank, but provide one from Santander. The reference only describes general interest.	10	Principle Equity	4		8		7	No concrete plan for securing financing	97
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	20	Vague on fiscal impacts	2	Proposal was too vague to assess benefits. Since all residential, wont provide jobs.	24	100 jobs	13		18		16	No mention of how many permanent full time jobs.	188
Total	87		47		93		48		76		77		881

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	26	Existing Building - confirm structural capacities; forward looking design is intriguing	27	Mission Hill Boston project. Covenant exclude non profit ownership. Concern depth of staff skill. Can they run two big projects simultaneously.	27	Community engagement experience; letters of support	26		25		22		24	More west coast experience than east coast. Aesthetic may not be indicative of the neighborhood. Will developer's design be flexible enough to address this?
Project Narrative	26	Much to discuss; courtyard access concerns; good open space design	28	Impressive time took to study SomerVision. Micro village, community. 57 parking - where? Underground? Repurpose building. Very creative design & positively ambitious includes aging adults, maker, residential, micro community	29	Doesn't include site plan alternatives, but willing to change plan in response to community input; innovative additions to space and programming, lots to draw broader community in; innovative senior housing; intended to build community within project and connect with larger community; aligns with SomerVision.	30		32		29		27	Provides some indoor parking, but also recognizes potential for strong bike component. Significant art component. Interesting program of uses. Ambitious aesthetic. Will it fit appropriately with the neighborhood? Open space plan seems busy.
Purchase Price	4	Very good.	4	F/s all using sample language?	4		3		4		3		2	Contingencies on offer with limits to exposure to environmental costs and off site improvements.
Financial Feasibility	6		7	Finance 80%. Eaglebridge Cap - 75% & East Boston expressed interest. Concern depth of Marka to oversee MIT project & PHCS simultaneously.	10	Strong letters of interest, experience with financing	10		10		8		10	Strong equity backing and bank references.
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	18		15		21	White not guaranteed, potential to create quality jobs; provides outdoor spaces for community, offers new types of public spaces; variety of use of space likely to have broader appeal in community.	24		21		19		16	Reuse of building reduces impacts. Fiscal net impact near top of proposals. Offer limits off site infrastructure improvement costs.
<i>Total</i>	<u>80</u>		<u>81</u>		<u>91</u>		<u>93</u>		<u>92</u>		<u>81</u>		<u>79</u>	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	30		28	While I cannot say that their designs appeal to me, they show evidence that they have completed urban infill projects that are well aligned to what they are proposing. They demonstrated extensive community involvement for the first of their example projects. The others seemed to involve working through ordinances. While they claim 58.3% will be public open space, I discount some of that because it is too intermixed with the building footprint. Still, they provide the full area that is currently the "park" so I consider that they have met the requirement.	20	12 CLP; 8 Live/work; 20 loft style; garage; solar power; 40 units; retail, restaurant; community space; rehab site	15	Of 3 prior examples, only 1 seems to have reached completion. No examples of prior community engagement.	23		28	Lot of successful infill projects outside of Massachusetts. Everything they have in MA are ongoing.	321
Project Narrative	32	Residential units, artist live/work space, and commercial space, encouraging bicycles w/ 118 spaces.	22	Open space is publicly useable. The artistic element is central to their proposal. The CLP is a creative form of housing. I'd prefer to see more 3 BRs, especially since I'm concerned whether artists will really live in artist flats. But the CLP will open up family housing in Somerville. Solar panels on roof.	19		25	No clear alternative plans; will revised structure meet code?; plans indicate existing structural supports that may be overstated. Drawing suggest existing steel supports	30		31	The proposal is very unique and very innovative. Lacks site plan alternatives; in line with SomerVision; creative community amenities	360
Purchase Price	10		4		2	2,774,800 purchase; tax gain 294,488	2	contingencies, on purchase price	4		4	They have adjustments to the ENA and purchase price has contingencies on it with a low environmental price. Although changes to ENA don't seem unreasonable.	50
Financial Feasibility	22	Appears to have strong credentials	6	The artist element adds some financial risk to the project. While they provide banking references, none state that they will provide the financing. On the other hand, they plan to provide 30% of the capital.	6	30% owner equity 70 financial	6		10		10	Equity partners, KA, have the financial capacity to fund the project; good relationships with institutional lenders for construction financing.	121
Municipal Benefits/Impacts		Addresses community vision in a variety of ways.	8		15		15		19		22		213
Total	94		68		62		63		86		95		1,065

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
6 Diamond Sinacori Page 1	Team Experience	24	Housing Plan is quasi sub-urban; faces on 'public' open space is a concern	18	Only 1 project in Boston listed as urban infill experience. Dedham is not Somerville. Proposal easy to read.	28	Clear engagement plan, detailed; experience	26		27		19		30	Strong infill experience and track record of community process.
	Project Narrative	20	Very limited active space; memorial is not appropriate or located properly for uses	19	Seeking LEED Gold Rating. Who manages open space. Too minimal affordable housing. Designs are suburban and not urban designs. How flexible in park design.	24	Fairly straightforward plan, nothing innovative or much to engage community	27		24		19		25	Good pedestrian flow through the site with multiple desire lines addressed. Offers a mix of open space including required and requested contiguous open space as well as second open space component with community garden.
	Purchase Price	4		4	Offer \$1,050,000	2		4		4		1		1	Some language in ENA/LDA section that may suggest a number of contingencies.
	Financial Feasibility	9		8	Unclear interest	10	Has experience in this area	10		10		10		10	Strong history of delivery of program and securing necessary backing.
	Municipal Benefits/Impacts	16		13	Why \$3000 contribution to Davis Sq and not Teele Square. Recheck parking request.	12	References SomerVision which includes raising families vs. "extreme worst case scenario" of every 2 bedroom having kids, can't assume what student education needs will be or will be less than average per pupil cost; 2 fte in coffee shop arent quality jobs; \$6,000 contributions toward improvement not much.	24		14		15		16	Weaker net fiscal benefits as a result of residential focus. Also lack of long term job creation. While demolition during construction will be significant the development gives good setbacks from neighboring properties while creating strong street edge.
<i>Total</i>	<u>73</u>		<u>62</u>		<u>76</u>		<u>91</u>		<u>79</u>		<u>64</u>		<u>82</u>		

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience				I personally visited other Diamond Sinacori projects around Boston and found them to be of high quality. They describe a detailed community engagement process and experience at having done this before.									
	30	Experience in a variety of urban projects.	30		30		28	Open space split, area confined by residential units may not appear "open to" the public.	20		28	Exceeds open space requirement; good engagement plan - detailed; only 1 infill example.	338
Project Narrative	29	Will provide opportunity for HS students to experience project. Majority of condos 2 bedrooms community art gallery; making contributions to community path project and Davis Square streetscape.	20	This is a straight residential design. I would prefer to see more 3 BRs, but they are providing a large amount of public green space.	28		20	Low school use costs. No commitment to family housing. No alternative plan.	28		24	No site plan alternatives; no event spaces, commercial, retail, boxed in by private housing. Should contribute to Teele Square as priority.	307
Purchase Price	3		2		4	1,050,000; tax gain 69,167	3	No contingencies	2		2	Purchase price is lower taking environmental into account; ENA - refundable request.	36
Financial Feasibility	10	In 37 years developing real estate, never backed out on a executed purchase and sale agreement or land disposition.	10	Will work with Fantini & Gorga. Letter from Salem Five Cents Savings Bank all but saying they would provide financing. Solid financial project.	10		9		8		9	ENA; mention that deposits be returned in the event the project is determined to not be financially feasible or permitting or ordinance change. No guarantee.	123
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	20	Appears to produce quality projects that meet community standards.	5	Based on city's assessment of income and their assessment of municipal costs, the project would cost the City \$95,000 per year. Since all residential, won't provide jobs.	21		12	No permanent jobs. Narrow fiscal impacts when adjusted for schooling costs.	16		17	No full time permanent jobs; only 2 from coffee shop which are not quality jobs; need breakdown of municipal benefits.	201
<i>Total</i>	<u>92</u>		<u>67</u>		<u>93</u>		<u>72</u>		<u>74</u>		<u>80</u>		<u>1,005</u>

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	22	Open Space includes courtyard reduced by parking (negative); quality of lower level spaces is of concern; poor elevations to be resolved	7	Community engagement in design- no examples given. Proposal presentation - basic, add to more questions. Architect has no experience in these projects. Disappointed no community process mentioned. They should have provided more clarity in the developer's vision to operate.	26	Technically has 41% open space, walkway and courtyard not welcoming to community, walkway not very useable space.	23	Paved Circulation & Paved Mixed Use in my vew meet the community wishes for open space	18		20		22	Recent infill experience by consultants, but limited number of projects by lead developer.
Project Narrative	27		14	No mention about traffic around Teele Square. DCI proposal says living space but none in program description presented. No mention of SomerVision. Not much green space.	24	Not a lot for larger community beyond art offices; not a lot of open space, not inviting to community; stand alone parking lot good use of open space.	19		22		27		25	Strong Arts component, but dislike surface parking in location that could otherwise be open space.
Purchase Price	3		2	Is this a lease? If least what are the terms; why p.80 says estimate. Scored all other bidders same. This proposal had to score lower because financial plan unclear.	3	Low offer price	2		4		3		2	Weak purchase price.
Financial Feasibility	8		4	There should be a covenant which excluded non-profit ownership into perpetuity; need to see business plan; need Assessor review on R.E. taxes.	6	Potential grants not a reliable source of funding; office income not a sure thing.	5	A lot of variables	5		3		4	Bank references suggest weak commitments and I question whether the interested parties in the space would be able to afford space that is newly constructed. Does the financial pro-forma make sense? Vague source for equity.
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	18		10	Do city want to maintain park? What is the cost? Infrastructure plan and money involved; flooding issue already on Broadway & Mason.	11	Low tax income; fire and police costs? How would salaries be funded? Benefitted?	18		13		14		20	Proposal retains building, which reduces disturbance during construction. Mix of commercial space will create new, quality job opportunities. Middle of the road for fiscal benefit.
Total	78		37		70		67		62		67		73	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	25		17	Their proposal includes 3 local example projects that involve artists' space which is similar to their proposal. Developer/ Architect has a record of designing buildings community doesn't like (empty hole in Teele square, ugly building in Davis). Other than stating they had experience with community engagement, but provided no examples, nor did they describe a plan beyond there being a community engagement period. They claim 41% of site will be open space, but some of this is the path to the courtyard and the courtyard itself, and some directly abuts the building making its public use questionable. They did not count parking, though.	30	Revise Arts Center	18	Is courtyard in building open space? Not at night. Enclosed by building. Will the reuse of building meet code?	22		24	The community has voiced multiple times what the importance of the amenities and open space are to them. Their lack of research and/or importance on community needs on the current and past community visions makes me doubt their ability to execute a community vision through design over their own desires. The uses of the park are at bare minimum. As a design team and experience, they are weak.	274
Project Narrative	29	Artist work spaces and gallery; mostly indoor parking, but some surface parking; educational programs for residents and other; joint ownership of open space.	23	The open space, especially the green portion, is very limited. Plenty of space for art on site. I like the provision for artists studios rather than artist flats. Solar panels on roof.	30	81 spaces; 50 in building; 18 on ground?	22	Lack of Public Space	32		26	Although the concept of an arts center is appealing; multiple community meetings indicate that the park and other amenities are more important. Residential, open space, retail, office, etc. No circulation strategy; no mention of LEED elements.	320
Purchase Price	3		2		4	4,765,000; 20K office rental; tax gain 158,395	3		3		3	low purchase price relying too heavily on the income of the development itself. Do they have a business plan?	37
Financial Feasibility	7	Group started in 2014, track record not there.	4	The artist element adds some financial risk to the project. East Boston savings bank provided letter of interest, but nothing saying they had worked with them before or that it was probable they would be willing to provide financing.	8		4	Little current equity. Heavy dependence on grant fundin if given ENA. No firm financial commitments.	7		7	Only 1 bank reference- rfp required 3.	72
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	22	Interesting use of artist work space with potential uses by community.	9	Because of the low number of family units, the costs to the city are low, resulting in a contribution of \$100,000 to the City per year. 20,000 sf of office space should provide some jobs.	21		15	Low cash price. No agreement for payment in lieu of taxes. Estimated tax liabilities low. Not enough "open" space.	22		17	No mitigation plan?	210
Total	86		55		93		62		86		77		913

Committee Member	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Team Experience	23	Switch Building Functions; two building scenarios creates least beneficial open space (TBD); Confirms uses throughout; no architectural character shown.	23	Although developer has experience, don't like architect design w/ 2 buildings. Notes from last community process says NO to two buildings. Team didn't do their homework.	28	Somerville experience; Community Engagement experience	25	Not sure meets open space requirements?	30		22		30	Good team with strong infill experience.
Project Narrative	27		19	67 parking spots; 2 buildings not appealing; passive green space, arranged as a corridor; how live/sell space get zoned; demolishing building? Design fell flat; proposal good but not a lot of personal appeal. Cookie cutter approach & Artisans Asylum put in to meet RFP.	24	No classes under age 18, significant portion of arts programming not offered to entire community; exclusive arts focus doesn't offer broad appeal to larger community beyond open space.	22		24		17		20	Proposed components for green space focus too heavy on fixed programs, versus multi-purpose open space. Open space inward looking, doesn't invite public usage. Surface parking designed poorly.
Purchase Price	4		4	Appreciate their lawyer looking at proposal; like comments by Wilmer Hale ENA 3.1 & 3.2, 3.3; City should provide commentary of counsel - for Trinity; Sec. K.3 - no land banking	2		4		4		2		4	Contingencies on offer with limits to exposure to environmental costs and off site improvements.
Financial Feasibility	9		10		8	Potential grant funding not reliable source of financing	10		10		5		10	Strong equity backing and bank references. More conservative LTV than other teams.
Municipal Benefits/Impacts	19		10	5.0 points making artist asylum non-profit no tax.	11	Can't assume to know educational costs of student without knowing educational needs, use full per pupil amount in calculation. Not clear if new jobs created. If created, how they will be funded? Is there enough demand to sustain two Artisan's Asylum? Must be fully taxable property, not clear tenants will be able to meet obligation.	18		18		13		16	Top of group net fiscal impacts, but scale may impact neighborhood.
Total	82		66		73		79		86		59		80	

Committee Member	8		9		10		11		12		13		TOTAL
	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Team Experience	30		26		28		29		30		30	Trinity will be able to deliver a program and have past experiences in infill projects; although they're main focus has typically been on residential.	354
Project Narrative	27	Artist Asylum non-profit - No taxes?? Has residential; artist live/work units; surface parking	15	The open space is too limited. There is a lot of built structure. Plenty of space for art on site, but I don't believe the artist studios will provide housing for artists long term.	30	35 units; 8 live work; Artist Asylum; 32 open space	28	Adjustments requested of ENA & LDA indicate inability to meet timetable. Financing is weak	28		23	Two building concept was rejected by the community; lack of understanding of what the community needs are; open space has the impression of being "private"; its not inviting; lack of community amenities. The open space is more of an office park.	304
Purchase Price	3		4	Developers example projects tend to be quite a bit larger than what they are proposing here, although it does suggest they can handle complicated projects. Architect's examples are for future construction. Developer has a good reputation, especially for being honest. They described detailed experiences with community engagement. They claim 40% of the site is public open space, but a substantial portion of this is sandwiched between the TAB building and their new building, making it less useable.	4	4.9 million; 2 million cash; tax gain 110,292	3	Extensive modifications requested	3		4	Lot of modifications to the ENA; but valid suggestions	45
Financial Feasibility	7	Artisan's Asylum project costs (10%) will come in form of capital contributions from institutional and individual donors.	8	Somewhat complex in that the Artisan's Asylum part would be handled by municipal bonds, but they seem to have thought it through. They have 1 banking reference that describes past successful projects, and another showing interest. They also have 2 references regarding the bonds. The artist element does add some risk.	10		3	Little or no equity. Artist's Asylum equity needs to be raised by future fundraising. MassDevelopment Tax Exempt Bonds cannot finance 75% of project cost as such financing is only available to 501(c)(3). such financing only applies to Artisan's Asylum Space.	7		8	They are depending on the revenue from renters and loans/grants/equity of other companies. Strong bank references.	105
Municipal Benefits/Impacts		Condos and Artisan Asylum - lot of surface parking.	4	Based on city's assessment of income and their assessment of municipal costs, the project would cost the City \$12,500 per year. 32,000 sf of artist space should provide some jobs, but not as high-paying as open space.	20	Tax 342,814; tax bill 102,463	15	Tax revenue is missing payment in lieu of taxes for Artisan's Asylum. No tax abatement for affordable units. School costs to city are under the realistic expectations for the project.	21		21	30,000sf non taxable - Artisan's Asylum. Need to re-evaluate.	186
Total	67		57		92		78		89		86		994

**Post – Interview
Scores and
Comments**

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary
 Powder House Community School
 Project - RFP #15-63
 July 1, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBER #1 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS

<i>RFP Team Name</i>			
1	Affirmative Investments		
		OVERALL	Score 2
			Comments Use of existing building as demonstrated by conceptual plans is least developed and appropriate. Retaining large amounts of exterior building skin not in keeping with community visioning. Park plan is well conceived and highly considerate of public input process.
2	MarKa		
		OVERALL	Score 5
			Comments Creative and thoughtful urban intervention. Like potential for current resident input and involvement. Touched on most Somervision goals of all entries. Park should be simplified to meet community input. Recommend removal of restaurant space as commercial use-in conflict with Teele sq. goals.
3	Diamond Sinacori		
		OVERALL	Score 4
			Comments Top new building option. Most open space. Veteran's Park - passive use is not acceptable based upon community input process. Architectural planning a styling least compatible with site and community.
4	SMART		
		OVERALL	Score 1
			Comments
5	Trinity		
		OVERALL	Score 1
			Comments Two building scenario is not acceptable solution based upon process and community criteria developed over many years process. Community supports Artisan's Asylum - but this location is not the best option.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #2 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
		Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL	<p>HIGHLIGHTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addressing community values by providing 10 affordable housing units 2. Commercial Condominium - provide development with mixed use 3. Working with Somerville Community Corp. 4. Team strength 5. Large condo size. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase price \$100,000 - appearance they want the land for free 2. Developer earns money from luxury condo sales, and potential future commercial office sale to Tufts University - which takes tax revenue from city. 3. Reusing existing building 4. Meets open space minimum for RFP 5. Want city & property owners to pay for affordable housing units - developer position is focused on community values
		3	
2	MarKa	OVERALL	<p>HIGHLIGHTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micro-community design with strong creative elements and ambition appearing to align with the creative foundation developed over the years in Somerville 2. Senior - age in place housing 3. Continue - bicycle school 4. Artists/makers space 5. Commercial office space 6. Strong connection to SomerVisions articulated 7. Reuse of building brought down to structural load bearing walls 8. Contemporary design - revolving outside artist mural 9. Open space - welcomes neighbors - ownership converted back to city 10. Senior co-owners living on-site invested with Developer and accountable <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer price: \$2,000,000 2. Plus \$754,800 of park improvements are completed 3. Plus \$20,000 offsite streetscape improvements along Broadway 4. West Coast project experience 5. Boston project in process, however not built 6. Mid-size developer
		4	
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL	<p>HIGHLIGHTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEED Gold star rating for condominiums <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer price - \$1,050,000 2. Whole project is focused towards luxury condominiums 3. Requires - affordable units 7 4. Park ownership - is owned by association - potential exclusion from neighbors to use 5. Passive walkthrough park and grass, not active 6. Demolish PHCS - new building 7. Institutional partner unknown 8. Suggestion during presentation to flipped building orientation, so parcel is not segmented
		1	
4	SMART	OVERALL	<p>HIGHLIGHTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maker space - generates economic development to the community 2. New concept for PHCS, non residential <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has cashflow plan 2. Appearance longer start up phase 3. Offer price: \$250,000 4. Plus \$1,050,000 site improvements 5. Need clarification of all maker space or artist space, or a combination of both
		3	
5	Trinity	OVERALL	<p>HIGHLIGHTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong developer team credentials with Trinity Financial 2. Artisan's Asylum <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer price: \$2,000,000 2. Plus: up to \$1,000,000 open space 3. Projects is actually 3 projects 1-housing, 2-artist & park 4. Developer didn't appear know Ward 7 community input (available on city website) was opposed to the concept of two buildings. 5. Developer didn't appear know Ward 7 community input (on city website) was opposed to park surrounded by two buildings. 6. Disconnect during presentation regarding the developers understanding the Ward 7 current issues. 7. Funding for housing portion coming from Trinity Financial 8. Funding for Artisan Asylum coming from non-profit - timeline for getting this project up and running 9. Response back from developer would not combine into one building
		3	

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary
 Powder House Community School
 Project - RFP #15-63
 July 1, 2015
 COMMITTEE MEMBER #3 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS

RFP Team Name			Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL	4	Experience with this type of project; experience with community involvement; good use of open space, welcoming to neighbors, multi-use; walkway part of 40% open space, have benches? Something to make useable space for public?; in line with community requests; develop park and turnover ownership to City; need to firm up negotiations with Tufts about parking and any other potentially shared space and renting of commercial space; mix of residential and commercial space is appealing; 1-3 bedroom mix provides options to potential buyers; affordable housing beyond minimum requirement, 25%; provide site options, demonstrates flexibility in thinking about site; appears to be financially feasible; gallery/cafe has arts component. Affirmative's proposal meets the Somerville is a great place to work, play, live and raise a family criteria. 25% affordable housing makes more units within reach of more potential buyers. The number of 2 and 3 bedrooms gives families options. The mix use plan includes office/R&D/studio space bringing jobs to Somerville The open space is used in a variety of ways that are inviting to community. They have experience with this type of project and working in Somerville. They have demonstrated commitment to community input and being responsive to it. Appears to be financially feasible.
2	MarKa	OVERALL	5	MarKa's proposal is dynamic mix of housing (geared to a wide variety of potential residents), retail, commercial space, restaurant/café, artist hall and active open space to draw community in. This innovative proposal is in line with SomerVision goals. Brings something new to area, potential enough of a draw to bring more customers to Teele Square businesses. Brings high quality new uses to neighborhood.
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL	2	Diamond Sinacori's proposal is almost entirely condominiums with open space, a coffee shop and galley space. It doesn't meet the community's desire for mixed use to substantially beneficial to neighbors. Not sure why Veteran's Memorial included here and not added to Veteran's Cemetery a few blocks away. Good amount of open space, but current plan has one section of open space tucked behind the building, not welcoming to community. Diamond Sinacori did say open to community input, perhaps that would change. Not a vital mixed of uses to draw community in beyond open space. Coffee shop and facilities jobs (4) and 1-2 bedroom doesn't meet the Somerville goal of a great place to work, live, play and raise a family the proposal claims. Has experience and financial resources.
4	SMART	OVERALL	2	Relying of grants to be awarded in future for part of financing. Current plan of includes courtyard and walkway as part of 40% open space, not inviting to public. No housing including affordable housing listed in RFP. Primarily focused on arts may not be a broad benefit to community beyond open space. Proposed uses fit into residential neighborhood?
5	Trinity	OVERALL	3	Two building plan creates open space that resembles a corridor. Will it feel welcoming to community or like front lawn to two buildings? Not sure how two entities will function, independently? In sync? It's a small area to have separate organizations. Includes mix of uses. The 18 years = requirement for classes limits community participation. Offers a variety of housing. Trinity has financial resources. Donations and grants are part of Artisans Asylum's financing.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary

Powder House Community School

Project - RFP #15-63

July 1, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBER #4 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS

<i>RFP Team Name</i>				
1	Affirmative Investments			
			Score	
		OVERALL	2	Building reuse for me brings too many variables to the successful completion of the project.
2	MarKa			
			Score	
		OVERALL	5	Building design a concern for community. Park design interesting. Restaurant as part of project concern during business from square. Strong community meetings.
3	Diamond Sinacori			
			Score	
		OVERALL	4	Park option concern. But with strong community input feel safe. Building alignment needs work
4	SMART			
			Score	
		OVERALL	2	Building design concerns. Finances a concern.
5	Trinity			
			Score	
		OVERALL	4	Finances a concern. Park needs big community work.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #5 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
1	Affirmative Investments		
		Score	Comments
		OVERALL	I liked Affirmative's mix of uses; their traditional use commercial space seemed to support primarily day-focused use and I like the focus on affordable housing for the residential portion. They had one of the highest number of 2+ bedroom units of any developer. The team seems to have a very good reputation for listening to the community (having significantly changed their concept based on feedback from original application) and I think would be willing to work with community to develop the project to meet the community's needs. Big plus for having one, easily accessible open space that doesn't seem to be encroached upon by private uses and no secondary driveway. Also already started talking with Tufts about integration of the basketball court. Financially seems solid and Affirmative as a developer seems like they have the pieces in place to get it done.
		5	
2	MarKa		
		Score	Comments
		OVERALL	This project seemed to be one of the most engaging and unique proposals, responding to community goals/processes. I liked the creativity and intermix of uses. Development team seemed excited and supportive of mix of uses. Curious as to whether the size/mix of uses are really feasible on the site, particularly the retail component and the overall sizes of the unit. Expect that the developer could figure out how to make this financially feasible in the end. Lots of hard-space in landscaping. While I think of open-space as greenspace, I think at some point a moderate sized plot of grass has less benefit than a well designed, engaging hardscaped area in terms of making it a space that will actually get used. Curious how well the city can maintain this type of outdoor space. Use of building creative. Appreciate no additional surface parking or curb-cuts.
		5	
3	Diamond Sinacori		
		Score	Comments
		OVERALL	The developer did not seem responsive to the feedback and process that has occurred since the original RFP proposal, putting forth the same plan as previously. While they've said that they would be flexible in the development of the site, there did not seem to be any real interest in changing the potential use of the open space. Had some of the design team been present and voiced more strength on the team, I might feel more comfortable that there really was opportunity for dialogue on the site. Residential development is a "safe" bet for the community (a positive). In general, other projects left me with a feeling of being more community-oriented/engaging. This one overall, eh. No particularly exciting financial/ community benefits provided.
		3	
4	SMART		
		Score	Comments
		OVERALL	More risky than many of the other proposals, both due to reliance on minimal building changes (to minimize structural upgrades) and business model relying on fundraising. That said, appreciate singular building and not requesting tax exempt status. Seem to have done more due diligence than other creative-space focused proposals and overall more stable financial concept. Concerned about who will take charge of the community involvement component of the process and whether the proposal would really respond to community input.
		3	
5	Trinity		
		Score	Comments
		OVERALL	Not convinced that live-work units will actually be live work, but mostly live. Would be more interested if Trinity was willing to fully back Artisan's Asylum building component. Have concerns about fundraising timeline. Not a fan of the two/three building solution, but not sure how they could get the additional residential development into currently developed area. Some concern about maker-activities being noisy at off-hours.
		3	

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #6 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
1	Affirmative Investments	Score	Comments
		OVERALL	<p>Strong team but unexciting design. Solid choice who would get the project done. The partnership with Somerville Community Corporation is a good recommendation for a team that can complete projects and run a thorough community process in a dense, urban neighborhood in Somerville.</p> <p>The inclusion of five, 3 bedroom units is appealing for potentially housing families in the area. The higher number of affordable housing units seems to be subsidized by the negligible purchase price to the city.</p> <p>The large and contiguous open space is a strong positive for this project. Additionally their effort to integrate the design with the neighboring TAB parcel shows potential for improving the connectivity of the corridor from Broadway to Holland Street.</p>
		4	
2	MarKa	Score	Comments
		OVERALL	<p>The leading proposal in my viewpoint. This is a very strong design team with great experience in urban infill and a very detailed and strong response to both SomerVision and community Concerns brought up in the proceedings of the previous rfp process.</p> <p>Excellent open space allowed by reutilization of the existing structure.</p> <p>Strong financial capacity to deal with any project challenges. Strong team commitment to Somerville.</p> <p>Inclusion of the Collaborative Living Project is a great sign of grounding within the Somerville community and will also lead to the opening of housing in the buildings these participants leave in other parts of the city.</p> <p>The offering of Artists and Maker's space fits well with community interest identified in the last rfp process without imperiling the overall economics of the project.</p> <p>This developer also offered the most substantial purchase price in the proposal which were evaluated as most desirable.</p> <p>I do have a concern about the amount of pavement in the open space but am comfortable this will be addressed through the community process.</p>
		5	
3	Diamond Sinacori	Score	Comments
		OVERALL	<p>Proposal has good massing around the old footprint of the building providing lots of open space</p> <p>The solely residential focus of this proposal misses the exciting potential of some of the other Use cases. That said, the team has strong construction experience in high end residential housing and no challenges with reuse of the old building structure that those who maintain the original structure face.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the structure and programming of the open space and the developer's openness to community input. While a veteran myself, the idea of a quiet, contemplative Veteran's park in this space of active transit seems more focused on the value of the adjacent condos than on the community's desire for open space and a connection between Broadway and Holland Street.</p>
		3	
4	SMART	Score	Comments
		OVERALL	<p>Concern over the organizational capability of the SMART team.</p> <p>Funding sources rely on grants and donations not yet evident. My concern is that there is a sizable raise (approx. \$3MM) needed and that this could extend the timeline of the project by several years.</p> <p>Additionally there is no housing component, which in other proposals serves to subsidize the non-profit portions of the project.</p> <p>Also concerned about project teams approach to minimal modification of the existing structure and whether they would be able to sustain the project if they discover they need additional modification and upgrading to code of the structure.</p> <p>On a positive note the reuse of the structure does add a green benefit and should, if all goes well, speed the project timeline.</p> <p>The inclusion of substantial surface parking somewhat defeats the purpose of the open space.</p>
		2	
5	Trinity	Score	Comments
		OVERALL	<p>Strong team capable of getting the project done even with substantial concerns over Artisans Asylum's near term financial and organizational capability.</p> <p>The two building layout constrains the open space and makes the "corridor" feel quite cramped.</p> <p>Hard to delineate where the open space begins and what is the residential building's backyard. This, to me, is the major flaw of this proposal and drops its ranking significantly. All along through the various community processes there has been a strong and repeated call for open space from the community. The corridor approach of this design changes that to an active but constrained space where it is unclear what is connected to the residential units "backyard" and what is open to the public.</p>
		2	

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #7 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
			Score Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL	3 Community is not terribly fond of the building as it exists currently and the proposal called for minimizing the renovations of the building in order to stay under certain requirements. This seems to be contrary to the goals for the community. While proposal includes affordable component, proposer is offering to pay a minimal amount versus other proposals that also have affordable component approaching levels of this proposal. I like the proposals open space component - not over planned or programmed. I also like the mix of units and unit sizes.
2	MarKa	OVERALL	4 Energetic, exciting, creative proposal that appeared to truly engage and connect with the community. The proposal included invested occupants as well as a development team with strong financial backing. There are some concerns regarding lack of recent, local completed projects and the extent that the building is going to be selectively demolished. Also some concerns that the open space is over programmed and that hardscapes are overemphasized at the expense of grass and open areas.
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL	4 This proposal stands out for their creation of open space; a strong need and request of the community. The proposer seemed slightly set in their ways in terms of use, type and design of the space that didn't seem to reflect the sentiment of the community. The proposer's experience delivering quality buildings stood out. While proposal was strong for the above elements there wasn't a component that would connect with and engage the community in the construction of the development.
4	SMART	OVERALL	1 Proposal seemed disjointed and not terribly organized. Team doesn't appear to have clear leadership or vision. Presentation and design of open space suggested surface parking in what is counted towards "open space"
5	Trinity	OVERALL	2 (Did not attend presentation) Proposal with two buildings ... effects with open space creating unwelcome space and likely would not feel "public" The buildings are proposed to be built on piers with an open parking deck on the first level which would likely have negative impacts on neighboring properties and open space some open space created in narrow bad between TAB & Powderhouse at the expense of the center open space. Doesn't seem that proposal considered desires of the community.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #8 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
		Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL 3	This project would involve condos and commercial space, along with a community space. They would have 10 condos classified as affordable. They would rehab present building which I would expect to lessen the disruption to the neighborhood during the construction process. All parking is within the building. They would work with Tufts to create a new linear connection. Ground Inc. is leading the design of the open space. They were involved with the design of the open space for Tufts bid so they should already have a head start on the community's desires for the green space. Concerns: a low bid for this project. A commercial space that was suggested be occupied by Tufts, although they said in the interviews that they would be open to seeking a tenant for this space that was more aligned with the SomerVision Plan (the needs of the community should come first).
2	MarKa	OVERALL 5	This project demonstrated creativity while being very much aligned with SomerVision. It addresses the housing needs of seniors who wish to remain in the community; artists in a live/work space; required affordable units and commercial space. Keeping the old building and rehabbing it, I would expect to lessen to some degree the impact on the neighborhood during the construction process. The process building design demonstrates creativity in the use of the present structure and the potential is also there for the green space taken into consideration the community process. The bid was one of the stronger bids of the final grouping. Concerns: I hope that the commercial uses do not take away from the businesses of Teele Square. It would be beneficial to work with the present businesses of the Square to enhance the foot traffic in Teele Square.
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL 4	This company has a long history of building quality projects. The design of the two and three story townhouse with underground parking would appear to blend well with the style of surrounding neighborhood housing. This project appeared to have the most green space of all the projects. Although the developer had a strong preference for the focus of the green space, I would hope that he would be open to the community input on how best to design and program the space. Condo fees would contribute to park maintenance. Concerns: Bid was on the lower side, but this was the tendency for most project bids.
4	SMART	OVERALL 1	This building project would involve artists, makers, and innovators. Appears to have the potential for community involvement in a variety of ways once the project is built. Reuse of present structure would appear to lessen the impact on the community during the construction process. Indoor parking for a majority of spaces is a plus. Concerns: Some surface parking. Bid appears to be on the lower side. City responsible for maintenance of park.
5	Trinity	OVERALL 2	Trinity, the developer, has a positive reputation. One of the higher bids for this project. Condos will contribute \$25,000 each year to park maintenance. Park given back to city. "Onsite Maintenance Manager/ Porter providing general clean-up as a part of entire site maintenance" is a plus of this project proposal. Majority of parking in basement of buildings. Involvement of artist community. Concerns: Having a second building on lot even if planned for Artisan's Asylum is not seen as a positive. Some surface parking needed. Non-profit status of Artisan's Asylum, appears to have an impact on Tax Revenue.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #9 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
		Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL 4	Strengths: The applicant has experience working with the Somerville community on this type of project. They have the resources to succeed. Ground Inc. performed as well as could be desired when working with Tufts. The proposal satisfies the need for a affordable housing more than any other proposal. The small amount of office space will bring some jobs to the neighborhood, though not many. Weaknesses: They are reusing the building, which imposes some technical risk as to whether they can succeed. The park meets all the requirements, but does little more. By my calculation, this proposal will cost the city \$52,368/year.
2	MarKa	OVERALL 5	Strengths: The artistic element is central to this proposal. It is not just an afterthought. I credit the developer for proposing an edgy design featuring native plants rather than the typical sterile proposals. The proposal adds only 3 fewer affordable residential units than the proposal that adds the most units. By my calculation, this proposal will provide the city with \$168,047/year in additional revenue, one of the few proposals that increases city revenue. The 13,000 sf of commercial space should bring some jobs to the neighborhood. Solar panels on the roof. Weaknesses: The artistic element adds some financial risk to the project. While they provide banking references, none state that they will provide the financing. On the other hand, they plan to provide 30% of the capital. They are reusing the building, which imposes some technical risk as to whether they can succeed. The proposal provides fewer 3 BRs that desired, but the CLP will open up family housing in Somerville. It will be a challenge to ensure the "artists flats" are actually used by artists.
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL 3	Strengths: I personally visited other Diamond Sinacori projects around Boston and found them to be of high quality. They have the financial backing to be successful. Increases residential housing. Design fits into neighborhood. Weaknesses: They are targeting smaller, less family-oriented housing. The proposal only provides the minimum affordable housing. By my calculation, this proposal will cost the city \$29,380/year. Since the proposal includes only residential units (aside from a small cafe), it will not bring jobs to the neighborhood. The developer has stated a strong preference to deliver a style of park different than what the community has expressed.
4	SMART	OVERALL 1	Strengths: The Developer/Architect has experience designing artists' spaces that are similar to the current proposal. The artistic element is central to this proposal. The proposal provides artists' studios which appears to be a more feasible plan that providing artists' flats. Solar panels on roof. While I did not do a detailed calculation, the proposal will likely provide revenue to the city. The 20,000 sf of office space should bring some jobs to the neighborhood. Weaknesses: The developer/architect has a record of designing buildings the community doesn't like. The demonstrated no experience with community engagement, nor did they describe a plan. The amount of open space marginally meets the defined requirements. The artistic element adds some financial risk to the project. East Boston savings bank provided letter of interest, but nothing saying they had worked with them before or that it was probable they would be willing to provide financing. They are reusing the building, which imposes some technical risk as to whether they can succeed.
5	Trinity	OVERALL 2	Strengths: The developer has a good reputation, especially for being honest. They described detailed experiences with community engagement. The 32,000 sf of artist space should bring some jobs to the neighborhood. Weaknesses: While they claim 40% of the site is public open space, a substantial portion of it is sandwiched between the TAB building and their new building, making it less useable. I question whether they meet the defined open space requirement. While I did not do a detailed calculation, the proposal will likely cost the city more than the revenue it provides.

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary Powder House Community School Project - RFP #15-63 July 1, 2015 COMMITTEE MEMBER #10 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name			
		Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL 4	25% affordable units a plus - 2+3 bedrooms, mixed use r/d, community space, appears to financial capable and able to deliver project. Good presentation. Renting to Tufts not the worst problem. Open space plan is very good - should be easy to work with.
2	MarKa	OVERALL 4	Live, Work concept a plus; good mix of live work and un restricted units. Financial backing should be sound. Mariscal presented well with the team. Collaboration with Steam Academy, green roof LLC and Green City Growers a definite plus! Potential for some jobs.
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL 5	Attractive Design; financial capable; cash purchase 1.05 million; always delivered on previous agreements. Suggest Veterans monument be relocated to a more suitable location , and the public space becomes more active; suggest evaluation from community. Good presentation!
4	SMART	OVERALL 4	Large art center with 42K sq.ft of shared, maker and film spaces is a need of the artist community in somerville. Financial capability is a concern. Local Architects & Developer (consultant) are a plus. Not keen on dependence on grant funding; no Pilot agreement.
5	Trinity	OVERALL 5	Art emphasis and collaboration with Artist Asylum a plus! Financial capabilities appear to be very sound; 2 million cash purchase price is attractive. Open Space design alternative. Artist asylum affiliation for equity should be flushed out, as it appears there is little equity, and would need fundraising

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary			
Powder House Community School			
Project - RFP #15-63			
July 1, 2015			
COMMITTEE MEMBER #11 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS			
RFP Team Name		Score	Comments
1	Affirmative Investments	OVERALL	Open space is visible and accessible from both Broadway And Holland. Both active and passive use of open space as desired by neighbors. Possible collaboration with Tufts creating multi use parking and plaza as shown in option 2. Appeals to multi age groups esp. teens + and adults +. Park will be built by developers and turned over to the city for both ownership and maintenance. Affirmative investments has extensive national experience and a competent local partner with SCC. The CDC has built successful affordable housing over the years and has a long history working with residents, stakeholders and the city. Affirmative has 63 projects over 35 years and a working relationship with Eastern Bank. Both SCC & Affirmative have actively involved residents in the planning and development of projects. A reasonable plan has been presented on getting community involvement. The plan involves re-use of the building with modifications. Such plan does present risks to the project due to the many unknowns of re-use. The design includes many green elements including green roof gardens and thoughtful design for retention of rain water. Project includes cafe and gallery space and commercial (R&D) space potentially leased to Tufts. Long term job creation potential is high. 42 housing units with 10 affordable (25%) & the balance market rate. Family units (3 bdrms) included. Unknown as to whether any residents will work out of homes, but employment possibilities at Tufts and galleries/Gallery, cafe will benefit neighbors and residents and commercial space will be created. The timeline presented is reasonable. The project provides an opportunity to increase affordable housing in Trek Square at a density the neighborhood can handle. Creation of affordable housing at 25% without subsidy could become the "gold standard" for our community. SCC has an opportunity to provide mixed use housing which can also be a model for other projects and city neighborhoods.
		5	
2	MarKa	OVERALL	The developers have an innovative approach to park development and integration with the building. The use of natural elements and art are integrated well. Developers claim that 38% of the land will be devoted to open space. The park will be built with an eye to low maintenance and natural elements that will fit well with the concept. The developers plan for the city to own only a portion of the open space (northeastern part). Two lots will draw community into building, according to the developers, but will the division of public and private space inhibit public use of at least 42% of site. Pathway through the park will include solar lighting and bike parking will be integrated. The projects mixed uses should be very beneficial to the community and create a lively gathering spot for all ages. The project meets 29 of 39 Somerville goals and it is clear that the developers are interested in the community and its needs. The project will include artists residences and workspaces, include multi income and multi-generational housing as well as meeting spaces for residents, neighbors and artists. Several Somerville groups are participating in the project including the collaborative living group and the local bicycle school. Re-use of the building poses risks in terms of mitigation costs and re-usability. The group says it will budget for the known and insure for the unknown. The plans indicate significant structural changes that may not be feasible for the existing building sustain. This is a significant issue. Sebastian Marical, architect has offices in Somerville as well as the west coast. Several projects have been completed on the west coast, but none on the east. Several are in development, but there does not seem the breadth of development experience to assure smooth completion and within budget. The project has a good mix of live/work/sell space as well as a cafe and other commercial facilities. The timeline is reasonable, but the developer's history does not provide confidence that the timeline can be met. The vision of the project is outstanding. The viability is uncertain.
		4	
3	Diamond Sinacori	OVERALL	The park space as divided inhibits full accessibility. The success of marketing of units seems predicated on providing both views and access to open space as part of the residents "back yards." The developer envisions passive and quiet open space which is not the intention of the neighbors who expressed interest in both active and passive uses. There are limited spaces to gather other than for sitting or contemplation. The Veteran's Memorial uses significant park space and duplicates the efforts of other Veteran's memorials in Somerville. It is unclear if the splintering of recognition for Veterans to multiple locations in fact does them all honor or whether the Veterans of Somerville and the city have an investment in this memorial. The concept does not come from the input of the community through 2 1/2 years of input. The park shall be built by the developer and maintained by a trust funded by the condominium association. The project will get "instructions from the trust on maintenance." It is unclear how reliable such a framework will be for careful maintenance. There is a willingness to consider transfer to the city, but this does not seem to be a goal of the developer. Diamond Sinacori has a successful track record of developing high end projects and while there is a willingness to consider alternative site layouts, anything that limits open space and views for residents will impact the salability of units. The developers have access to financing and skills, if the project makes money. The community engagement process is not highlighted with a lot of thought and it is unclear how much effort and expense will be allocated toward community engagement. The building layout and design is very appropriate to the neighborhood, but the lack of family housing is a negative. Affordable housing is targeted at the required level. The units will sell at the high end of the market. There is a small amount of space allocated for a cafe and gallery/lobby, but this seems more like an after thought. I don't see any intention to encourage living/work space or commercial/retail for job creation or to the benefit of the community. The timeline seems as to be expected, but a tear down will involve more construction noise and potential pollution than a re-use (if this is in fact realistic). The developer does not seem to be particularly sensitive to the focus group and community input process prior to the issuance of the RFP. Thematically the development of the park as a Veteran's Park does not seem in keeping with community needs.
		3	
4	SMART	OVERALL	The park area is geared to public lawns with programming in the public space. \$1 million will be committed to open space. Design elements don't seem that reflective of the need for some active space. The total of 42% open space is limited by the design element of opening up the building courtyard and including that as public. It is not clear that this would be inviting space at all times including evenings and when the building is in use by tenants and visitors during the day. The developers intend for the city to take over the green space and lawn. Programmed activities are anticipated, but it is not clear who or how they are paid for. The open space is limited by the developer's desire to have above ground parking included. The financial capability is questionable as the project requires an equity offering as well as fund raising and will therefore be highly leveraged. This could seriously slow down the project or stall it, so that the timeline for development is questionable. 18 months for a timeline does not seem reasonable. The architect and developer are experienced, but the developer does not provide strong financial assets to back the project. There is a commitment to a public process and a demonstrated history of neighborhood involvement in projects. The building layout and design are limited by the re-use of the existing building and the requirement for above ground parking. The courtyard into the building does not create realistic public space. Solar and green elements are emphasized. There is no housing component to the project, and as such, it does not contribute to market rate or affordable housing and in fact is not a consistent project with other neighborhood users. The project is primarily work/sell, cafe and commercial spaces.
		2	
5	Trinity	OVERALL	While the open space may technically meet the 42% threshold, the placement of two substantial buildings on either side of the green space creates a corridor effect and shadow effects from the building are likely to limit sunlight. In addition to the two buildings above ground and exposed below building parking limit the benefit of the open space. Green space design plans are fluid and while potential concepts are presented, nothing has been developed consistent with input from neighborhood focus groups. Green space is to be turned over to the city after development. The location of the Artist Asylum building on the site is problematic. Two parking areas with two street entrance/exits puts strain on both Broadway and Dacland traffic. The trucking needs of the Artists Asylum also are inconsistent with a residential neighborhood. Trinity is an established and experienced developer. The developer has access to financing, but the plan to use MassDevelopment as the major source of funds is unrealistic as they only fund non-profits of which Artists only would qualify. In addition it is unclear as to the ability of the Asylum group to raise adequate equity and afford to service debt as well as other ongoing expenses. The developers are looking for tax concessions for the non-profit which have never been offered. Negotiating a viable PILOT seems unlikely. The project includes 35 market rate and affordable condos and 8 live/work/sell units facing Broadway as well as 30,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. The mix of affordable to market rate appears to be at code. The timeline seems uncertain with the Artists Asylum equity funding needs. Trinity has said they would finance the building, but negotiations on tax concessions, liability for the Asylum and requested amendments to the LDA and ENA seriously limit the expectations that the project can move forward smoothly.
		3	

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary

Powder House Community School

Project - RFP #15-63

July 1, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBER #12 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS

<i>RFP Team Name</i>			
1	Affirmative Investments		
			Score
		OVERALL	4
2	MarKa		
			Score
		OVERALL	5
3	Diamond Sinacori		
			Score
		OVERALL	3
4	SMART		
			Score
		OVERALL	2
5	Trinity		
			Score
		OVERALL	3

Somerville Evaluation Criteria Summary

Powder House Community School

Project - RFP #15-63

July 1, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBER #13 - POST INTERVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS

<i>RFP Team Name</i>			
1	Affirmative Investments		
			Score
		OVERALL	4
2	MarKa		
			Score
		OVERALL	5
3	Diamond Sinacori		
			Score
		OVERALL	3
4	SMART		
			Score
		OVERALL	1
5	Trinity		
			Score
		OVERALL	2

Design

Standards &

Guidelines

RFP Appendix E

APPENDIX E
Design Standards & Guidelines

**Powder House School Site
Design Standards & Guidelines
December 2014**

I. Purpose

To establish guidelines for the reuse or redevelopment of the Powder House Community School (PHCS) site that ensures an appropriately-scaled development that physically integrates into the existing neighborhood with adequate open space that creates recreational and environmental value to the City.

II. Use and Dimensional Standards

Development shall reflect the wishes of the community as expressed in numerous community meetings on the project, including the July 2014 community meeting. The community prioritized several key desirable project elements such as mixed uses; green space; affordable housing for families, singles, artists, seniors, and others, with options for artists' lofts, live-work, etc.; a performance arts/community center; pedestrian/bike friendly vital streets and pathways; etcetera. In addition, the development must meet the following use and dimensional standards:

1. **Uses:** The following uses shall be allowed:
 - A. Office/R&D
 - B. Small Retail and Service
 - C. Medium Retail and Service
 - D. Eating and Drinking
 - E. Residential
 - F. Accommodations (ie hotel)
 - G. Educational/Recreational/Institutional
 - H. Public park/Recreational facility
 - I. Parking (along with other uses)
 - J. Protected Uses

Retail uses shall be limited to a total of no greater than 18,000 square feet.

These uses are based upon Clusters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J in Table 7.13 of the current Zoning Code. Retail uses that would be limited in size are in clusters B, C and D.

2. **Building Height & Mechanical Equipment.** New buildings should not exceed 45 feet in height, except that all elevator and stairwell penthouses, roof mounted mechanical equipment (including enclosure, if any) and other similar rooftop installations shall be set back behind a plane inclined at 45 degrees from the vertical, beginning at the maximum height of the building, along all street lines and rear lot line and shall be screened

Screening shall be pursuant to Section 10.5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. **Minimum Lot Size:** The minimum lot size shall be set to include the entire 80,800 square foot site, but with the understanding that a user shall be allowed to dedicate portions of the site back to the City of Somerville for a dedicated city park.
4. **Setbacks:** As a transition to abutting residential structures, a minimum of 15 feet of side yard setback is required. Within 25 feet of a side yard, no structure may be greater than 30 feet in height, except that residential townhouses, two-family homes or single-family homes may be 35 feet in height. The side yard setback and height requirements shall not apply to any application reusing the square footage of the existing PHCS in the setback provided that at least 50% of the total square footage of the building will be retained. Also, the structure shall not further encroach within setback areas.
5. **Development Intensity:** A development shall not exceed a FAR of 1.0 and a maximum of 35 residential units. A development that reuses the net square footage within the existing school building may exceed the FAR and residential unit requirement, providing up to 40 units and add up to 10% of additional space to the existing structure.
6. **Dedicated Parkland.** A continuous portion of the parcel's total square footage, with a minimum of 0.75 acres, shall be improved for public open space (including on-site sidewalks, public paths, park and/or playground use). Dedicated parkland may be placed above underground parking areas, but shall not be elevated at a grade more than three feet above street level. The public open space shall be dedicated to the City of Somerville unless there is a determination that the long-term user of the site is better capable of maintaining the open space. Provide multiple conceptual designs for the use of the park along with a park management plan.
7. **Parking Requirements:** Parking shall be provided at:
 - A. 1 space per 800 sf office
 - B. 1 space per 1500 sf small retail
 - C. 1 space per 800 sf medium retail
 - D. 1 space per residential unit
 - E. 1 space per 800 sf educational / institutional
8. **Artist Studio Space.** Art space is encouraged. This would be space used for the creation, production, rehearsal or teaching of any visual art or craft, including but not limited to painting, drawing, graphic design, photography, video, film, sculpture, and pottery; of written works of fiction or nonfiction; or of any performing art, whether for live or recorded performance, including music, dance, and theater, and accessory sales of such art.

III. Development Standards

1. **Lighting.** Lighting shall be appropriate to the surrounding historic and pedestrian-oriented neighborhood character. The light levels of the development and open space should be designed for safety while minimizing glare and light trespass. Applicants will be required to prove that light trespass onto adjacent residential properties is minimized or eliminated.
2. **Parking Optimization Plan.** Applicants shall include a Parking Optimization Plan illustrating how management and possible pricing strategies will encourage shared use and reasonable turnover of parking spaces.
3. **Pedestrian Connections.** Continuous pedestrian connections shall be retained between major points of pedestrian activity on the site, including, but not limited to, the connection through the site connecting Packard Avenue at Broadway to Holland along the side of the existing Tufts Administration Building (TAB). Adequate lighting along the path shall be maintained and the path shall be accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days per year.
4. **Pedestrian Oriented Requirements.** To promote pedestrian activity, new or renovated buildings shall be designed with windows and separate front entrance doors to lobbies, retail and business, and other sources of pedestrian activity. These entrances shall be oriented to existing or proposed public sidewalks, paths, and/or open space.
5. **Service Areas and Loading Spaces.** Ground level mechanical equipment, utility and trash enclosures, loading docks and other utilitarian and service elements shall not abut the street or property edge(s) of the parcel and shall be visually screened.
6. **Shadow Effects.** Buildings shall be designed to minimize shadow and wind to open space and residential areas especially between 10 am and 2 pm in the winter. Shadow effects shall be demonstrated in technical studies.
7. **Transportation Analysis.** The applicant shall provide a Transportation Study and a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan tailored to the proposed site and mix of use on the site. The scope of the document should be prepared in consultation with the City of Somerville's Director of Traffic & Parking and may include a project description and a description of the existing conditions of the transportation network in the vicinity of the site. The following items may be required as part of a Transportation Study:
 - a. Counts of existing traffic volumes.
 - b. Projected traffic volumes for the proposed development based on accepted engineering standards and adapted to local conditions.
 - c. Projected size of delivery vehicles, and frequency and days/hours of delivery.
 - d. Reviews of accident history trends in the vicinity of the site.
 - e. Analyses of the Development impacts on the transportation network in the vicinity of the site.

- f. Examination of transportation by all feasible modes, including automobile, transit, bicycle and pedestrian.
- g. Explanation of consistency with City transportation plans.

If the impact analyses indicate that safety or capacity will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the Applicant will indicate appropriate mitigation measures, subject to the approval of the Director of Traffic and Parking, prior to the granting of a special permit.

8. **Utilities.** Utilities and wiring shall be placed below ground.
9. **Research and Development Uses.** Research and development uses limited to a laboratory engaged in research, experimental and testing activities which may include the development of mockups and prototypes but not the manufacture of finished products. Any use that creates any noise, glare, dust, vibration, fumes, odors, gases, smoke, vapors, emissions of noxious or hazardous materials or substances outside of the structure, or creates any pollution of water ways or ground water, or transmission of signals that interfere with radio or television reception, or creates hazards to safety or health are not permitted.
10. **Parking Facilities.** Where structured parking spaces are not accessory to a principal use on the same lot, the total square footage of such parking spaces shall be limited to occupy no more 40% of the total square footage of the net square feet developed on the site.

IV. Design Guidelines

These guidelines are intended to provide general standards for building massing, siting and articulation.

1. **Street/Usable Open Space Facing Facades:** Structures should front the sidewalk and the publicly accessible usable open space. Varied architecture should be created by using recessed or projected entryways, bays, canopies, awnings, residential balconies on second floor or above, and other architectural elements.

Where there are ground-floor residential uses, front porches are encouraged.

Where there are ground-floor commercial uses, they should include thirty-foot-wide commercial bays with independent entrances onto the street to create visual and pedestrian interest.

Non-residential ground floor façades should have a minimum 75% transparent material, and non-residential second floor facades should have a minimum of 40% transparent material. These openings should provide views into the building and should not be blocked by interior storage, non-artistic displays, or greater than 30% internally mounted signage.

2. **Buildings in Context.** The new or renovated design should interface with the adjacent Tufts Administration Building through appropriately applied features that frame outdoor open spaces and/or screen other utilitarian and service elements. Visible rear and side façades should maintain a similar character to the front façade of the building and the intended character of the surrounding district.
3. **Exterior Building Materials.** All visible portions of new buildings should use high quality, durable, and aesthetically appropriate exterior building materials. Particular attention should be paid where properties abut residential property. Predominant exterior building materials should include an appropriate combination of brick, glass, wood, artistically used metal, stone, or stucco.
4. **Height Transitions.** A transition in height should be established where new development adjoins low-rise residential properties.
5. **Mechanicals.** All rooftop-building systems, including wireless communications facilities, should be incorporated into the building form in a manner integral to the building architecture, including screening with materials that harmonize with buildings' exterior finishes.
6. **Neighborhood-serving Uses.** It is strongly encouraged that, should any non-residential use be included in a development, the mix of uses proposed for the site has an emphasis on neighborhood-serving retail uses and community enriching services. The successful development of the site will bring high quality new uses to a vibrant residential neighborhood with excellent transit access that is situated at the edge of Teele Square and within close walking distance of Davis Square.
7. **New Buildings.** Massing and height of new buildings should be articulated in a manner compatible with the physical character of the surrounding districts, particularly where a building abuts a residential property. Whenever possible, historical variety in the scale, rhythm, and relationship of buildings should be preserved.
8. **Parking Entrances:** Entrances to on-site, off-street parking should be designed to minimize conflict with pedestrians.
9. **Public Art.** Installation of public art is encouraged to add visual interest and distinguishing features to landscaped or other public areas.
10. **Signage.** All signs should respect buildings' context and be oriented to pedestrians.
11. **Park:** The dedicated parkland/open space should a simple but elegant design, should be located to support public gathering (i.e. not hidden behind the development site), and be interconnected to the connection between Broadway and the TAB site. The parkland should include elements that meet the needs of the neighborhood and the community as well as the new development. The park shall be shaped to maximize its usefulness.

12. **Parking:** The project should investigate the opportunity to share parking between uses to minimize the amount of paved parking areas and/or garages. Also, car-share or flex-car spaces should be incorporated into parking area where possible. Parking should be located underground, if possible. Parking may be located at-grade, underground or in parking decks that are shielded from adjacent residential property and the street by portions of the structure not being used for parking. Parking in decks or at grade should be designed so as to reduce their visibility from Broadway and from adjacent residential structures.
 13. **Adjacent Neighbors:** The project should be sensitive to the neighboring homes, including those along Paulina Street, ensuring that there is not excessive traffic, vehicle noise and other disturbances in this area unless properly screened and mitigated. Parking and circulation plans, adjacent to residential neighborhood, should be provided to reduce visual and noise impacts.
 14. **Connections:** Any proposed development shall support improved access to surrounding neighborhoods by means of sidewalk connections, crosswalks, landscaping, traffic signalization and traffic calming methods.
 15. **Green Elements:** Applicants shall demonstrate the project is capable of meeting LEED for buildings, LEED-ND, or a viable alternative standard for green building and neighborhood design. Whenever possible, green roofs should be incorporated into the project and should include gardens or usable features.
-