

MEMORANDUM – DRAFT

To	Jeff Bagg, City Planner Michael Owens, Procurement Officer
From	Emily Keys Innes, AICP, LEED AP ND, Principal
Date	June 29,2021
Project	20109 - Easthampton
Subject	Whitepaper on Precedents – Progress Draft
Cc:	

The purpose of this memorandum is (1) to gather information about the City of Easthampton’s needs relative to housing and economic development relative to the RFP planning process and (2) identify best practices for municipal disposition of former schools and appropriate components of those requests for proposals.

This memorandum is a progress draft and will be updated throughout July and August as more precedent RFPs become available. Interviews with some of the municipalities to supplement the information from the RFP may be appropriate to determine whether the process was successful and if the result met the community’s expectations.

The memorandum is divided into four sections:

- Section 1. Housing Needs within the Community/Recommendations from the Housing Production Plan
- Section 2: Recommendations of the Downtown Strategic Plan
- Section 3: Best Practices for Municipal Disposition of Former Schools/Components of Disposition Plans
- Section 4: RFP Criteria for Housing and Economic Development. Smart Growth, and Sustainable Buildings and Site Practices

Table of Contents

Section 1. Housing Needs within the Community/Recommendations from the Housing Production Plan.....	3
Summary of Housing Needs Assessment.....	4
Section 2: Recommendations of the Downtown Strategic Plan.....	6
Summary of Community Criteria	7
Section 3: Best Practices for Municipal Disposition of Former Schools/Components of Disposition Plans.....	14
Redevelopment and Reuse of Memorial School Building (Adams)	14
East Street School (Amherst)	16
Adaptive Reuse of the Russell School (Northstar) (Hadley).....	16
Sullivan School (North Adams).....	17
Purchase and Adaptive Reuse of the Calvin Coolidge School (Maynard)	17
Adaptive Reuse of Brown School Building (Newburyport).....	19
Section 4: RFP Criteria for Housing and Economic Development. Smart Growth, and Sustainable Buildings and Site Practices.....	21

Section I. Housing Needs within the Community/Recommendations from the Housing Production Plan

The *Easthampton Housing Production Plan 2021-2025* was approved on February 17, 2021 by the City Council and the Planning Board and by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) on April 15, 2021. The plan was prepared by the City of Easthampton, Barrett Planning Group LLC., and Dodson & Flinker.

The Subsidized Housing Inventory is 530 units or 7% of the year-round housing count identified in the 2010 Census. Most of the units of affordable housing inventory are rental units.

Easthampton's household growth since 1990 has been higher than its population growth (18% vs. 3%). This means that demand for housing is increasing and household size is getting smaller. The City has been proactive in trying to meet demand by adopting a 40R overlay district, supporting and approving comprehensive permits, establishing an emergency rental assistance program, and identifying surplus City-owned sites for affordable housing.

The Housing Production Plan identifies five City goals for housing:¹

- **Goal 1:** Create a wide variety of affordable and mixed-income housing that helps to keep Easthampton a welcoming, inclusive community.
- **Goal 2:** Provide more housing options, including affordable and market-rate housing options, for low-income families, seniors, and individuals with disabilities, through a variety of mechanisms to increase housing choice.
- **Goal 3:** Actively strive to achieve the Chapter 40B 10 percent minimum for affordable housing by annually producing at least 38 units that count on the Subsidized Housing Inventory, through local actions and approval of private development, especially development of rental units.
- **Goal 4:** Encourage new development and repurposing of existing buildings to create affordable and mixed income housing that reinforces the development patterns of Easthampton's downtown urban neighborhoods and maintains a predominantly single-family character in established single-family neighborhoods; strengthens the vitality of downtown with diverse housing types; and promotes housing in walkable areas convenient to shops, services, transportation, parks, and schools.
- **Goal 5:** Promote the development of surplus institutional or town-owned property and redevelopment of the mills to create desirable mixed-income and mixed-use neighborhoods, where feasible.

All five goals are relevant to the development of the RFP; Goal 5 is, of course, the most directly related.

¹ City of Easthampton, Barrett Planning Group LLC., and Dodson & Flinker, *Easthampton Housing Production Plan 2021-2025*, p.5.

Summary of Housing Needs Assessment

Key Facts: Population

- Almost 20% of the City's population is people 65 years and over.
- The median age is 45.
- The number of children and young adults is declining (children under 10 were 13% of the population in 1990 and 8% in 2018; Teens 10-19 were also 13% of the population in 1990 and 9% in 2018).
- 14% of residents have one or more disabilities.
- 41% people with disabilities are also seniors.

Key Facts: Households

- The average household size has declined from 2.51 in 1990 to 2.20 in 2018.
- The number of families and households with children have also dropped from 1990 to 2018 (by 4% and 16%, respectively).
- The number of single-person households has increased by 57% from 1990 to 2018; total household growth was 18% in the same period.
- 42% of households rent.
- Most single- or two-person households are renters.
- 66% of households with low or moderate incomes are cost-burdened (spending over 30% of monthly gross income on housing).

Key Facts: Income

- Residents of Easthampton have a significant wage gap in comparison to nearby communities: the average weekly wage in Easthampton is \$814. However, the average weekly wages for those with full-time jobs in the City is \$920.
- Most workers are commuters.
- 12% of households are headed by single women with children, yet men are paid 1.3 times women.
- Over 33% of household are headed by women; many of these households are lower in income.
- 18% of people with disabilities have income below poverty levels.
- Easthampton families and households have lower incomes than other communities in the region. The median household income was \$66,142 in 1990 and \$59,604 in 2018. The median family income was \$78,089 in 1990 and \$77,054 in 2018. Median nonfamily incomes were almost the same: \$41,041 in 1990 and \$41,139 in 2018. These are inflation-adjusted numbers.
- 9.5% of the population are below the poverty line. 66% of families in poverty and single women with children.

Key Facts: Housing Stock

- Easthampton has about 7,731 dwelling units. About a third are single-family detached; just over 25% are multifamily of three-ten units, and almost 22% are multifamily of ten-fifty units.
- 90% of the rental inventory is studio, one and two-bedroom units.
- Most of the housing stock is 1970 or earlier.
- Recent development has been focused on mill renovations and multifamily construction.
- Subsidized units are 16% of renter-occupied housing units.
- Monthly rents for two-bedrooms units are between \$1,200 and \$1,400.
- Median gross rent as a percentage of household income is 27.6% in Easthampton, lower than other communities in the region.
- Rental prices do not support significant improvements.

Key Facts: Housing Needs

- ADA-accessible features for aging and physically impaired residents.
- More affordable units, both unrestricted and deed restricted.
- Additional affordable units to meet the City's statutory requirement under Chapter 40B.
- Units that are affordable at different levels of affordability (% of Area Median Income or AMI).
- Smaller units to address the needs of people who don't want larger homes.

Section 2: Recommendations of the Downtown Strategic Plan

The *Easthampton Downtown Strategic Plan* (March 2020) was prepared on behalf of the City by Harriman with Tighe & Bond and RKG Associates. The consolidation of the City's three downtown elementary schools was the impetus for the plan. Once the new school is complete, the school buildings and sites will no longer be needed for the school system and thus would become available to support other City goals.

The goals of the plan are as follows:²

- **Re-use Committee and RFP:** Establish a School Re-use Committee to oversee the creation of a Request for Proposals and the selection of responses.
- **Economic Development:** Develop a coordinated vision for the Downtown to enhance economic development opportunities.
- **Municipal Assets:** Address redevelopment opportunities and reuse of the municipal assets (Center/Pepin School and Maple Elementary) for their future role in creating a vibrant downtown.
- **Revitalization:** Improve the Union Street and Cottage Street corridor as a vibrant commercial district and a creative heart of the community.
- **Shared Parking:** Examine opportunities for shared parking to reduce paved surfaces and promote walkability and density.
- **Smart Growth:** Investigate 40R District zoning to provide impetus to private investment in the Downtown.
- **Implementation:** Provide a coordinated implementation strategy.

After evaluating existing conditions and summarizing community feedback, the report provides an analysis of the reuse possibilities for each school site. This analysis includes criteria for the reuse of each school and a matrix of criteria that will form the basis of the prioritization discussion for the Re-Use Committee and the evaluation criteria for proposals in response to the RFP.

The tables of the criteria for each school³ and the evaluation criteria⁴ are provided on the following pages.

² City of Easthampton, Harriman, Tighe & Bond and RKG Associates, *Easthampton Downtown Strategic Plan* (March 2020), p. 9.

³ City of Easthampton, Harriman, Tighe & Bond and RKG Associates, *Easthampton Downtown Strategic Plan* (March 2020), pp. 51-53.

⁴ City of Easthampton, Harriman, Tighe & Bond and RKG Associates, *Easthampton Downtown Strategic Plan* (March 2020), pp. 57-63

Summary of Community Criteria

Community-Identified Desired Uses: Center School

DESIRED USE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	NON-PROFIT
Affordable Housing		Y	Y
Artist's Co-op Housing			Y
Parking	Y		
Private Sale		Y	
Mixed-Income Housing		Y	
Senior Housing		Y	
Market (Like Faneuil Hall)	Y	Y	Y
Municipal Use	Y		
Museum	Y		Y
Senior Center	Y		Y
Food Hall (Like Haymarket)	Y		Y
Hotel - Bed & Breakfast		Y	
Park/Playground for K-8	Y		
Urgent Care Center		Y	
Educational/School Extension	Y		
Library	Y		Y
Mixed Use		Y	
Incubator/Co-working	Y		Y
Boarding School		Y	
Maker Space with Tools	Y		Y
Retail		Y	

Community-Identified Desired Uses: Pepin School

DESIRED USE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	NON-PROFIT
Intergenerational Health and Wellness Center or Community Center with Gym Access	Y		Y
Housing		Y	
Vocational School/Maker's Space	Y		Y
After School Program	Y		
Winter Farmer's Market	Y		Y
Incubator Spaces/Co-working Spaces	Y		Y
Rentable Community Space	Y		Y
Indoor Athletic Space	Y		Y
Culinary Space		Y	Y
Maintain Community Ownership	Y		
Senior Center	Y		
Library	Y		Y
Intergenerational Mutual Learning Center	Y		Y
Artist Live-Work Space		Y	Y
Emergency Shelter	Y		Y

Community-Identified Desired Uses: Maple School

DESIRED USE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	NON-PROFIT
Parking	Y		
Affordable Mixed-Income Housing	Y	Y	
Playground/Open Space/Pulaski Park/Community Gardens	Y		
Library			Y
Artist Live/Work		Y	Y
Boutique Hotel		Y	
Mixed-Use			
Educational Use	Y		
Club/Restaurant		Y	
Senior Center	Y		Y
Museum	Y		Y
Business Incubator Space	Y		Y
Solar on Roof	Y		Y
Performance Space	Y		Y
Small Theater		Y	

School Reuse Criteria (for use by the Re-use or Evaluation Committee)

ID #	Category	Topic	Criteria	Evaluation (for explanation only)	Priority Factor
1a	Community Benefits	Intergenerational Use	Provides direct civic benefit through its function or activities for Easthampton residents of all ages	This criterion allows for potential civic uses to be incorporated in the building	3.44
1b		Seniors	Provides direct civic benefit through its function or activities for seniors	Additional bonus points for uses that benefit seniors	3.44
1c		Arts and culture	Provides direct civic benefit through its function or activities for Easthampton artists community	Additional bonus points for uses that benefit arts and culture in Easthampton	3.33
1d		Young residents	Provides direct civic benefit through its function or activities for younger residents	Additional bonus points for uses that benefit teens	2.78
1e		Payment for on-site or off-site improvements	Provides indirect civic benefits through off-site or on-site improvements or additional funding for activities that benefit Easthampton residents	This criterion allows for the new owner to fund off-site improvements or provide direct funding for civic uses at other locations	3.75
1f		Enhanced tax revenue	The reuse of the building provides indirect community benefits through enhanced tax revenues	Provides for the uses that will add to the City's tax revenues - like commercial uses, for-profit uses, senior housing	3.67
1g		Public open space dedication or easement	Provides direct civic benefits in the form of a park or a playground on the site for public use	Provision for a public open space in case the site is not re-parcelized with a public open space during the site disposition stage	3.67
1h		Public parking dedication or easement	Provides direct civic benefits in the form of X spaces of public parking on the site with adequate signage and wayfinding for public use	Provision for public parking in case the site is not re-parcelized with public parking during the site disposition stage	2.72
2a		Financial Considerations	Economic benefits	Future use provides long-term positive economic benefits to the City	Redevelopment/reuse should result in long-term positive economic benefits for the City as a higher NPV of economic benefits
2b		Comparative economic benefits	The higher value proposition for the reuse of the existing building will be preferred if other factors are equal	The highest financial value in the form of purchase price or long-term tax revenue, jobs created may be preferred if all other factors are equal	3.63
2c		Redevelopment schedule	More rapid development and reuse will be preferred to	Redevelopment should be time-bound to reduce City's risk with	3.00

ID #	Category	Topic	Criteria	Evaluation (for explanation only)	Priority Factor
			reduce the holding costs and risks to the City	changing market conditions and proponent's funding	
2d		Financial capability of the proponent to develop, operate, and maintain the use	The preferred reuse proponent must be financially sound and capable of accomplishing and maintaining the reuse that it proposes	Redevelopment / reuse proponent should have secured funding resources to complete the project and sustain the project through lease-up/occupancy stage	3.89
2e		Long-term viability	The new use will be a long-term occupant, and there is a limited risk that the City will be required to undertake a subsequent re-acquisition or disposition process	Redevelopment/reuse should be financially self-sustaining to reduce the risk of defunct/vacant buildings in Downtown and without recourse to City funding for operation and maintenance	4.00
3a	Architectural Design	Preservation of existing architectural character	Building reuse preserves and enhances the existing architectural character of the building	Preference for uses that preserve that existing building	2.56
3b		Compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood	Building reuse/redevelopment that is in keeping with the scale and character of the existing surrounding context	Preference for redevelopment uses that are architecturally compatible with the surrounding uses. This criterion allows for potential demolition of the existing school buildings if they are functionally obsolete for the proposed uses	3.33
3c		Site improvements	Reuse or redevelopment of the buildings enhances the building perimeter for pedestrians and users	Preference for uses that enhance and improve the building perimeter including sidewalks, landscaping, improved pedestrian entrances	4.00
4a	Circulation, Access, and Parking	Parking	Adequate parking is provided for all uses on-site or with shared parking agreements with surrounding or adjacent property owners	Adequate parking for uses on site or with shared parking arrangements so existing parking infrastructure is not impacted	2.89
4b		Future neighborhood connections	Redevelopment/reuse provides additional pedestrian connections through the site with public access paths to improve pedestrian connections to surrounding uses on adjacent lots	Incentive for proponents to incorporate connections to surrounding properties if appropriate	4.11
4c		Pedestrian amenities	Redevelopment/reuse provides a safe, walkable pedestrian	Preference for safe, walkable sidewalks and pedestrian paths	4.00

ID #	Category	Topic	Criteria	Evaluation (for explanation only)	Priority Factor
			environment for all users with sidewalks, pedestrian routes, and lighting separated from vehicular circulation		
4d		Bicyclist amenities	Redevelopment/reuse provides adequate on-site facilities or improvements for bicyclists	Preference for Bicyclists with adequate bicycle infrastructure including bike paths, bike parking around the site if required	2.67
4e		Parking signage	Clear demarcation and signage are provided for vehicular circulation including on-site parking, shared parking, and service vehicles access, loading, and unloading	Clear parking signage	3.11
4f		Signage and wayfinding	Signage will be provided indicating the public ways, pedestrian paths, public amenities, and open space	Clear signage	3.22
4g		Future public benefits	The proponent will participate with the City and the surrounding property owners with any shared parking arrangements, public path easements, open space dedications, and other arrangements as brought forward by the City to allow the continued use of the sites before its redevelopment/reuse to the extent feasible	Ensuring that the proponent is open to reasonable future public benefit arrangements after the site is redeveloped	4.33
5a	Compatibility	Zoning	The reuse/redevelopment will be compatible with zoning regulations in effect at the time of disposition	This criterion ensures that future use is consistent with the zoning. If the community-desired uses are not compatible with the current zoning, then the zoning will have to be changed before disposition	4.44
5b		Traffic management	The reuse/redevelopment will not impose an activity level in terms of traffic that is any greater than when the building was in use as a school	Ensures that the new use does not generate additional traffic	2.89
5c		Night-time uses	The proposed use will not impose night-time activity that creates significant negative impacts or nuisance	Ensures that the new use doesn't add night-time activity impacts	2.56

ID #	Category	Topic	Criteria	Evaluation (for explanation only)	Priority Factor
			with the surrounding neighborhood		
5d		Day-time uses	The use will not result in daytime activities that are inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood	Ensures that the new use doesn't add detrimental daytime activity impacts	2.33
6a	Sustainable Development	Sustainable Design	Redevelopment/reuse of the site and building incorporates eco-friendly and sustainable design features	The building incorporates sustainable design features	3.63
6b		LEED Certification	Redevelopment/reuse of the building will earn LEED Certification level of Silver and higher	Additional benefits if the building pursues LEED certification	3.25
7a	Building Use	Diversity of housing types	The housing use proposed adds to the diversity of housing within the Downtown	This is to ensure that the housing use prioritizes seniors and younger demographic who would like to live closer to Downtown	3.94
7b		Affordable housing	The housing use proposed includes 15% of units as affordable housing units	Ensures affordable housing at the same level as 40R Zoning requirement	3.33
7c		Artist's live-work	The building redevelopment/reuse includes spaces focused towards artists such as artist's live-work spaces, artist's studios	Additional preference if the spaces focused towards artists are incorporated	2.67
8a	Form of Disposition	Disposition	The form of disposition (lease or sale) should be based on market considerations and provide the best net present value to the City	Disposition must provide the best value to the City	3.75

The original chart included a column for the evaluation score from the committee member reviewing the proposal. As part of the RFP development process, the Re-use Committee should reconsider the assigned priority factors to reflect changes since March 2020 and the approved *Easthampton Housing Production Plan (2021-2025)*.

The priority factors shown were drawn from weightings by the Sounding Board members involved in the development of the *Easthampton Downtown Strategic Plan*. The plan recommends reformatting this table to create one for each school with specific weightings of the criteria by school.

The reuse scenarios for each school and site identified several options, including both public and private uses. For example, a portion of the land on the Center School site was identified for public open space and public parking. Such public uses should be discussed by the Re-use Committee when considering restrictions on the use of the site post-disposition. The Re-use Committee should also discuss the number of priorities; the list above is significantly longer than those in the sample RFPs discussed in the next section.

Section 3: Best Practices for Municipal Disposition of Former Schools/Components of Disposition Plans

The following documents are RFPs or, in one case, an RFI, for communities in Massachusetts. This resource is still under development, and further additions will be necessary to complete this document. In addition, interviews with certain communities to judge the level of success with the RFP process would be helpful to supplement the review of written materials. For example, two communities extended the due date for proposal in response to its RFP.

Purpose of RFP	Town	RFP/RFI	Due Date
Redevelopment and Reuse of Memorial School Building	Adams	RFP	March 2021, extended to June 2021
East Street School	Amherst	RFP	Draft
Adaptive Reuse of the Russell School (Northstar)	Hadley	RFI	October 2020
Sullivan School	North Adams	RFP	Missing
Purchase and Adaptive Reuse of The Calvin Coolidge School	Maynard	RFP	September 2019, extended to October 2019
Adaptive Reuse of Brown School Building	Newburyport	RFP	May 2017

Redevelopment and Reuse of Memorial School Building (Adams)

The RFP issued by the Town of Adams was for a portion of the Memorial School building. The Town provided an option for purchase or long-term lease; a combination of uses (multi-family, condominiums, or rental; assisted living, professional office, and educational/institutional, or any combination of those uses); and preferences for reuse (contribution to the local tax base, expansion of housing opportunities, and potential for job creation). Purchase price or lease terms were also identified as part of the criteria. The Town indicated its desire to retain the gymnasium and auditorium for future use but was flexible about other options (see note below on extension of deadline).

The structure of the RFP include background to the project, an overview of the Town and its location within the region, and transportation options. The RFP also provided a detailed description of the site and buildings, a summary of physical and regulatory conditions, parking, environmental assessment, and a description of the neighborhood.

The Goals and Objectives section identifies the following preferences:⁵

- Preference will be given to the creation of new, quality market-rate or workforce housing development, but mixed-use proposals are also welcome.

⁵ Town of Adams, *Disposition & Redevelopment of 30 Columbia Street: RFP #20-004*, 2021, p.10.

- The proposed project should provide positive impact on the local tax base and provide economic benefit to the local community.
- Preference will be given to responses that create new jobs within the community and support community-oriented use of that portion of the building with the gymnasium.
- Preference will be given to proposed projects that add value to the community and work to enhance community character in this part of the town center.
- Preference given to projects that incorporate community gathering places and provide pedestrian-oriented solutions.
- Preference given to projects that respect the building's unique architecture and the existing green space.
- Preference will be given to proposed projects that incorporate green and sustainable design and development practices.

The Town also detailed potential assistance to the developer and the responsibilities of the developer. The Town required the developer to obtain funding. The Town would negotiate the cost of the building and land and was willing to consider a TIF for non-residential properties or an application for a MassWorks grant for infrastructure improvements.

Requirements for submission were standard. Evaluation criteria included rankings on developer experience and ability to successfully develop similar projects, ability to provide a public benefit (address the goals and objectives of the RFP), the compatibility of the project with the neighborhood, and the financial capacity of the developer. Each would be ranked highly advantageous, advantageous, not advantageous, and unacceptable.

The RFP also defined the Rule for Award and specific components of the Purchase and Sale Agreement and the Development Agreement.

Finally, the RFP included a timeline of the process and a section on conditions and restrictions.

Exhibits were provided in a Dropbox link but were not listed in the RFP.

Adams issued an addendum that extended the period for submitting response. Within the addendum, the Town identified several options that may be of interest to Easthampton:

- Potential lease back of community space (gymnasium and auditorium) to the Town.
- Potential shared use of the gymnasium and auditorium between the Town and the developer.

Other questions that were asked of the Town included utility costs, size of the service, whether components such as the elevator and sprinkler system were up to code, and the condition of the HVAC system. Easthampton should consider creating a FAQ sheet to accompany the RFP with answer to common questions such as these.

A conversation with the community to understand why the due date was extended is recommended.

East Street School (Amherst)

The first page of the RFP contains a summary of the most critical information. Similar to other RFPs, this is followed by a summary of the project's background and a description of the property. This includes the location of wetlands, local utility providers, a link to site and conceptual design plans (the webpage has all the resources related to this project), zoning, easement, and a description of the bidder's responsibility for due diligence, with associated disclaimers.

The Town provide a detailed list of objectives and guidelines including the type and affordability of housing; guideless for design and construction; and the unit count, configuration, and rents. The RFP also describes a required management and maintenance plan, the roles of the Town and the developer, and components of the Land Disposition Agreement.

The minimum criteria are defined, and the comparative criteria are listed. The evaluation criteria are described in more detail in Appendix D (see below).

Other sections include the submission requirements, the review process, and the terms and requirements.

The RFP includes four appendices.

- Appendix A: Certificate of Tax Compliance
- Appendix B: Certificate of Non-collusion
- Appendix C: Disclosure of Beneficial Interest in Real Property Transaction
- Appendix D: East Street School Comparative Criteria

The Comparative Criteria are listed in detail with additional detail that defined what is highly advantageous, advantageous, acceptable, and unacceptable. Criteria include the affordability of the units provided, the track record of the developer, the financial feasibility of the project, the schedule, unit mix, design, management and maintenance plan, community support, and Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

The RFP available on the Town's informative webpage for this project is a draft. A conversation with the community to understand the status of this project is recommended.

Adaptive Reuse of the Russell School (Northstar) (Hadley)

The Town of Hadley issued a Request for Interest (RFI), rather than an RFP. The Town provided links to a building survey and its historic preservation plan. The RFI has minimal information, with a short history of the site, applicable zoning, and possible eligibility for Community Preservation Funds.

A conversation with the community to understand what the response as and whether a full RFP was issued is recommended.

Sullivan School (North Adams)

Not yet reviewed.

Purchase and Adaptive Reuse of the Calvin Coolidge School (Maynard)

In common with the RFPs from other communities, Maynard's RFP begins with a summary of the project, key goals, and criteria for selection.

The schedule and key FAQs about the process follows the introduction.

The Town provided a conceptual lot layout and described the portion to be sold and the portion to be retained by the Town (an existing public park). Because of the building's status as eligible for listing on the National Historic Register, and because of the Town's interest in preserving key architectural details, the RFP contains a detailed description of the building, with images of the interior.

This is followed by a description of the Town and support for its desirability as a place to locate new uses.

The Town also has a section on incentives for developers. This section includes the following:

- Joint application for a CDGB grant.
- Possible support from the Affordable Housing Trust
- Support from the Maynard Historic Commission to designate the school on the National Register of Historic Places so that the project is eligible for State and Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credits.
- Possible support from the Community Preservation Committee.

The RFP identified preferred options for adaptive reuse; these were changed in a later addendum (see below). The Town also identified 9 goals for reuse which were incorporated into the comparative evaluation criteria (see discussion below). This included a list of desired enhancements to the neighborhood and park, listed in order of importance. The evaluation criteria were also listed in this section, in addition to the full appendix devoted to the evaluation criteria (see below).

Submission requirements and additional information were standard; the additional information was the terms and conditions of the proposal submission. This RFP also identified the section and award process and additional terms for the purchase and sale agreement. The RFP listed planned restrictions on the use of the property in this section. Finally, the Town provided a list of reservations and disclaimers

All Appendices were included as part of the RFP, including the following:

- Links to relevant information and resources.
- Conceptual layout.
- Recommendations from the Maynard Historical Commission, some of which were preservation restrictions and some of which were recommendations.
- A professional report on historically significant features.

- The full MACRIS entry and supporting materials for the school.
- The comparative evaluation criteria (see discussion below)
- Several forms, a sample disclosure statement, sample purchase and sale agreement, and a checklist of requirements.

The comparative evaluation criteria are discussed in detail in the appendix. The criteria considered included the following:

- The inclusion of new uses.
- Preservation of access to playground and sledding hill.
- Provision of housing units.
- Preservation of historic features.
- Experience with similar projects.
- Financial benefits to the Town.
- Design criteria.
- Energy efficiencies in renovations.

Note that the later addenda, discussed below, changed some of these criteria.

The evaluation rating scale assigned specific points to highly advantageous (16), advantageous (4), less advantageous (2) and not advantageous (1).

The first addendum extended the deadline for responses to October 2019.

The second addendum changed the process schedule and the accessibility of data and revised the conceptual plans and other information in the original RFP. This addendum also updated the status of repairs to the roof, required that the proposer complete the full development of the design plans, identified responsibility of the Town to request certain waivers, and established the right to deed restrictions on impermeable surface area.

The third addendum updated the redevelopment options and altered the first of the comparative evaluation criteria to be more specific. Ratings were determined based on how many residential units were proposed and whether either (1) units dedicated to seniors or (2) an increased number of affordable units would be provided.

The updated redevelopment options were as follows:⁶

Preferred property adaptive reuse plans could be one or more of the following:

- Residential units/condominiums sold at market rate.
- Residential units/condominiums sold at market rate, with one or more units designated as affordable housing units in perpetuity -or- with one or more units designated as senior citizen housing.
- Residential units/condominiums, with each individual unit to be sold as an affordable housing unit in perpetuity.

⁶Town of Maynard, *Request for Proposals for the Purchase and Adaptive Reuse of the Calvin Coolidge School*, 2019, p. 89

- Rental apartment units, with one or more units designated as affordable housing in perpetuity or with one or more units designated as senior citizen residences.
- Co-housing is allowed, since it is a variation of multi-family housing.
- Nonprofit educational uses, such as a school or childcare center.
- Any type of residential or educational use noted above, with space set aside for rental to a nonprofit organization or government agency serving children, senior citizens, families, or the Town’s recreational, cultural, or historical needs.

A conversation with the community to understand why the due date was extended and whether the process was successful is recommended.

Adaptive Reuse of Brown School Building (Newburyport)

Newburyport’s summary includes use restrictions on the site, including compatibility with the operations of the Youth Center which remained on site.

Project goals include the following:⁷

- Financial benefit to the City, including proposed purchase or lease price.
- Proposers anticipated level of assistance in undertaking renovations to the rear building addition to accommodate the Newburyport Youth Center in connection with the existing gym space (outside and separate from the main building).
- Creation of new affordable housing units.
- Creative redevelopment proposals including, but not limited to, multi-family residential, artist studios, artist live-work space, and the incorporation of green building techniques and materials.
- Reuse of the building and its site, which is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the Newburyport Youth Center.

The City provided images of the site, floorplan, and pictures of the building.

The City also provided a short community profile and a longer description of the property, including a description of portions of the building that were historically significant. All attachments were provided via a Dropbox link and the attachments were listed within the RFP.

The City identified development guidelines, including the terms and conditions of the disposition (including use restrictions), disclosures about conditions, zoning requirements, and design guidelines for the building, the site, and the relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.

The RFP listed the required components of the proposal which were consistent with other proposals. The requirements for the price proposal provided the most recent municipal assessment of the building.

After describing interview process and naming the interview committee, the City defined the minimum evaluation criteria, discussed the evaluation process, and

⁷ City of Newburyport, *Request for Proposals Adaptive Reuse of Brown School Building*, 2017, p. 2.

provided comparative evaluation criteria. These included descriptions of the following components:

- Proposed Purchase Price
- Proposed Adaptive Reuse Plan
- Project Schedule
- Development Team Qualifications
- Financial Stability & Capacity

The City defined conditions for the solicitation.

A conversation with the community to understand whether the process was successful is recommended – this is the oldest of the RFPs reviewed.

DRAFT

Section 4: RFP Criteria for Housing and Economic Development. Smart Growth, and Sustainable Buildings and Site Practices

The RFPs reviewed do not contain detailed criteria for sustainable buildings and site practices. The City of Easthampton has design standards for its Smart Growth District, and it has adopted the Stretch Code. Additional RFPs and discussions with communities may identify RFPs that had more specific requirements for sustainable buildings or reveal whether such practices were components of the proposals in response to the RFPs.

DRAFT