



RFP200172 - Redevelopment of Urban Government Center

Scoring Summary

Active Submissions

Supplier	Total / 110 pts	GFE Pass/Fail	Preference / 10 pts	Compatibility / 15 pts	Proposed Development / 40 pts
Underhill Associates	84.5	Pass	10	11.4	28
Booker Design Collaborative	62	Pass	10	8.4	21.6



Team Experience	Community Benefits
/ 25 pts	/ 20 pts
19.5	15.6
12	10



RFP200172 - Redevelopment of Urban Government Center

Underhill Associates

Scoring Summary

Evaluation Group 1 - Initial Evaluation

Reviewer	GFE Pass/Fail
Alan Cunningham	Pass
Average:	Pass
	↓
Calculated:	Pass

Evaluation Group 2 - Preference Evaluation

Reviewer	Total / 10 pts	Preference / 10 pts
Kim Henry	10	10
Average:	10	10
		↓
Calculated:	10	10



Evaluation Group 3 - Compatibility

Reviewer	Total / 15 pts	Compatibility / 15 pts
Gretchen Milliken	12	8 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	10.5	7 / 10
Laura Grabowski	12	8 / 10
larry lenahan	10.5	7 / 10
Benjamin Moore	12	8 / 10
	Average:	7.6 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	11.4	11.4

Evaluation Group 4 - Proposed Development

Reviewer	Total / 40 pts	Proposed Development / 40 pts
Gretchen Milliken	32	8 / 10



Kiffany McAfee	28	7 / 10
Laura Grabowski	28	7 / 10
larry lenahan	20	5 / 10
Benjamin Moore	32	8 / 10
	Average:	7 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	28	28

Evaluation Group 5 - Team Experience

Reviewer	Total / 25 pts	Team Experience / 25 pts
Gretchen Milliken	20	8 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	20	8 / 10
Laura Grabowski	20	8 / 10



larry lenahan	17.5	7 / 10
Benjamin Moore	20	8 / 10
	Average:	7.8 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	19.5	19.5

Evaluation Group 6 - Community Benefits

Reviewer	Total / 20 pts	Community Benefits / 20 pts
Gretchen Milliken	16	8 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	16	8 / 10
Laura Grabowski	16	8 / 10
larry lenahan	14	7 / 10
Benjamin Moore	16	8 / 10
	Average:	7.8 / 10
		↓



Calculated:	15.6	15.6
-------------	------	------

Scoring Comments

GFE - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Alan Cunningham	Pass	Meets the requirement(s)	Bidder provided completed GFE.

Preference - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Kim Henry	10	Other	local vendor-yes minimum wage-yes

Compatibility - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Gretchen Milliken	8 / 10	High level of detail in response	Clear, comprehensive and detailed compatibility plan that includes community representation and involvement as well as tying into the CHASE principles.



Kiffany McAfee	7 / 10	Mostly complete response	The developers' provide good elements of neighborhood goals and priorities; creative adaptive reuse which include new urbanism, multi-generational housing, mix use facilities retail, daycare, grocery/farmers market, abundant green space and sustainability designs (solar), and walkable, bike and pedestrian safe parkways.
Laura Grabowski	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Displacement plan included. Detailed explanation of compatibility. Multi-generational and mixed use. Includes affordable housing.
larry lenahan	7 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	The proposed development of primarily senior, student, and affordable housing along with small retail uses fits in with the overall land uses of nearby surrounding neighborhoods.
Benjamin Moore	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Pledging to reuse/keep most/all of existing structures as desired by neighbor input.

Proposed Development - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
----------	-------	--------	----------



Gretchen Milliken	8 / 10	High level of detail in response	Detailed proposal that covers many of the aspects of development and addresses many of the community concerns regarding historic preservation, green space and affordability. Proforma appears to be thorough and strait forward, underlining a nearly \$9M gap, but makes suggestions as to how to address the gap through partnership with the city.
Kiffany McAfee	7 / 10	Mostly complete response	Strong proposal, responsive to community needs, neighborhood stabilization plan and integrate city-wide visionary strategies.
Laura Grabowski	7 / 10	Other	Planned reuse of hospital building. Detailed description of tenants. Describes funding gap.
larry lenahan	5 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	The proposed development plan provides a rather detailed plan description including adaptive reuse of existing buildings on site. However, the potential large amount and exact type of taxpayer assistance needed to potentially carry out the development plan to fruition is not clearly defined.



Benjamin Moore	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Community serving retail amenities, community housing and partners make this a strong submission. With affordable senior housing and Bellarmine U students, a multi-generational living model would be nice in this area.
----------------	--------	----------------------------------	---

Team Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Gretchen Milliken	8 / 10	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Diverse, professional and experienced team with extensive relevant project experience and financial capabilities to pull off a project of this size. Somewhat unclear what the roles and responsibilities of all the players will be, but shows commitment to diversity and minority owned businesses.
Kiffany McAfee	8 / 10	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Proven track record in the space of neighborhood planning and development, affordability, urbanism, and economic sustainability; the extensive collaborative partnerships, and local support, and diverse staff are representative of the community-wide vision



Laura Grabowski	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Detailed partner list.
larry lenahan	7 / 10	Mostly complete response	The developer has participated at some level on a number of various other redevelopment projects.
Benjamin Moore	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Very impressive team including a number of proven developments in Louisville and beyond. Developments appear to be high quality and in line with original plans.

Community Benefits - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Gretchen Milliken	8 / 10	High level of detail in response	Community benefits are responsive to the feedback from the neighborhood, providing connectivity, green and open space, grocery and services and affordable housing. the proposal also commits to providing jobs and workforce training to the residents in the surrounding neighborhoods as well as continual community involvement and engagement.



Kiffany McAfee	8 / 10	High level of detail in response	The proposal is concise and well detailed; illustrates a vision infused with inspiration and vitality. This proposal is well researched, and identifies various aspects of community feedback and engagement needs, and offers the most benefit to public goods; to include creating increased jobs/training for residents and students as a component of an excellent anti displacement initiatives.
Laura Grabowski	8 / 10	High level of detail in response	Extremely detailed plan for community benefits.
larry lenahan	7 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	The proposed development of primarily senior, student and affordable housing units and a few small retail uses (grocery, daycare, restaurant, and fitness facility) along with additional green space are mostly in keeping and complimentary of the surrounding neighborhood land uses.
Benjamin Moore	8 / 10	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Meets my expectations for their current stage of work



RFP200172 - Redevelopment of Urban Government Center Booker Design Collaborative

Scoring Summary

Evaluation Group 1 - Initial Evaluation

Reviewer	GFE Pass/Fail
Alan Cunningham	Pass
Average:	Pass
	↓
Calculated:	Pass

Evaluation Group 2 - Preference Evaluation

Reviewer	Total / 10 pts	Preference / 10 pts
Kim Henry	10	10
Average:	10	10
		↓
Calculated:	10	10



Evaluation Group 3 - Compatibility

Reviewer	Total / 15 pts	Compatibility / 15 pts
Gretchen Milliken	7.5	5 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	9	6 / 10
Laura Grabowski	7.5	5 / 10
larry lenahan	9	6 / 10
Benjamin Moore	9	6 / 10
	Average:	5.6 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	8.4	8.4

Evaluation Group 4 - Proposed Development

Reviewer	Total / 40 pts	Proposed Development / 40 pts
Gretchen Milliken	24	6 / 10



Kiffany McAfee	24	6 / 10
Laura Grabowski	16	4 / 10
larry lenahan	20	5 / 10
Benjamin Moore	24	6 / 10
	Average:	5.4 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	21.6	21.6

Evaluation Group 5 - Team Experience

Reviewer	Total / 25 pts	Team Experience / 25 pts
Gretchen Milliken	7.5	3 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	15	6 / 10
Laura Grabowski	10	4 / 10



larry lenahan	15	6 / 10
Benjamin Moore	12.5	5 / 10
	Average:	4.8 / 10
		↓
Calculated:	12	12

Evaluation Group 6 - Community Benefits

Reviewer	Total / 20 pts	Community Benefits / 20 pts
Gretchen Milliken	6	3 / 10
Kiffany McAfee	12	6 / 10
Laura Grabowski	8	4 / 10
larry lenahan	14	7 / 10
Benjamin Moore	10	5 / 10
	Average:	5 / 10
		↓



Calculated:	10	10
-------------	----	----

Scoring Comments

GFE - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Alan Cunningham	Pass	Meets the requirement(s)	Vendor provided completed GFE.

Preference - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Kim Henry	10	Other	local vendor-yes minimum wage-yes

Compatibility - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Gretchen Milliken	5 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	Lacks a clear vision for the area and details about how they will achieve the different aspects to make a "sustainable" and "abundant" neighborhood. Proposal is disjointed, wordy and rather general.



Kiffany McAfee	6 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	Proposal provides good claims for integrating thriving local business, creative art, and enriched heritage enhanced with cuisine restaurants and entertainment venues.
Laura Grabowski	5 / 10	Partially supported claim(s)	No displacement plan. Unclear if uses will be compatible with existing neighborhood.
larry lenahan	6 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	The proposed mix of new market rate housing and is in keeping with surrounding neighborhood uses. The proposed office space and small hotel are slightly different commercial uses than immediate surrounding neighborhood land uses, but not unacceptable in their proposed form.
Benjamin Moore	6 / 10	Partially supported claim(s)	Submission contains many impressive elements for retail and reuse, however a lack of commitment to reusing buildings on the site is concerning given the neighborhood feedback.

Proposed Development - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
----------	-------	--------	----------



Gretchen Milliken	6 / 10	Medium level of detail in response	Proposal goes beyond Urban Gov't Center site making it difficult to compare to the other proposal and to know what to score and what not to score. Proposal lacks detail and draws heavily from a French history that is not longer relevant to this area. Proposal does not address equity and inclusion. Proforma is disjointed and hard to get a comprehensive understanding of.
Kiffany McAfee	6 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	Proposal expresses valid concepts and ideas for urbanistic plans and expansive economic development.
Laura Grabowski	4 / 10	Medium level of detail in response	Lower level of detail on hospital building and other on-site plans.



larry lenahan	5 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	The overall proposed development of new market rate housing fits the current high demand locally as well as nationally for this type of housing opportunity. A new office development would provide increased daytime traffic to support nearby neighborhood small retail and restaurants. A new boutique hotel would provide night-time traffic to support nearby restaurants and shops as well. However, the referenced \$20,000,000 in public infrastructure costs associated with the project needs much more clarification. The proposal lacks specificity with regards to the hospital building.
Benjamin Moore	6 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	Envisioning the entire neighborhood is very nice and appreciated. However, the plans for the property in question seem to rely more on work already completed. The density they propose is impressive.

Team Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
----------	-------	--------	----------



Gretchen Milliken	3 / 10	Missing / mismatched attributes	Lead consultant (Booker Design Collaborative) missing from team experience!! Team lacks diversity and expertise in certain areas, such as mixed income/affordable housing and community engagement.
Kiffany McAfee	6 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	Team experience demonstrates a broad level of expertise and proven track record of commercial development.
Laura Grabowski	4 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	Lower level of detail on partner responsibilities
larry lenahan	6 / 10	Partially fits desired attributes	The proposed developer has provided some supporting project experience.
Benjamin Moore	5 / 10	Mostly complete response	The team has a great product in their existing Paristown development, but the depth of their development experience in pulling off an adaptive reuse of this magnitude is in question.

Community Benefits - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
----------	-------	--------	----------



Gretchen Milliken	3 / 10	Poor level of detail in response	Unclear what the community benefits are aside from the area-wide proposal for the site. Mixed income housing seems to be an afterthought and lacks detail and description as to how it is integrated into the site. Again, the proposal expands beyond the area defined in the SOI so it is difficult to score or understand what is included and what isn't.
Kiffany McAfee	6 / 10	Partially meets my expectations	Favorable ideas and strong community response for library and local staple businesses. The developer provides adequate response and research for adequate parking plans, increase traffic flow and mitigation plan for view shed and aesthetics of housing plan designs.
Laura Grabowski	4 / 10	Other	Community benefits are unclear.
larry lenahan	7 / 10	Mostly complete response	The proposed development enhances the overall existing character and current status of the surrounding neighborhoods.
Benjamin Moore	5 / 10	Medium level of detail in response	Again, the entirety of their neighborhood plan is interesting, but this section seems to lack specific opportunities for CB.