

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

2A

DCAMM / Office of Leasing and State Office Planning • 617-727-8000 ext 31800

A. SUMMARY INFORMATION

PROJECT NUMBER:	202410900.1	PROPOSAL NUMBER: 8
SUMMARY OF RFP:		
USER AGENCY:	TRC – TRIAL COURT, MASSACHUSETTS	
SEARCH AREA:	Springfield	
REQUESTED SQ FT:	244,000	
DESIRED OCCUPANCY DATE:	as soon as possible	
TERM OF LEASE:	40 Years, with two 10 year extension options	
PUBLIC PARKING:	650 - 900 within ¼ mile of proposed site	
ACCESSIBLE PUBLIC PARKING:	3	
RESERVED PARKING:	70	
ACCESSIBLE RESERVED PARKING:	1	
DROP OFF OR OTHER PARKING:	Requires 20% of onsite parking to be EV; Sallyport	
PROPOSER	Contact:	Claiborne Williams
	Name:	The Liberty Junction Team
	Company:	FDS MA Liberty Junction, LLC
	Street1:	1001 19th Street N
	City State Zip:	Arlington, MA 22209
OWNER	Company or Owner:	FDS MA Liberty Junction, LLC (Claiborne Williams, Richard Mann, John
	Street 1:	Barros, and Conan Harris)
	City State Zip:	1001 19th Street Suite 1401
		Arlington, VA 22209
PROPOSED ADDRESS:	125 Liberty Street	
	Floor: Levels -1,0,1,2,3,4,5,and 6	
	Springfield, MA 01103	
PROPOSED SQ FT:	270,055	
CONFIRMED USF MEASURE:	To be confirmed during design phase	
PROPOSED TERM:	40 Years	
COSTS INCLUDED IN BASE RENT:	Modified Gross Lease, provided a rent concession Year 1 with alternate scenarios to spread rent credit over term	
COSTS OUTSIDE OF BASE RENT USER AGENCY WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR:	Cap/Ex account in Year 1. Cap/Ex expenses are not included in the base rent	
ESTIMATED COST OF IMPROVEMENTS (included in base rent):	\$462,225,258	
DATE OF SITE VISIT	December 16, 2025	
PROPOSER INTERVIEW	March 5, 2026	

B. REQUIREMENTS OF RFP

State whether the proposal meets the requirements of the RFP

Check Y (Yes) if the proposal meets a requirement and the existing condition meets the requirement.

Check N (No) if the proposal does not meet the requirement.

Check NP (Not at Present) if a proposal meets a requirement but existing conditions do not meet the requirement.

Check NA (Not Applicable) if criteria is not applicable to this RFP

COMPLETE SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------

ELIGIBLE PROPOSER PER RFP	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
TYPE OF AGREEMENT & TERM OF LEASE	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
SEARCH AREA/LOCATION	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
USABLE SQUARE FEET WITHIN RANGE	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
TYPE OF SPACE (OFFICE, RETAIL ETC)	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
PROPOSAL INCLUDES LANDLORD'S SERVICES	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
PROPOSAL INCLUDES LANDLORD'S IMPROVEMENTS	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
LANDLORD CAPACITY TO DELIVER PER RFP	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
LANDLORD WILLING TO SIGN COMMONWEALTH LEASE	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
PARKING REQUIREMENTS PER RFP	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A
OTHER RFP REQUIREMENT: _____	☐ Y	☐ N	☐ NP	☐ N/A

C. COMMONWEALTH POLICY OBJECTIVES

Historic Properties

Is the proposed space in a building listed on the National Register of Historic Places as provided by 16 USC § 470a (1974)?	☐ Y	☒ N
If yes, does the proposal meet the User Agency's needs and is it feasible in terms of costs and requirements to lease this space when compared with other available properties?	☐ Y	☐ N
Is the proposed space in a building certified as an historic landmark as provided by G. L. c. 9, § § 26 through 27C?	☐ Y	☒ N
If yes, does the proposal meet the User Agency's needs and is it feasible in terms of costs and requirements to lease this space when compared with other available properties?	☐ Y	☐ N
Is the proposed space in a building designated as an historic landmark by the local historic commission?	☐ Y	☒ N
If yes, does the proposal meet the User Agency's needs and is it feasible in terms of costs and requirements to lease this space when compared with other available properties?	☐ Y	☐ N

Historic Properties Comments:

The proposed premises is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, nor a historic landmark.

Leading by Example – Decarbonizing and Minimizing Environmental Impacts in State Government

Please identify how the proposal complies with or is planned to comply with Executive Order 594:		
Compliance with or exceeding current building energy codes	☒ Y	☐ N
Energy Star Building Certification	☒ Y	☐ N
LEED Building Certification	☒ Y	☐ N
Passive House Building Certification	☒ Y	☐ N
Compliance with municipal energy disclosure ordinances	☒ Y	☐ N
Compliance with state recycling requirements	☒ Y	☐ N
Access to electric vehicle charging stations	☒ Y	☐ N
Close to public transportation and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists	☒ Y	☐ N
Other contributions to reduced GHG emissions or reduced impacts	☒ Y	☐ N
Smart Location Index of 60 or greater per GSA	☒ Y	☐ N
	☐ Y	☐ N
	☐ Y	☐ N
	☐ Y	☐ N
Other _____	☐ Y	☐ N

Leading by Example Comments:

The proposed premises has a Smart Location Index of 64. The proposal supports Executive Order 594 efforts by Compliance with or exceeding current building energy codes, Energy Star Building Certification, LEED Silver Building Certification, Passive House Building Certification, Compliance with municipal energy disclosure ordinances, Compliance with state recycling requirements, Access to electric vehicle charging stations, Close to public transportation and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists, Other contributions to reduced GHG emissions or reduced impacts, Smart

Location Index of 60 or greater per GSA. The proposed building will have the following building energy certifications: LEED Silver which supports the A&F bulletin priorities for leasing published in February 2025.

South Coast Rail Corridor Plan

Is the proposed building located within one of the following South Coast Rail Corridor communities? <i>Acushnet, Attleboro, Berkley, Bridgewater, Canton, Dartmouth, Dighton, Easton, Fairhaven, Fall River, Foxborough, Freetown, Lakeville, Mansfield, Marion, Mattapoisett, Middleborough, New Bedford, North Attleborough, Norton, Raynham, Rehoboth, Rochester, Seekonk, Sharon, Somerset, Stoughton, Swansea, Taunton, Wareham, and Westport</i>	☐ Y	☒ N
If yes, did the proposer demonstrate how their proposal is consistent with implementation of the recommendations of the Corridor Plan?	☐ Y	☐ N

South Coast Rail Comments:

The proposed premises is not located within a South Coast Rail Corridor community.

Gateway Cities

Is the proposed building located in one of the Gateway Cities listed below? <i>Attleboro, Barnstable, Brockton, Chelsea, Chicopee, Everett, Fall River, Fitchburg, Haverhill, Holyoke, Lawrence, Leominster, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Methuen, New Bedford, Peabody, Pittsfield, Quincy, Revere, Salem, Springfield, Taunton, Westfield, Worcester</i>	☒ Y	☐ N
If Yes, answer the following 2 questions:		
Does the proposal promote private investment in construction or substantial rehabilitation of a commercial and/or multi-family residential development?	☒ Y	☐ N
Is the proposed building located within the downtown area?	☒ Y	☐ N

Gateway City Comments:

The proposed premises is located within the Gateway City of Springfield within the downtown area.

Inclusive Design

Does the proposal offer innovative facilities that meet the diverse needs across age, gender, ability, language, ethnicity, and economic circumstance? <i>(If yes, describe how in the comments section)</i>	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
--	---------------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

Inclusive Design Comments:

Proposer submitted a written plan outlining how their facility is designed to emphasize universal design principles to create inclusive environments for all occupants regardless of ability, in addition to compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board. The proposal focuses on specific inclusive design goals including universal entrances, gender inclusive restrooms, wellness rooms, and international wayfinding signage.

Environmental Justice Population Area

Is the proposed building located in an Environmental Justice Population Area as verified on Mass.gov?	☒ Y	☐ N
---	---------------------------------------	----------------------------

Environmental Justice Population Area Comments:

Proposed property is in an Environmental Justice Population neighborhood, and the use does not create an Environmental Burden. The proposed plan will provide integrated design principals that provides "access for all." The design for the proposed courthouse seeks to meet the diverse and changing needs of users across age, gender, ability, language, ethnicity and economic circumstance.

Access & Opportunity

Does the proposal include an outline on how the proposer will create opportunities for individuals or groups from historically under-represented demographics? <i>(If yes, describe how in the comments section)</i>	☒ Y	☐ N
--	---------------------------------------	----------------------------

Access & Opportunity:

The proposal includes a written plan on creating opportunities for individuals/groups from historically under-represented demographics in support of the A&F Bulletin published in February 2025. Given the scale of the project, the Springfield

Regional Justice Center development will provide substantial employment opportunities for the city and expand opportunities for M/W/VBE, DBE, SBE, and other historically underrepresented groups. Per the Proposer: "While construction of the new Springfield Regional Justice Center will generate work for subcontractors, suppliers, vendors, and businesses supporting real estate, engineering, construction, and infrastructure, we expect our broader Proposed Development Concept will create lasting employment opportunities in the contemplated retail and mixed-use developments. Our entire team is focused on fostering an inclusive partnership environment for local and diverse businesses, suppliers, and trades throughout the lifecycle of the project and will deploy established strategies to engage with the local workforce and job seekers to maximize economic impact for the City of Springfield. Liberty Junction has assembled the strongest possible team for this pursuit, a diverse team with deep roots in Hampden County and Massachusetts. The Liberty Junction leadership team is comprised of FD Stonewater, a national real estate development firm with deep government-sector experience, and CoJo Partners, a Massachusetts-based Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) led by developers, Conan Harris and John Barros. Conan and John are respected community leaders whose careers have been dedicated to advancing equitable growth, building strong communities, and creating opportunities for the citizens of Massachusetts and beyond. With a mission to drive community impact at their core, John Barros and Conan Harris have worked tirelessly to advance inclusive economic development, generate opportunities for underrepresented businesses, and create pathways for underserved communities to thrive."

1. LOCATION: ACCESS, PROXIMITY AND PARKING; NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Public parking provided in proposal:	550 spaces in the Bay State parking garage directly across from proposed site, and 2,300 in total within 1/4 mile of the proposed site	
Other parking provided: (reserved, drop off, etc.)	34 reserved onsite and 38 Reserved in the Bay State parking garage directly across from the proposed site.	
Has the User Agency approved the public transportation access to the selected location?	☒ Y	☐ N
What is the distance of the proposed building to nearest public transportation?		
Proximity to a bus line:	Liberty/Dwight bus stop #(1913) serving bus line G3 P21	
Proximity to a rail line:	500' to Union Station Amtrack station and bus terminal	
Are the applicable proposed parking areas well-lit and accessible for employees and visitors with physical limitations?	☒ Y	☐ N
Has the User Agency approved the proposed parking provided by the Landlord or available in the area for the requirement?	☒ Y	☐ N
Has the User Agency visited the location and approved the proposed access and neighborhood characteristics?	☒ Y	☐ N
Is the User Agency satisfied that the proposed location will provide a safe working environment for employees and visitors?	☒ Y	☐ N

Section 1 Comments:

Parking requirements are met as follows: 550 spaces in the Bay State parking garage directly across from proposed site, and 2,300 in total within 1/4 mile of the proposed site, 34 reserved onsite and 38 Reserved in the Bay State parking garage directly across from the proposed site. User Agency approved public transportation access, Liberty/Dwight bus stop (1913) serving bus line G3 P21 in front of proposed site and 500 feet from Union Station. Proposed site will be well lit, the User Agency approved the proposed parking, the User Agency visited the location and approved the proposed access and neighborhood, and the User Agency is satisfied the location will provide a safe working environment for employees and visitors.

2. BUILDING CONDITIONS: EXTERIOR ENVELOPE AND SYSTEMS

Has the User Agency approved the proposed architectural image (to be further refined), exterior appearance, entrances, and lobby design for the proposed building?	☒ Y	☐ N
Has the proposer provided conceptual site plans, renderings, and building elevations?	☒ Y	☐ N
Is the proposed site located within a flood plain?	☐ Y	☒ N
If yes, describe any anticipated limitations, mitigation measures, or resiliency features related to the proposed development		
Will the proposed building be designed to comply with all applicable ADA/accessibility requirements and codes?	☒ Y	☐ N
Has the proposer identified any known environmental concerns, hazardous materials, or site remediation requirements?	☐ Y	☒ N

If yes, please provide more information:			
Provide the # of proposed passenger elevators:		12	
Provide the # of proposed freight elevators:		TBD during the design phase	
Will the proposed elevators include ADA-compliant wheelchair access?		☒ Y	☐ N
Current use of proposed development site:		Medical Office building	
Will rezoning, variances, or changes in land use approvals be required? If so, describe status and timeline		Proposed use is allowed by-right under the existing zoning	
Describe the proposed building envelope systems (walls, insulation, glazing, weather barrier systems):		Proposed high performance envelope systems designed to meet or exceed current building code requirements	
Proposed general building construction description:		Concrete and steel	
Will electric and HVAC to the premises be separately metered?		☒ Y	☐ N
Will the building include an energy management system for lighting and building operations?		☒ Y	☐ N
Will the building include a backup generator or emergency power system?		☒ Y	☐ N
Will the proposed building shell and systems satisfy the User Agency's requirements upon completion, as proposed		☒ Y	☐ N
If no, identify required revisions or additional improvements:			
Construction schedule in # of months/anticipated occupancy date:		42 Months	

Section 2 Comments:

The User Agency approved, in concept, the architectural image and conceptual site plan. While the overall concept received approval, the architectural image requires further refinement, which will be addressed during the design phase. The proposed location is not in a flood plain. The proposed building will be designed to comply with all applicable ADA/accessibility requirements and codes. There is currently a medical office building on the site that will be demolished, and the proposer states that the property will be delivered vacant and ready for demolition and redevelopment. The proposed building is allowed by-right under existing zoning. The general building construction will consist of concrete and steel, and the shell building envelope system design will meet or exceed current building code. Utilities will be separately metered. The building will include an EMS system and 1000 KW back-up emergency generator. The building shell and system satisfies the User Agency. The proposed construction schedule is 42 months.

3. PROPOSED PREMISES CONDITIONS: CHARACTERISTICS, EVALUATION CRITERIA

Will the proposed premises provide a contiguous block of space meeting the User Agency's program requirements?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Will the proposed floor plate efficiently accommodate the User Agency's space program and operational needs?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Are there any proposed structural, mechanical, or design constraints that may interfere with efficient layout, flexibility, or accessibility?	☐ Y	☒ N	☐ N/A
Is the proposed building module regular and consistent?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Is proposed column spacing consistent to efficiently utilize the space?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Will the proposed location of the premises within the building support the agency's operational, security, and public access goals?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Will the proposed location provide adequate daylighting throughout the space (at least 25% of the exterior wall surface)?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A

Section 3 Comments:

The proposed building provides contiguous blocks of space. Floor plates will be designed efficiently to minimize structural and mechanical requirements. The proposed building module will be regular with column spacing consistent to efficiently utilize the space. The proposed location is a single-tenanted building that will support the User Agency's operational, security and public access goals. The proposed design will provide adequate daylight throughout the space with at least 25% of the exterior wall surface. This building has an L-shaped design which maximizes space utilization and functional adjacencies with all courtrooms benefitting from exposure to natural light.

4. LANDLORD CAPACITY: DEVELOPMENT DELIVERY, DESIGN & BUILD-OUT, BUILDING AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Will the proposed development and Landlord's Improvements comply with the requirements of the RFP as proposed?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The proposal identified the following exceptions, assumptions, or deviations from the RFP requirements:	N/A		
Does the proposal include a conceptual space plan or test fit demonstrating compliance with the RFP SAFS and program requirements?	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The estimated amount for Landlord's Improvements is:	\$462,225,258		
The estimated amount appears sufficient to perform the described Landlord's Improvements:	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The proposed space is expected to be available for occupancy on schedule reasonably consistent with the Desired Occupancy Date outlined in the RFP.	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The capacity of the proposer's team to design and build out the space is rated as:	Acceptable		
The proposer identified the design professional(s) who will prepare Working Drawings.	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The identified team is:	Leers Weinzapfel Associates		
The proposer identified the contractor expected to complete Landlord's Improvements.	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
The identified contractor is:	Suffolk Construction		
The qualifications and experience of the professionals of the proposer's team demonstrate successful completion of comparable projects.	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
Has the proposer demonstrated evidence of project financing capability or lender commitment?	FD Stonewater		
The financial capacity and stability of the proposer are rated as:	Acceptable		
Proposed Landlord's Services comply precisely with the RFP.	☒ Y	☐ N	☐ N/A
If not, the proposer identified the following modifications:			
The demonstrated capacity of the proposed landlord to prepare the proposed space for occupancy and to provide Landlord's Services and Landlord's Improvements is rated as:	Acceptable		

Section 4 Comments:

The Landlord's Improvements comply with the RFP requirements. The proposal includes a conceptual space plan. The estimated amount for Landlord's Improvements \$ \$462,225,258, which appears sufficient to perform Landlord's Improvements. The proposed space is expected to be available for occupancy on a schedule reasonably consistent with the Desired Occupancy Date outlined in the RFP. The design professional identified is Leers Weinzapfel Associates. The identified contractor is Suffolk Construction. The proposer's team demonstrates successful completion of comparable projects. FD Stonewater will provide structured financing for the project. The proposed Landlord's Services comply with the RFP and the demonstrated capacity of the proposed Landlord to construct the proposed space for occupancy and provide Landlord's Services is acceptable.

CONCLUSION

Based on a comprehensive review of the proposals, the Massachusetts Trial Court stated programmatic requirements, the RFP requirements, the project delivery assumptions, and the applicable Commonwealth policy objectives, the proposal for the premises located at 125 Liberty Street in the Gateway City of Springfield is recommended for selection as the preferred site for the Springfield Regional Justice Center's procurement of approximately 300,000 square feet of courthouse, office, detention/holding space for trials and records storage.

The evaluation reflects that the proposal is fully responsive to the RFP and satisfies the required elements relating to completeness of submission, proposer eligibility, lease term, search area and location, proximity to public transportation, usable square footage, type of space, Landlord's Services, Landlord's Improvement's, landlord capacity to deliver, willingness to sign the Commonwealth lease, and parking requirements. The proposal further demonstrates that the site can support the User Agency's operational needs through a contiguous and efficient floor plate, regular building module, consistent column spacing, adequate daylighting due to the L-shaped design, and a location that supports security, public access, and functional workflow requirements.

As with all proposals received, the building is proposed as a single-tenant facility, which supports the efficient, secure, and orderly accommodation of the agency's program.. In addition, the proposal includes conceptual site plans, renderings, elevations, and a test fit that supports the conclusion that the proposed development can be delivered in a manner consistent with the RFP and the agency's needs. The proposed shell and building systems are designed to meet or exceed applicable code requirements, include ADA-compliant access, separately metered utilities, energy management

systems, and emergency power, and are expected to satisfy the User Agency upon completion. The development team, including Leers Weinzapfel Associates and Suffolk Construction, has been identified and demonstrates the experience and capacity necessary to execute a project of this scale, while the identified financing support from the Liberty Junction Team further confirms the proposer's ability to deliver the Landlord's Improvements and Landlord's Services required under the RFP. The estimated Landlord's Improvements are substantial, but the proposal appears financially and operationally supportable within the framework presented, and the anticipated occupancy schedule is reasonably consistent with the desired occupancy date. Taken together, these factors establish that the proposal is not only responsive, but also feasible, well-structured, and capable of meeting the Commonwealth's long-term space needs.

From a procurement standpoint, the proposal also represents the strongest overall value proposition available to the Commonwealth. It is the lowest-cost proposal received, which is a significant and material consideration in a procurement of this magnitude, particularly where the Commonwealth must secure nearly 300,000 square feet of specialized space while remaining attentive to fiscal stewardship and the User Agency's budget restraints. The proposal therefore advances the Commonwealth's obligation to obtain the best practical value for public funds while still meeting the technical, operational, and delivery requirements of the RFP. Equally important, the proposal aligns with current Commonwealth policy objectives. The project strongly advances the Commonwealth's leading-by-example sustainability goals through compliance with current building energy codes, Energy Star, LEED Silver, Passive House principles, municipal energy disclosure requirements, state recycling requirements, electric vehicle charging access, proximity to transit, pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, and a Smart Location Index above the required threshold.

The proposal also supports the Commonwealth's equity, access, and inclusion priorities by locating the project in the transit-oriented development, while incorporating universal design principles, ADA and Architectural Access Board compliance, and a written plan addressing access and opportunity for historically under-represented demographics which is essential for the City of Springfield. The site's location, proximity to Union Station and local bus service, and the availability of substantial parking further enhance accessibility for employees and visitors. In addition, the proposed development is consistent with the Commonwealth's broader economic and place-based objectives by supporting private investment in a downtown Gateway City location. For all these reasons, the proposal should be viewed as fully aligned with the Commonwealth's policy framework, fiscally advantageous, and appropriately responsive to the User Agency's needs, and therefore merits selection as the selected proposal for this procurement.

Evaluation Feedback Received from Massachusetts Trial Court:

Location:

- Downtown, adjacent to Union Station
- 3min walk to Union Station; 19 min walk to Court House
- Good access to highway
- Sloped site, not in flood zone

Parking and Sallyport Plan:

- 34 parking spaces (for judges & department heads)
- 38 reserved spaces in garage directly across Liberty Street
- Additional parking in multiple garages within walking distance
- Pull-in (interior) sallyport accessed from within secure fence

Façade:

- Distinctive façade with two "watchtowers" connected by wall of glass
- Square mass at one end is obvious public entrance
- May benefit from solid bands connecting towers
- Glazing creates public lobbies with good natural light
- Insets on upper floors allows for natural light at courtrooms

Quality of Initial Design (TRC)

- L-shaped floor plan
- 6 stories (above grade), up to 8 CRS per floor
- All courtrooms receive natural light
- Lock-up and sallyport at grade (due to sloped site)

- Dedicated JC floor
- Judges' lobbies paired at each detention core
- Transaction offices on lower floors
- Jury deliberation rooms stacked on one end of floor
- Courtrooms seem short and wide - not a lot of spectator seating
- Column spacing: 40' x 40'; ceiling heights vary by floor, but seem acceptable

This evaluation has been completed with specific reference to the statements of the Request for Proposals (RFP) and the Lease Proposal as submitted and clarified, both in writing and during the site visit.


 Christopher McQuade
 User Agency Project Manager

Date


 Peter Woodford
 DCAMM Project Manager

6-23-26

Date

