

In City Council pkg.



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139

TEL 349-4300
FAX 349-4307



EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
ROBERT W. HEALY
City Manager

RICHARD C. ROSSI
Deputy City Manager

July 28, 1998

To The Honorable, the City Council:

Enclosed are copies of the minutes of the first three meetings of the Neville Manor Site Advisory Committee. We will continue to send minutes of the meetings to the City Council.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy
City Manager

NEVILLE MANOR SITE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 9, 1998

Attendees: Jim Barton, Janet Burns, Michael Haran, Joe Harrington, John O'Brien, Neil Rosenberg, Richard Rossi, Ellen Semonoff, Albe Simenas, staff and consultant Dennis Carlone.

At the outset, introductions were made and each person described the interests or group(s) they were representing.

Rich Rossi introduced the idea of a consultant who would be able to take the ideas the committee had and do some conceptual design work to facilitate the work of the committee. (Dennis Carlone was later introduced as that consultant.)

Rich Rossi also stressed that the City Manager saw the City Council's adoption of the home rule petition as an affirmation of two principles: that the City was committed to continuation of nursing home care and to the development of affordable assisted living and that the City was committed to ensuring that development on the Neville Manor site was done in a manner that maximized green open space and protected the water supply.

Many members of the committee spoke about their concerns and the interests that they wished to see accommodated in a final siting plan for the project. A summary of the many of the key points is:

- (1) Would like in the end to be able to say to Secretary Coxe and the upland communities that there is no change of use, including the intensity of use. No adverse change of use relative to water quality
- (2) Opportunity to "create" open space making the Neville site more accessible and welcoming
- (3) No adverse impact on quality or quantity of water, and ensure use of naturalistic best management practices
- (4) Maximize green open space
- (5) There have to be improvements along with the changes to balance
- (6) Make site feel like it is part of the reservation, less isolated
- (7) Important to use opportunity to provide improvements of Water Dept. operations, with an eye toward locating such uses offsite in the future
- (8) Need to accommodate 90 -100 nursing beds here or elsewhere
- (9) Need to ensure that existing residents are not displaced and moved only once

(10) The project has to be financially viable

One formulation of the objectives for the advisory committee that was offered was:

- No change in use of the site
- Preserve the quality and quantity of the water supply
- Create more accessible open space on the site
- Improve connection of the site to the reservation

Rich Rossi also laid out the three alternatives that the group would be looking at for siting: (all the alternatives would operate within the constraints of the 51,034 square feet referenced in the home rule petition)

1. Rehabilitate Neville Manor as an assisted living facility, remove the three facilities on the site (the Superintendent's house, the ecology center and the administration building) and build a nursing home somewhere on the project site.
2. Demolish Neville Manor and the three facilities on the site and rebuild an assisted living facility and a nursing home somewhere on the project site.
3. Rehabilitate Neville Manor, leave the three facilities and locate the nursing home offsite

The next meeting was scheduled for July 16 at 4:00 at Neville Manor.

NEVILLE MANOR SITE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 16, 1998

Attendees: Jim Barton, Janet Burns, Michael Haran, Joe Harrington, John O'Brien, Richard Rossi, Ellen Semonoff, Albe Simenas, Louise Weed, staff and consultant Dennis Carlone.

Rich Rossi began the meeting by introducing Cambridge Historical Commission Executive Director Charles Sullivan, who reviewed historic preservation issues at Neville Manor.

Charles described the issues related to the possible demolition of the Neville Manor Building, the demolition of the superintendent's house and/or the demolition of just the power plant. At the local level, the city's demolition review ordinance calls for the Historical Commission to protect "significant buildings" fifty years old and older which "constitute or reflect features of architectural, political, economic or social history of the city." Charles noted that the Commission would be likely to find the complex "significant" as an example of the city's social and political and history in its care of low income residents. Once a determination of significance is made, the Commission must decide whether the building is to be preferably preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished. The determination of whether the building or buildings is to be preferably preserved includes consideration of the significance of the building against the proposed replacement project and consideration of why the building cannot be preserved as part of the new project. If there were a finding that the building should be preferably preserved, no demolition permit could be issued for six months, during which time the Commission could undertake a landmark designation study. It would take City Council approval to designate the building as a landmark.

In addition to local historical review, Charles explained that a building and site can also be placed on the National Register of Historic Places, a federal designation that is administered by the Massachusetts Historical Commission. Inclusion in the Register is relevant to Neville Manor's redevelopment in part because a listing on the Register would allow the proponents to apply for federal tax incentives for renovations. Properties that are listed or are eligible to be listed can receive the tax incentives. In addition, where federal or state permits or licenses are being sought, properties that are eligible or listed on the Register may be required to enter into negotiations about ways to mitigate any adverse affects of the project. Charles noted that the buildings are considered eligible by the Massachusetts Historical Commission staff, although no formal determination has been made. He further offered his view that while it would be possible that historical tax credits could be obtained for Neville and the superintendent's house without the power plant, in his view, it was unlikely that historical tax credits could be obtained for the rehab of Neville without the superintendent's house.

There were many questions about the historical issues and there was extensive discussion about the issue of the significance of the building and ways to address that significance at the site.

Committee consultant Dennis Carlone next summarized his work over the past week, during which he met with a number of committee members and staff to gain a fuller sense of the project. Dennis offered a brief summary of those meetings and reviewed some early thoughts and possible approaches based on information gathered to date. In addition to the principles that had been laid out by the committee the week before, Dennis noted several other ideas:

- The site should be staked out

- The view from Concord Ave needs not to be overwhelming

- The school facility in the trailer might be accommodated in the facility

- The heating system might be able to be moved into another building

- It was important to try not to leave more problems for the future

- It might be possible to have parking in the afternoon along the roadway

- The Neville Manor building was more impressive than he had thought

It was agreed that more thought needed to be given to how the third alternative, moving the nursing home offsite, would be approached. For the next meeting, it was agreed that John O'Brien would provide a summary of the offsite options that had been considered so that they could be discussed. He also offered to invite David Ennis of Affirmative Investments to the next meeting to summarize the project's financing.

Two members of the public from the Friends of Neville Manor spoke against demolition of Neville Manor and in support of the project overall. John noted we had not really spoken about the interests of the current residents in continuing to live on the Neville Manor site. He wanted to make sure that the Committee was aware of the strength of their desire to remain at the site.

The next three meetings were scheduled:

July 23 at 8:00-9:30 a.m. at City Hall (for discussion of other sites and financing) (Note: David Ennis is on vacation this week and will be unable to attend; he is available to attend the following week.)

Thursday, July 30, 4:00-5:15 p.m. at Neville Manor (Dennis will present very preliminary drawings for brainstorming)

Thursday, August 6, at 8:00-9:30 a.m. at Neville Manor (Dennis to present somewhat more detailed alternatives)

NEVILLE MANOR SITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 23, 1998

Attendees: Jim Barton, Janet Burns, Michael Haran, Joe Harrington, John O'Brien, Richard Rossi, Ellen Semonoff, Albe Simenas, and staff.

Michael Feloney from the Cambridge Housing Authority did a presentation of a site alternatives' matrix that was done based on the method used for the Library 21 process by Sasaki. Michael explained the meanings of the different categories in the matrix, program suitability, parcel size, location and proximity, access and availability. He noted that the basic difference between this matrix and the one done for the library 21 process is that this was done by the proponent for one site rather than by an independent entity. He tried, however, in doing the matrix, to address each category in a straightforward manner. Several observations and corrections were made in regard to the matrix, including that the existing Neville Manor site should not be listed under "suitability of the program" for the existing site.

Rich Rossi explained that one key difference between this project and the library has to do with the availability of eminent domain power to take land where the property owner is not willing to sell or where there is no agreement on the price. He raised questions about whether the City could or would do a land taking where the land was to be transferred to another entity. John O'Brien noted that it was not possible to operate the nursing home on a parcel that was less than 50,000 square feet because of parking, set backs and access needs. The one parcel where less than 50,000 might be acceptable would be a parcel of 43,000 square feet located right across from the existing site since the parking might be accommodated on the existing site. There was discussion about the unwillingness of the owner of that parcel to sell; given that it is an elderly man with family that wish to remain in the property, the possibility of a sale or land taking seemed quite remote. Another parcel raised to John by Ann Roosevelt was a piece of the Grace site. That is listed in the matrix but the information on it was incomplete at this time. Concerns were raised about that site for a nursing home because of its proximity to Alewife Brook Parkway and because it appears that the sale of the land will preclude residential uses given the issues about soil contamination. There was discussion of the Mooney Street site and several members noted that it was in an industrial warehouse area which would not be very suitable for a nursing home siting. Significant contamination was raised as a serious barrier to another site at 445 Concord Ave.

Rich went through the various Central Square sites and discussed the issues that each raised. He offered the view that what was really necessary for an alternative to be suitable was a site in West Cambridge with some open space. There was considerable discussion about the possibility that a viable site might exist at Blair Pond. Although there could be issues about access as well as availability, there was great interest in having an investigation done about a possible site at Blair Pond. John agreed to begin an investigation into the Blair Pond site and to report back to the Committee. It was noted that perhaps the city could take over the control of some of the open space from the MDC as a piece of any project.

There was further discussion about alternatives to building a new nursing home, such as pairing with Sancta Maria or with Youville. John and Paul Hollings described their intensive discussions

with Youville which seemed quite unlikely to lead to a partnership. Youville's current financial problems and the difficulty of the Cambridge Health Alliance adding nursing home beds at Youville made this not a viable alternative. (HUD holds a mortgage secured by the whole building and any monies the Cambridge Health Alliance put in would be subordinated to the HUD mortgage). Sancta Maria is currently at capacity, and would be unlikely to sell off some of its land to the Cambridge Health Alliance to create a competing institution in its back yard.

Michael Haran noted that the calculations of the costs for running the nursing home and assisted living facility were based on some sharing of services, rehab, some kitchen services, etc. This is one of the reasons why the proximity of the nursing home and the assisted living facility is important. It was noted that the Blair Pond alternative to be explored might well be close enough to allow for some shared services.

John reported that at the Neville Board meeting last night there were serious concerns raised about pursuing any alternative that had significant risks that could cause the project to implode, such as large environmental clean up problems.

It was agreed that information about the 3 or 4 most plausible sites would be more fully detailed and that the Blair Pond site would be explored. Information about the financing of the project was passed out and will be discussed more fully at the next meeting.

The next meeting was rescheduled to the Ackerman Room (from Neville Manor) and will be at 4:00 on July 30. The following meeting will be at Neville Manor at 8:00 on August 6.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Rossi, Deputy City Manager

FROM: Michael Feloney *MF*

DATE: July 20, 1998

RE: Neville Manor - Site Alternatives

CC: Dennis Carlone

Attached for your review and comment is the draft site analysis matrix I mentioned last week. It was originally prepared in connection with a hearing in May before the City Council's Health and Hospital's sub-committee. The City Manager had requested that a general "options matrix" be prepared for that meeting; I had prepared the attached for John O'Brien's use in summarizing the sites considered under the 'explore other sites' option of that general matrix.

You will notice immediately that the matrix attached is based in its format and methodology on the matrix prepared by Sasaki Associates for the library site selection study. Please note that it was originally prepared for internal use only, as opposed to public distribution. Since the Sasaki study had been widely praised as a model for site analysis and selection, I thought that it would be useful to "test" alternative sites using a similar approach, and contacted Carla Francazio of Sasaki Associates to see how they had approached the library study. While the matrix attached cites Sasaki's work, I wanted to make clear by memo as well that it is directly based on their work.

The rankings were for the most part completed by me and are of course subject to revision. An inherent limitation in this regard is that the matrix obviously is not an analysis prepared by an objective third party, as was the library matrix. That said, I have not intentionally skewed any of the rankings, and hope it can be of use as a way to at least summarize and review the sites considered. Some other explanatory comments regarding the criteria adapted from the library study are provided below.

- Program suitability. Rankings in the case of sites with existing buildings were based primarily on how adaptable those buildings might be to a nursing home use. In the case of open sites, this category overlaps the 'parcel size' category, in that suitability is closely related to how a new building would fit on the site.
- Parcel size. The 50,000 square foot figure is based on a skilled nursing foot print of 15,000 square feet, 12,250 square feet for parking (35 spaces at 350 square feet per space), and set back square footage of 18,000 (an average 4,500 per side), and a 5,000 SF drop-off area.
- Location & Proximity. Note that this will category involves a normative judgment, in terms of what the best location for a nursing home is, and what it should be nearby. The attached considers proximity to the assisted living facility to be the most important criterion, and in that sense the rankings may be seen as being 'loaded'.
- Access. This does not seem to be as critical a category as it was for the library (e.g., the users are not coming and going each time they use the facility), and perhaps can be dropped or modified.
- Availability. I kept this category as it appeared in the library study, for the sake of initial review. Cambridge Health Alliance may want to review rankings in light of potential cost issues.

Neville Manor Skilled Nursing Facility Site Selection Analysis*

PRELIMINARY SITE EVALUATION

July 20,1998

SITE DESCRIPTION					PRELIMINARY CRITERIA				Preliminary Tally
District	Location	Parcel Size	Existing Building (s) Size	Program Suitability	Parcel Size	Location & proximity	Access	Availability	
		sf	sf	1 = good fit	1 = 50,000	1 = good	1 = good	1 = City-owned	
				0.5 = fair fit	.5=40,000+	0.5 = fair	0.5 = fair	0.5 = private	
				0 = poor fit	0=<40,000	0 = poor	0 = poor	0 = unlikely	
WEST CAMBRIDGE	769&773 Concord Avenue (Fusilli's/Noor's carpet store)	24,128	n/a	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	2
	655 Concord Avenue (31 unit condo building)	36,376	50,949	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	3
	13 Mooney Street (old Martignetti warehouse)	93,932	37,200	0	1	0	0.5	0**	1.5
	445 Concord Avenue (one story warehouse)	97,760	n/a	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0***	2.5
	641& 645 Concord Avenue (private residence/BBN-owned empty lot)	43,720	2,900	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	3
	545 Concord Avenue (office building)	15,222	16,279	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5
	650 Concord Avenue (existing site)	340,000	77,980	1	1	1	1	1	5
NORTH CAMBRIDGE	MBTA Site Trolley Yard	111,530	n/a	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	3
	Grace site (Information needed from David Vickery)								
CENTRAL SQUARE	115 Prospect Street (Bread and Circus)	26,325	13,452	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5
	(Prospect Street parking lot)	53,000	n/a	1	1	0	1	0	3
	(Naggar Block)	56,000	27,900	0	1	0	1	1	3
	(7-Eleven Block)	36,230	30,000	0	0	0	1	1	2
	(TAD-Dangle properties)	46,190	90,000	0	0.5	0	1	1	2.5
	(Post Office gut rehab)	39,350	55,750	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	3
	(YMCA)	30,241	180,000	0	0	0	1	1	2
	(Police Station Block)	36,035	51,000	0	0	0	1	0.5	1.5
	(Cambridge Gas and Light)	28,000	43,000	0	0	0	1	0.5	1.5
	(Salvation Army site)	28,000	27,000	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5

* Analysis is based in format and content on the site analysis matrix prepared for the City of Cambridge by Sasaki Associates, April 1998. Prepared for private use.

** under agreement

*** highly contaminated

d:\neville\outreach\matrix.xls

How the Neville Manor Assisted Living Facility will achieve Affordability

Under the proposed development plan, Neville Manor will be converted into a 71 unit assisted living facility. A total of 80%, or 57 units, will be targeted to elders making less than 80% of median income as determined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. More specifically, of these 57 units, 39 will be available to residents earning less than 60% of median income and 18 will be targeted to elders making between 60% and 80% of area median income. The remaining 14 units, or 20%, will be available to residents at market rates. (A table showing how these area median income percentages translate into current income levels is attached on the accompanying page.) To make the assisted living facility affordable, Neville Community Partners will utilize both capital and operating subsidies that are only available for projects that support low-income housing.

On the capital side, to renovate the assisted living facility, Neville Community Partners currently plans to use the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program, State and City of Cambridge HOME funds, the State's Housing Innovations Fund program, and the Massachusetts Housing Partnership Permanent Loan program.

Under the plan, Low Income Housing Tax Credits will be the major source of capital funding. By reserving 39 of the units, or 55%, for elderly residents earning less than 60% of median income, Neville Community Partners can generate approximately \$2.3 million in tax credit equity for the project. To receive Low Income Housing Tax Credits, a project must maintain its affordability component for a minimum of fifteen years. Neville Community Partners has pledged to keep the 39 tax credit units affordable in perpetuity.

Neville Community Partners also plans to access a total of \$1 million in HOME funds from the State and the City of Cambridge. Because the City of Cambridge is considered an 'entitlement community', that is, a municipality which receives its own allocation of Home funds each year, the State's Department of Housing and Community Development requires that in order to access \$500,000 from the State, the City of Cambridge must provide an equal amount. The State will only provide HOME funds to projects located in Cambridge if the City provides a matching commitment. The \$1 million in HOME funds will be a long term deferred payment loan.

An additional \$330,000 will come from the State's Housing Innovation Funds (HIF). The HIF funds will be loaned to the project at a below market interest rate and will also be a long-term deferred payment loan.

By assembling these funds, Neville Community Partners will be able to reduce the amount of debt necessary to finance the project. Neville Community Partners expects to obtain a permanent loan for the project from the Massachusetts Housing Partnership in the approximate amount of \$4.25 million. The Massachusetts Housing Partnership is a quasi-public entity that uses state-mandated funding from the commercial banking industry to provide permanent financing for affordable housing developments. The Massachusetts Housing Partnership requires that the project be kept affordable for the term of the loan.

On the operating side, Neville Community Partners plans on utilizing Section 8 subsidies to reduce tenant rents and Group Adult Foster Care payments to subsidize the cost of services for the 39 units reserved for elders earning less than 60% of median income. Section 8 subsidies will be tied directly to the units as project-based subsidies. Residents who qualify for these units will only be required to pay 30% of their monthly income for rent. These same residents will be provided services through the State's Group Adult Foster Care program, a subsidy stream administered by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services. The Group Adult Foster Care program provides approximately \$1025 per month per affordable unit. These funds are used to subsidize services that provide residents with assistance with activities of daily living such as bathing, dressing, and grooming.

Income Guidelines for Eligibility for Neville Manor Assisted Living Facility
(Figures Based on Area Median Income Figures of 1/7/98)

% of Area Median Income	1 Person Family	2 Person Family
20%	\$ 7,925	\$ 9,063
50%	\$19,813	\$22,657
60%	\$23,775	\$27,188
80%	\$31,700	\$36,250
100%	\$39,625	\$45,313

5535

Copies of the minutes of the first three
meetings of the Neville Manor Site
Advisory Committee.