

PLAN: Dudley Square Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Definitions

January 2019

Comparative Evaluation Criteria	PRC Area of Evaluation?	Definition	"Highly Advantageous" means...	"Advantageous" means...	"Not Advantageous" means...
1. Development Concept	✓	The Proposer's development plan relative to the Development Objectives set out in the RFP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Detailed, realistic proposals > Consistent with the Development Objectives > Including delivering deeply affordable housing options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Realistic proposals > Consistent with the Development Objectives > Do not completely or satisfactorily address all issues identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals are not consistent with the Development Objective > Do not address most of the issues identified
2. Design Concept	✓	The Proposer's development plan relative to the Design Guidelines set out in the RFP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Highly compatible with the Design Guidelines > Meet more of the identified objectives than competing proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Include most, but not all required drawings and design documents > Designs that follow most, but not all of the Design Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Include few of the required drawings and design documents > Designs that do not adequately follow most of the Design Guidelines
3. Sustainable Development	✓	The Proposer's sustainable & resilient development strategies relative to the Design Guidelines set out in the RFP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > A detailed plan that exceeds LEED Silver certification > Exceed the other requirements outlined in the Resilient Development and Green Building Design Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > A feasible plan for LEED Silver certification > Meet Resilient Development and Green Building Design Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fail to provide a plan for LEED Silver certification > Do not meet minimum Resilient Development and Green Building Design Guidelines
4. Development Team Experience		The Proposer's experience and capacity to undertake the proposed project, relative to that of other Proposers. Newly formed development teams and/or Joint Venture Partnerships will be evaluated based on their combined development experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide all of the requested information regarding the development team's experience and capacity > Demonstrate that the development team has successfully completed one or more similar projects in the city of Boston in the last five years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide most of the requested information regarding the development team's experience and capacity > Illustrate that the development team has successfully completed one or more similar projects elsewhere, or has transferable experience from another type of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not include any of the requested information regarding the development team's experience and capacity > Do not demonstrate that the development team has successfully completed a similar project to the one proposed

Comparative Evaluation Criteria	PRC Area of Evaluation?	Definition	"Highly Advantageous" means...	"Advantageous" means...	"Not Advantageous" means...
5. Financial Capacity		The strength of the Proposer's financing plan relative to other proposals. The Proposer must demonstrate experience in successfully raising funds for another significant project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that include approved or conditionally approved financing to initiate and complete the proposed development within a definitive timeframe > Illustrate if the project will require federal, state or local subsidy > Otherwise provides a financial plan detailing and evidencing any and all proposed, available resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a feasible financing plan using public (federal, state or local subsidy) sources, and private funding, to initiate and complete the development > Include letters of interest for all sources of debt and equity, indicated with timelines for commitments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a financing plan to initiate and complete the development but do not include letters of interest from funding sources or any other evidence of potential sources of private and public debt and equity > Include little to no documentation of a financial plan
6. Financial Impact		Financial impact to the City of Boston of the Proposer's Net Offer Price, which will be calculated by summing the Offer Price with any included request or identified need for funding relative to offers of other proposers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that rely on no sources of public funding > Includes an Offer Price to the City not less than the Appraised Value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that include an Offer Price less than the Appraised Value > Rely on reasonably justified sources of public funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that offer less than the appraised value and do not justify the basis for the reduction
7. Development Cost Feasibility		The strength and completeness of the Proposer's Development Budget relative to other proposals. Proposals should completely specify all anticipated costs and contingencies and stay in line with current industry standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals include a Development and Operating Pro Forma consistent with the use requested in this RFP > Includes cost estimates that are appropriate for the proposed project and its ongoing operations > Supporting documents such as estimates from professionals or price quotes from licensed contractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that include a Development and Operating Pro Forma consistent with the use requested in this RFP > Includes cost estimates that are appropriate for the proposed project and its ongoing operations > Do not provide supporting documentation for the most significant costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not submit a Development and Operating Pro forma or include a Development and Operating Pro forma that is lacking in detail, or not realistic or appropriate for the project and its ongoing operations
8. Diversity and Inclusion	✓	The comprehensiveness of the Developer's planned approach to achieving participation, including specific strategies to achieve maximum participation of MWBEs in non-traditional functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a comprehensive, highly reasonable, and justifiable Diversity and Inclusion Plan for a project of the type proposed that is clearly superior to that of all other proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a reasonable and justifiable Diversity and Inclusion Plan for a project of the type proposed that is similar or equal to all other submitted proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not provide a credible or detailed Diversity and Inclusion Plan for a project of the type proposed > Propose a Diversity and Inclusion Plan that is substantively inferior to all other submitted proposals

Comparative Evaluation Criteria	PRC Area of Evaluation?	Definition	"Highly Advantageous" means...	"Advantageous" means...	"Not Advantageous" means...
9. Development Timetable		The strength of the Proposer's Development Timetable relative to that of other proposers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a detailed development timetable that is feasible > Demonstrate an understanding of the development process > Provide clear indication that the project does not need additional funding and can close within twelve (12) months of tentative designation and will be completed within twelve (12) to eighteen (18) months of closing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a detailed development timetable that is feasible > Demonstrate an understanding of the development process > Provide clear indication that the project will close within six (6) months of receiving all necessary funding and be completed within twelve (12) to eighteen (18) months of closing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that fail to provide a development timetable or propose a development timetable that is either impractical > Demonstrate a lack of understanding of the development process > Indicate that the project will not close within six (6) months of receiving all necessary funding or that it will be completed in more than 18 months following closing
10. Good Jobs Strategy	✓	The strength of the Proposer's employment strategy relative to the Boston Residents Jobs Policy and the strength of the Proposer's Good Jobs Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a comprehensive, highly reasonable, enforceable and achievable Good Jobs Strategy for the proposed project that is clearly superior to that of all other proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a reasonable and justifiable Good Jobs Strategy for the proposed project that is similar or equal to all other submitted proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not provide a credible or detailed Good Jobs Strategy for the proposed project > Propose a Good Jobs Strategy that is substantively inferior to all other submitted proposals
11. Development Without Displacement	✓	The comprehensiveness of the Developer's planned approach to assisting the current residents of Roxbury to remain in their community in the future, afford housing, and find pathways to economic opportunity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a comprehensive, highly reasonable, and achievable Development Without Displacement strategy for a project of the type proposed that is clearly superior to that of all other proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that provide a reasonable and justifiable Development Without Displacement strategy for a project of the type proposed that is similar or equal to all other submitted proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not provide a credible or detailed Development Without Displacement strategy for a project of the type proposed > Propose a Development Without Displacement strategy that is substantively inferior to all other submitted proposals
12. Additional Benefits	✓	The Proposer's relative ability to provide benefits to the local community, above those generated by the development itself.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that describe and quantify specific benefits that it will provide to the community, aside from the development of the property > The level of benefits provided will be superior to those provided by other Proposers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that describe and quantify specific benefits that it will provide to the community, aside from the development of the property > The level of benefits provided will be equal to those provided by other Proposers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Proposals that do not sufficiently describe and quantify specific benefits to the community, aside from the development of the property > The level of benefits provided would be inferior to those provided by other Proposers

Comparative Evaluation Criteria	PRC Area of Evaluation?	Definition	"Highly Advantageous" means...	"Advantageous" means...	"Not Advantageous" means...
13. Parking (Dudley Street Commercial only)	✓	The proposed projects' parking strategy relative to the parking goals outlined in the RFP. The parking goals exceed the minimum parking requirements for this site.	> Proposals that provide plentiful public parking and adequate parking for the development uses	> Proposals that provide some public parking and adequate parking for the development uses	> Proposals that fail to provide any public parking or adequate parking for the development uses
14. Open Space (Dudley Street Commercial only)	✓	The proposed projects' open space concept relative to the open space goals outlined in the RFP.	> Proposals that provide a large public plaza or park with programmable space, plentiful green space, and several of the specific outdoor amenities that the community desires	> Proposals that provide an adequately-sized public plaza or park with programmable space and adequate green space, but that don't indicate that they will provide any of the more specific outdoor amenities that the community desires	> Proposals that fail to provide an adequately-sized public plaza or park with programmable space, adequate green space, or any of the more specific outdoor amenities that the community desires