REDEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

PEOPLE | PLACES | POSSIBILITIES

STRONGER COMMUNITIES BRIGHTER FUTURES

RI Funding Readiness Operating System

PROJECT PIPELINE

PARTNERSHIPS

CAPITAL READINESS

COMMUNITY IMPACT

COMPLETE TOOLKIT

EVALUATE • PRIORITIZE • BUILD • MAINTAIN

RIVERBEND WORKS DISTRICT

COMPLETE WORKED EXAMPLE

Fictionalized training case based on real redevelopment conditions

PLAN
ALIGN
FUND
DELIVER
TOGETHER.

REDEVELOPMENT IN ACTION.

IDEAS → PARTNERSHIPS → CAPITAL → THRIVING PLACES

Start Here: Riverbend Funding Readiness Evaluation

This completed fictional example shows how a community can evaluate Application, Project, and Systems Readiness, identify the gaps that prevent a priority redevelopment initiative from moving, and then use the complete RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ to build the evidence, ownership, capacity, processes, capital pathway, and learning routines needed for the current milestone and future opportunities.

HOW TO USE THE EVALUATION
For each question, mark 0 = Not yet / unknown, 1 = Partially in place / informal, or 2 = Ready with current evidence. Record the evidence behind each answer. Use the category results and any blocking conditions to determine the community's current readiness and the gaps that must be carried into the complete toolkit.

01 APPLICATION READINESS

Can we respond credibly?

- [2] Is the opportunity a clear fit with community priorities, applicant eligibility, and the next project milestone?
- [1] Can we explain the need, scope, budget, schedule, intended benefits, and implementation approach with current evidence?
- [1] Are the applicant, partner roles, approvals, match or leverage, and required attachments clear?
- [1] Can the team make a disciplined go / no-go decision and assemble a credible request in the available time?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: 5 / 8 [ ] Material gap [X] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

02 PROJECT READINESS

Can the work advance?

- [1] Is the next fundable milestone clearly defined rather than only the total project vision?
- [1] Are site control, eligibility, technical risks, critical unknowns, and major dependencies sufficiently understood?
- [1] Is there a credible reuse, end-user, operator, or stewardship pathway supported by community and market evidence?
- [0] Are governance, capacity, budget, procurement, cash flow, and delivery responsibilities in place?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: 3 / 8 [X] Material gap [ ] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

03 SYSTEMS READINESS

Can momentum continue?

- [1] Are community priorities and the project pipeline maintained between funding cycles?
- [1] Do partners have defined roles, durable trust, clear handoffs, and a regular operating cadence?
- [1] Is there a sequenced strategy for public, philanthropic, private, and flexible capital?
- [1] Does the community maintain evidence, learn from decisions, and improve the next project?

CATEGORY EVALUATION: 4 / 8 [ ] Material gap [X] Partially ready [ ] Ready with evidence

Riverbend Readiness Evaluation & Gap Summary

Riverbend begins with meaningful community support, public control of most of the district, baseline environmental information, and early demand signals. The evaluation also shows material project-readiness gaps and partially developed application and systems conditions. Those gaps are carried directly into the full eight-component build.

0-3 MATERIAL GAP	4-6 PARTIALLY READY	7-8 READY WITH EVIDENCE
A significant condition is missing, unknown, or dependent on a last-minute effort.	Important elements exist, but evidence, ownership, or repeatability remains incomplete.	The category is functional for the current purpose and supported by current evidence.

CATEGORY	SCORE	EVALUATION	STRONGEST EVIDENCE	GAPS TO CARRY FORWARD
Application readiness	5 / 8	[ ] Gap [X] Partial [ ] Ready	Strong community need; eligible public sponsor; public control of most of the site; initial predevelopment concept and candidate funding sources.	Scope, budget, schedule, match, approvals, commitments, and attachments are not assembled into one current application package.
Project readiness	3 / 8	[X] Gap [ ] Partial [ ] Ready	Thirty-eight public acres, baseline environmental work, resident-backed reuse direction, and early business/manufacturing demand signals.	No approved $850K phase, dedicated project manager, complete technical plan, validated operator/end user, or delivery and cash-flow structure.
Systems readiness	4 / 8	[ ] Gap [X] Partial [ ] Ready	Longstanding partners, a resident advisory group, an active redevelopment authority, and substantial but scattered project evidence.	Roles, handoffs, portfolio visibility, capital sequencing, evidence governance, and learning routines remain informal or dependent on individuals.

CRITICAL RULE • A community is Funding Ready for the current milestone only when all three categories are Ready with Evidence and no blocking condition remains unresolved. Eligibility, site control, delivery capacity, decision authority, or capital timing cannot be averaged away by a category score.

Overall Funding Readiness Determination

CURRENT POSITION	WHAT IT MEANS	WHAT TO DO NEXT
[X] Not yet Funding Ready	Riverbend has a material Project Readiness gap and unresolved blockers involving delivery ownership, technical unknowns, reuse validation, and capital sequencing.	Carry the gaps into the complete tool and build the missing evidence, ownership, capacity, operating products, and capital pathway across all eight components.
[ ] Partially Funding Ready	Important elements are in place, but one or more categories still depends on incomplete evidence, informal ownership, or one-time effort.	Use the complete tool to strengthen and connect the eight components so readiness becomes functional and repeatable.
[ ] Funding Ready for the current milestone	Application, project, and systems readiness are supported by current evidence and no critical blocker is unresolved.	Use the complete tool to verify the full operating system, integrate the components, and maintain a ready project pipeline over time.

Gaps to Carry into the Complete Tool

The six entries below are the most consequential gaps at the starting point. They do not replace review of the full system; they show where Riverbend must work with the greatest urgency as it completes all eight components.

READINESS CATEGORY + GAP / UNKNOWN	EVIDENCE OR DECISION NEEDED NEXT	FROS COMPONENT(S) TO EXPLORE
Application + Project: Community-benefit commitments are not yet formally adopted or protected through later design and financing decisions.	Adopt a purpose and benefit charter with measurable commitments, resident accountability, and displacement safeguards.	01, 05, 08
Project: No single accountable project lead, decision-rights structure, funded delivery team, or reliable operating cadence.	Appoint an interim project manager; approve a governance charter, roles, escalation path, procurement approach, and capacity budget.	05, 06
Project: Multi-parcel site-control and technical unknowns could change scope, cost, eligibility, or reuse feasibility.	Extend the rail parcel option and complete the district due-diligence plan for title, access, utilities, flood, geotechnical, asbestos, and cleanup alternatives.	03
Project: The mixed-use employment and enterprise concept has demand signals but no validated owner, operator, developer, or end-user pathway.	Complete market/end-user validation, compare realistic reuse alternatives, and define the development and long-term stewardship model.	04
Systems: Riverbend is prioritized, but the broader project pipeline, evidence file, decision record, milestones, and learning routines are not maintained in one shared system.	Create a current portfolio dashboard, project evidence index, version rules, milestone tracker, outcome measures, and after-action routine.	02, 08
Application + Systems: The $46M vision is not translated into fundable phases, and the $850K predevelopment package lacks approved uses, sources, match, bridge, and partner asks.	Approve milestone-specific uses and sources, cash-flow assumptions, candidate capital types, prerequisites, relationship owners, and a sequenced capital roadmap.	06, 07, 05

1 | How to Read This Worked Example

CORE DEFINITION
The RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ helps communities evaluate readiness, identify gaps, and build the evidence, ownership, capacity, processes, and capital pathways needed to advance current projects and maintain a funding-ready pipeline over time.

The worked example follows the same sequence as the blank participant toolkit: evaluate readiness, summarize gaps, frame the project and pipeline, complete all eight components, integrate the outputs, and establish a repeatable operating cadence. All names, organizations, amounts, sources, and conditions are illustrative.

Choose the Unit of Assessment

- One priority site or redevelopment project - the recommended starting point.
- A connected group of projects that must advance together, such as a district, corridor, industrial portfolio, or community redevelopment initiative.
- A community or regional project pipeline, when the purpose is to assess repeatable institutional readiness rather than one site.

Recommended Working Session

#	Step	What to Do
1	**Evaluate**	Complete the readiness evaluation; record the evidence, current position, and gaps.
2	**Frame**	Define the unit, purpose, stage, next fundable milestone, and pipeline context.
3	**Assess**	Assess current and target maturity across all eight components; record unknowns and dependencies.
4	**Build**	Complete the builders and operating products needed to close gaps and strengthen handoffs.
5	**Integrate**	Connect the outputs into governance, delivery, evidence, and capital pathways.
6	**Act**	Create an accountable 30/60/90-day plan focused on the next milestone.
7	**Maintain**	Reassess between funding cycles and keep the project pipeline current.

Evidence Before Judgment

Use current plans, inventories, agreements, site records, studies, budgets, meeting records, commitments, and named processes. Record unknowns explicitly. The full tool should show what is known, what is missing, who owns the next step, and what evidence will show progress.

Important Use Notes

- Complete all eight components. Use the evaluation and gap summary to identify where added depth or early action is needed - not which components can be skipped.
- Do not rely on one composite score. Use the evaluation, component evidence, operating products, ownership, handoffs, capital sequence, and action plan together.
- Funding Ready means the community can move a current project and maintain a credible pipeline for future opportunities - not merely produce a strong application.

2 | Readiness Process & Component Maturity

How the Readiness Evaluation and Full System Build Fit Together

1 | READINESS EVALUATION	2 | FRAME THE PROJECT / PIPELINE	3 | FULL SYSTEM BUILD	4 | MAINTAIN FUNDING READINESS
Evaluate application, project, and systems readiness; determine the current Funding Readiness position; and summarize the gaps supported by evidence.	Define the next fundable milestone, community purpose, accountable lead, current project stage, and the pipeline context in which the project must advance.	Assess all eight components, complete the builders, create operating products, resolve gaps, and integrate the evidence, ownership, capacity, process, and capital pathway.	Review the project pipeline, evidence, relationships, capacity, and capital pathway between opportunities so the system stays ready and continues to improve.

Full-Toolkit Component Maturity Scale

Level	Meaning
1 • Unformed	Work is largely reactive; ownership, evidence, or process is unclear.
2 • Emerging	Some elements exist, but they depend on individuals, one-time effort, or unresolved gaps.
3 • Functional	The component works for the current priority project with defined ownership, usable evidence, and connected handoffs.
4 • Durable	The component is repeatable across projects, regularly maintained, measured, and improved.

The Eight Components

#	Component	#	Component
01	Community Mandate & Intended Benefit	05	Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership
02	Visible Site & Project Pipeline	06	Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity
03	Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness	07	Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence
04	Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway	08	Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

Detailed definitions, evidence questions, operating products, and tools appear on each component worksheet.

> **MODEL DESIGN RULE**
> Community benefit is not a ninth component added at the end. It is the center of the operating system and a test applied across all eight components. Every team completes the full toolkit; the evaluation determines where the work starts and where added depth is required.

3 | Riverbend Project & Pipeline Profile

This baseline profile reflects Riverbend before the full system build. Later worksheets refine the project, assign ownership, clarify the next fundable milestone, and connect the district to a maintained community project pipeline.

Community / organization	Riverbend Redevelopment Authority (RRA) and City of Riverbend
Project, site, or portfolio	Riverbend Works District
Location / geography	Riverbend, illustrative Midwestern river city; East River and Foundry neighborhoods
Unit of assessment	[ ] One site/project [X] Connected initiative [ ] Community/region portfolio
Project sponsor / accountable lead	RRA is legal sponsor; City Manager and RRA Executive Director share interim responsibility pending appointment of a dedicated project manager
Current project stage	Early predevelopment: public acquisition and baseline assessment completed; district concept, due diligence, delivery structure, and capital sequence still under development
Next decision or fundable milestone	Approve and fully capitalize an $850,000, 12-month Predevelopment and Investment Readiness Phase
Assessment date	September 17, 2026 (fictional training example)
Facilitator	Redevelopment Institute facilitated working session
Participants / organizations	RRA, City departments, East River and Foundry residents, community development corporation, workforce board, transit and utility partners, environmental/engineering advisors, philanthropy, CDFI, and prospective end users
Next review date	90 days, or immediately after rail-option, project-management, or major technical/capital decisions

Community Purpose & Intended Benefit - Initial Statement

In one paragraph, explain why the project should move, who should shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Redevelop the 52-acre former Riverbend Tool & Foundry complex into a community-serving employment and enterprise district shaped by East River and Foundry residents. The project should remediate environmental hazards, reconnect the riverfront, create accessible quality jobs and affordable production space, support food and small-business growth, add childcare and transit access, and prevent displacement.

Next Fundable Milestone - Initial Statement

Define the next achievable phase or decision - not the total project vision.

Secure governing approvals, accountable delivery leadership, defined scopes, and an $850,000 capitalized predevelopment package to complete technical due diligence, validate reuse and end users, prepare a development concept and cost estimate, formalize community-benefit commitments, and create a sequenced capital strategy.

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Is there a documented community need and credible redevelopment purpose?	3	2026 Community Priorities Plan; 2024 Brownfield Area Plan; RRA board resolution; workshop summary.	Purpose is credible but not yet translated into project-selection and procurement criteria.
Who is affected, and how are they participating in vision, decisions, and stewardship?	3	Seven public workshops; 312 resident surveys; Resident Advisory Circle roster and meeting records.	Residents advise but have no formal decision or stewardship role.
What environmental, health, economic, social, and civic benefits are intended?	3	Draft Riverbend Benefit Charter; reuse concept; workforce, small-business, and public-health partner input.	Several benefits lack baselines, cost estimates, and responsible owners.
Who could be burdened, displaced, or excluded, and how will those risks be addressed?	2	Resident comments; housing-stability data; draft anti-displacement and construction-impact issues list.	No adopted anti-displacement, commercial-affordability, or construction-impact plan.
Are community commitments specific enough to track over time?	2	Benefit Charter v0.2 and draft outcome scorecard; commitments are not yet adopted or assigned.	No approved scorecard, reporting cadence, or consequence for missed commitments.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
3 • Functional		**4 • Durable**		Before predevelopment package approval and any developer/operator solicitation.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Strong participation gives the project legitimacy, but informal commitments could be weakened when technical, market, or capital decisions narrow the concept.

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

B. PURPOSE, PARTICIPATION & COMMUNITY BENEFIT BUILDER

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

Use this page to clarify the project purpose, who must shape it, and the commitments that will define success.

COMMUNITY PURPOSE & BENEFIT STATEMENT	
Current condition / community challenge	A 52-acre vacant industrial complex carries contamination, deteriorated structures, lost jobs, limited river access, and disinvestment in nearby neighborhoods.
Credible redevelopment purpose	Create a community-serving employment and enterprise district that remediates hazards, reconnects the river, and expands accessible opportunity.
People and groups most affected	East River and Foundry residents; former workers; small manufacturers and food entrepreneurs; students; transit-dependent households; nearby property owners.
Intended environmental, health, economic, social, and civic benefits	Remediate 38 acres; 250 quality jobs; 20 affordable production spaces; 60 childcare slots; workforce training; 0.8-mile river connection; stronger small-business activity.
Potential burdens, displacement, or exclusion risks	Rising rents; exclusion from jobs; loss of affordable business space; construction impacts; benefits flowing outside the neighborhood; concept drift.
Specific commitments that should be tracked	35% of hires from adjacent ZIP codes; 70% of jobs accessible without a bachelor's degree; 20 below-market production spaces; 60 childcare slots; quarterly public benefit report; resident seats in governance.

Stakeholder & Power Map

Stakeholder / Group	Affected How?	Influence / Authority	Needed Role	Engagement / Accountability Method
Resident Advisory Circle	Health, access, jobs, displacement	Lived expertise; proposed decision role	Co-define benefits and review concept changes	Monthly public meetings; two voting steering seats; quarterly scorecard
East River CDC	Neighborhood stability and small business	Trusted convener; local data	Facilitate engagement and anti-displacement plan	Funded scope; resident outreach log; public reporting
RRA / City	Owner, sponsor, approvals, public risk	Legal and budget authority	Adopt commitments; fund and deliver project	Board resolutions; decision log; public meetings
Community College / Food Collaborative / Makers Co-op	Facilities, programs, affordable space	Potential operators and demand evidence	Define operating needs and commitments	Feasibility interviews; MOUs; operating pro formas
Nearby businesses / property owners	Construction, access, market effects	Property and political influence	Coordinate access and mitigate impacts	Targeted briefings; issue log; mitigation agreements

01 Community Mandate & Intended Benefit

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Establishes why redevelopment matters, whose priorities shape it, and what lasting value should result.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared problem definition; stakeholder and power mapping; trust as infrastructure; outcomes and accountability.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Community purpose statement	Usable for current project	RRA + Resident Circle	Community folder / Benefit Charter v0.2	Convert to adopted project purpose before Day 30
Stakeholder and power map	In progress	East River CDC	Engagement folder / Stakeholder Map v0.1	Add influence, decision rights, and accountability methods
Community benefit commitments	In progress	RRA + CDC	Benefit Charter v0.2 / Scorecard draft	Quantify targets and adopt before predevelopment approval
Engagement and accountability plan	In progress	CDC + City Planning	CDC scope / Engagement Plan v0.1	Fund scope and establish quarterly reporting

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C04 reuse validation, C05 governance, and C08 evidence must translate community priorities into decisions and measures.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	The likely break is between advisory input and formal authority when cost, market, or developer pressures emerge.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	RRA board must adopt the Benefit Charter and give residents defined decision and accountability roles.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Authentic engagement and an adopted shared direction.	Top constraint / unknown	Benefits and anti-displacement safeguards are not yet operational or binding.
Target condition	Durable benefit framework guiding design, procurement, finance, delivery, and reporting.	Evidence that will show progress	Adopted charter, resident seats, baselines, targets, owner, and quarterly scorecard.
Accountable owner	RRA Executive Director + East River CDC	Review date / trigger	Before predevelopment authorization; quarterly thereafter.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Circulate draft purpose and benefit charter for evidence check.	RRA / CDC / Resident Circle	Day 7	Annotated draft and issue log
30 days	Adopt resident decision role and engagement/accountability process.	RRA Board / CDC	Day 30	Board resolution and governance roster
60 days	Quantify benefits and complete anti-displacement and construction-impact actions.	Planning / CDC / Finance	Day 60	Costed commitments and baseline memo
90 days	Approve scorecard and public reporting cadence.	RRA / Resident Circle	Day 90	Published scorecard and first review date

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Does the community maintain a current inventory of sites and projects?	2	City brownfield inventory; RRA project list; departmental capital plans, last updated on different schedules.	Ownership, stage, blockers, and related projects are inconsistent or missing.
Are projects prioritized using transparent criteria?	2	2026 strategic-plan priority list and draft project-prioritization matrix.	No common weighted criteria or documented comparison with other candidate projects.
Is each project assigned a stage, accountable owner, and next milestone?	2	RRA board materials and departmental trackers; stage, owner, and milestone fields are inconsistent.	No standard readiness-stage ladder or portfolio-wide owner/milestone practice.
Are related infrastructure, housing, workforce, or community projects visible?	1	Transit route study, sewer plan, housing program, and workforce strategy maintained in separate files.	Dependencies and timing are not visible in one operating view.
Can leaders explain why one project should advance before another?	2	Council and RRA resolutions identify Riverbend as catalytic; no current comparative decision record.	Priority rationale is not transparent enough to withstand changes in leadership or funding programs.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
2 • Emerging		**3 • Functional**		After 60-day pipeline refresh; quarterly portfolio review.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	The project has strategic support, but a stale and disconnected pipeline can hide dependencies, shift resources opportunistically, and delay neighborhood benefits.

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

B. SITE & PROJECT PIPELINE BUILDER

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

Build a current, shared portfolio view and identify which projects should advance first - and why.

PRIORITY SITE & PROJECT INVENTORY

Site / Project	Purpose / Benefit	Stage	Accountable Owner	Next Milestone	Critical Blocker	Related Projects / Dependencies
Riverbend Works District	Employment, enterprise, cleanup, river access	Early predevelopment	RRA / interim ED lead	Capitalize $850K predevelopment phase	No accountable PM; rail option and technical gaps; reuse and capital pathway unresolved.	Transit hub; sewer; housing; workforce
East River Transit Hub	Access to jobs and services	Concept / route study	Transit Authority	Confirm preferred alignment and operating funds	Preferred alignment and durable operating funding are not confirmed.	Riverbend site plan; workforce routes
Foundry Housing Stabilization	Prevent displacement and improve homes	Program design	East River CDC	Secure acquisition/repair pool	Acquisition/repair capital and anti-displacement commitments are not secured.	Benefit charter; transit; district investment
South Sewer Interceptor	Capacity for redevelopment and neighborhoods	Preliminary engineering	Public Works	Complete load and alternatives study	Load assumptions and preferred sewer alternative are not confirmed.	Riverbend utility demand; flood work
Old Depot Enterprise Center	Small-business incubation	Design / fundraising	Downtown Development Corp.	Finalize operating pro forma	Operating model, tenant commitments, and sustainable subsidy gap remain unresolved.	Makers pipeline; food hub programming

Transparent Priority Scoring Matrix

Adapt the criteria and weights. Use the same criteria for every candidate project and document the evidence behind each score.

Priority Criterion	Weight	Riverbend Works	Old Depot Center	Riverside Cold Store
Community benefit and strategic alignment	30%	4 / 1.20	3 / 0.90	3 / 0.90
Site control / eligibility / technical feasibility	20%	4 / 0.80	5 / 1.00	2 / 0.40
Reuse demand and end-user pathway	20%	3 / 0.60	4 / 0.80	2 / 0.40
Capacity and partner readiness	15%	3 / 0.45	3 / 0.45	2 / 0.30
Capital timing and leverage potential	15%	4 / 0.60	2 / 0.30	2 / 0.30
TOTAL / PRIORITY DECISION	100%	3.65 • Priority 1	3.45 • Priority 2	2.30 • Hold

02 Visible Site & Project Pipeline

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Creates a shared view of priority sites, stages, dependencies, and next decisions.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Asset mapping; project pipeline design; prioritization; shared visibility across programs and institutions.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Site/project inventory	In progress	City Planning	Portfolio workspace / Inventory v0.3	Complete ownership/stage/blocker update by Day 30
Readiness-stage ladder	Not started	Planning + RRA	Pipeline Standards draft / Planning workspace	Adopt five-stage ladder by Day 30
Priority scoring matrix	Draft	Planning / Steering Team	Steering folder / Priority Matrix v0.2	Validate criteria and approve by Day 60
Portfolio dashboard	Not started	Planning analyst	Dashboard specification v0.1 / not yet launched	Launch monthly dashboard by Day 90

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C01 defines priority criteria; C03–C07 supply site, reuse, capacity, and capital evidence; C05 assigns owners.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	Updates currently remain in departmental files and do not trigger coordinated decisions across related projects.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	Planning should own a shared dashboard reviewed monthly by the redevelopment steering team.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Riverbend is an adopted catalytic priority with visible community value.	Top constraint / unknown	The inventory is stale and related projects are not sequenced.
Target condition	A functional, transparent pipeline with standard stages, owners, milestones, blockers, and dependencies.	Evidence that will show progress	Approved matrix and dashboard showing Riverbend, transit, sewer, housing, and workforce links.
Accountable owner	City Planning Manager	Review date / trigger	Day 60; quarterly thereafter.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Confirm Riverbend stage, owner, blocker, dependencies, and next milestone.	Planning / RRA	Day 7	Approved project record
30 days	Refresh all 11 sites and adopt readiness-stage ladder.	Planning + departments	Day 30	Current inventory with evidence dates
60 days	Apply transparent priority matrix and document decisions.	Steering Team	Day 60	Signed matrix and decision record
90 days	Launch monthly portfolio dashboard and dependency review.	Planning analyst	Day 90	Dashboard and meeting calendar

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who owns or controls the site, and is access available for necessary work?	3	Recorded deeds for 38 acres; executed option for the 9-acre rail parcel; current access agreements.	Rail option expires in nine months; title interest and permanent access remain unresolved.
Are applicant, site, and activity eligibility understood for likely funding sources?	3	Draft eligibility memo v0.1; consultant program screen; preliminary counsel review.	Counsel and agency confirmation are pending for the rail parcel, acquisition costs, and selected activities.
What is known - and unknown - about contamination, liability, and cleanup needs?	3	2024 Phase I/II ESAs; remedial-alternatives analysis at roughly 60%; selected-building asbestos records.	No Phase II on rail parcel; solvent extent, demolition hazards, and final cleanup approach are uncertain.
Are zoning, utilities, infrastructure, title, and physical constraints documented?	2	Zoning/code memo; title reports; 2018 utility records; sewer plan; FEMA flood mapping.	Childcare/food uses need approvals; utility load, sewer, flood, geotechnical, and rail-title data are incomplete.
What technical decision or study is required next?	3	Draft integrated due-diligence scope covering rail, utilities, flood, geotechnical, asbestos, and cleanup decisions.	Scopes, funding, procurement sequence, and decision gates are not yet approved.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
3 • Functional		**4 • Durable**		When rail option is extended and integrated due-diligence package is completed; update after every technical finding.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Public control and core environmental data reduce risk, but unresolved parcel, utility, and cleanup issues could alter the reuse, cost, schedule, and promised community benefits.

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

B. SITE READINESS & UNKNOWNS BUILDER

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

Document what is known, what remains uncertain, and the next technical or legal decision needed.

SITE CONTROL, ELIGIBILITY & TECHNICAL CHECKLIST

Readiness Item	Status	Evidence / Location	Owner	Next Decision / Study
Ownership / site control	Partial / usable	Deeds for 38 acres; rail option	RRA counsel	Extend option; resolve rail title and access
Access for assessment or work	Usable on core	Access agreements and ownership files	RRA property manager / counsel	Secure permanent access for rail and utility work
Applicant eligibility	Preliminary	Eligibility memo v0.1	City attorney / grants counsel	Confirm legal applicant and ownership timing
Site and activity eligibility	Preliminary	Program screen by consultant	Grants counsel / environmental consultant	Confirm parcel/activity eligibility before application
Liability / defenses / agreements	Partial	Acquisition and cleanup file	RRA counsel / environmental counsel	Complete liability/defense and agreement review
Environmental conditions and data gaps	Core usable; gaps remain	2024 Phase I/II; RAA 60%	Environmental consultant / RRA	Rail Phase II; solvent delineation; asbestos; final RAA
Title / liens / encumbrances	Core clear; rail unresolved	Title reports	RRA counsel / title company	Clear encumbrance and record option extension
Zoning / land use approvals	Industrial; mixed-use approvals needed	Zoning map/code memo	City Planning	Determine overlay/conditional-use pathway
Utilities and infrastructure	Outdated / partial	2018 load records; sewer plan	Public Works / utilities	Complete load, sewer, access, and cost study
Physical / geotechnical constraints	Preliminary	Flood map and site observations	Civil / geotechnical consultant	Flood resilience and geotechnical screening

Risk & Unknowns Register

Risk / Unknown	Potential Consequence	Information or Decision Needed	Owner	Target Date
Rail option/title expires	Loss of critical access and development pad	Extend option; title cure strategy; acquisition authorization	RRA counsel	Day 30
Solvent plume extent unknown	Cleanup cost and schedule escalation	Supplemental investigation and regulator meeting	Env. consultant	Day 60
Utility/sewer capacity uncertain	Reuse mix or infrastructure cost changes	Integrated load and sewer alternatives study	Public Works	Day 75
Flood/geotechnical constraints	Reduced developable area and resilience risk	Survey, flood-resilience concept, targeted borings	Civil engineer	Day 90

03 Site Control, Eligibility & Technical Readiness

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Clarifies the legal, environmental, physical, and regulatory conditions that determine whether a project can move.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: System boundary definition; constraint and risk mapping; decision-point design; evidence-based handoffs.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Site control record	Usable for core; partial district	RRA counsel	RRA Legal / Parcel Control Log v0.4	Extend rail option / update title by Day 30
Eligibility screen	In progress	Grants counsel	Legal + Grants / Eligibility Memo v0.1	Agency/counsel confirmation by Day 45
Technical due-diligence checklist	In progress	Environmental + civil team	Technical folder / Due-Diligence Matrix v0.3	Complete integrated scope and findings log
Risk and unknowns register	Draft	Project manager	PM workspace / Risk Register v0.1	Review monthly and after each finding

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C04 needs technical facts to compare reuse; C06 must procure studies; C07 must fund risks; C08 must maintain the evidence file.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	Technical reports are produced, but findings are not consistently translated into reuse, schedule, budget, and capital decisions.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	Authorize one integrated due-diligence scope and a decision log connecting findings to C04, C06, and C07.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Core public control and usable Phase I/II evidence.	Top constraint / unknown	Rail parcel/title plus utilities, flood, and cleanup-alternative unknowns.
Target condition	Maintained district-wide site dossier supporting every parcel, phase, eligibility screen, and capital decision.	Evidence that will show progress	Extended option; clear title path; confirmed eligibility; completed studies; approved cleanup and infrastructure assumptions.
Accountable owner	RRA counsel + environmental/civil lead	Review date / trigger	After each major finding; formal review Day 90.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Extend rail option and authorize title/access work.	RRA / counsel	Day 15	Executed extension and title action memo
30 days	Approve integrated due-diligence and eligibility scope.	RRA / consultants / agency	Day 30	Signed scope, schedule, and decision gates
60 days	Complete rail Phase II and regulator/eligibility consultations.	Environmental team	Day 60	Reports and written determinations
90 days	Complete utility/flood/geotech work and update cost/risk register.	Civil + Public Works	Day 90	Integrated technical dossier and board decision

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
What is the intended reuse, and how was it selected?	2	2025-26 community workshops, survey results, concept plan, and draft reuse-alternatives memo.	Alternatives have not been compared using community, technical, market, and operating criteria.
Is there credible community, public, or market demand?	2	23-business makers waitlist; manufacturer inquiries; letters from the community college and food collaborative.	No independent market study, absorption analysis, customer commitments, or operating feasibility.
Who could own, operate, develop, occupy, or steward the site?	2	RRA ownership and partner letters; no selected master developer, operator agreement, or binding tenant.	No selected developer, master operator, binding tenant, or ownership/operating structure.
What infrastructure, approvals, or complementary investments are required?	2	Draft concept plan, zoning memo, utility/access notes, and related transit and sewer project records.	Requirements, costs, sequencing, and responsible parties are not validated.
What would make the reuse financially, operationally, and socially durable?	1	Early concept cost and partner operating concepts; no integrated pro forma, reserve policy, or stewardship model.	No pro forma, cross-subsidy strategy, operating reserves, stewardship plan, or affordability mechanism.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
2 • Emerging		**3 • Functional**		After reuse alternatives, market/operating feasibility, and community decision checkpoint are complete.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	The concept reflects community priorities, but weak demand and operating evidence could overpromise jobs and services or push the project toward a less beneficial use later.

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

B. REUSE ALTERNATIVES & END-USER PATHWAY BUILDER

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

Compare realistic reuse options and identify the owner, operator, end user, and complementary investments required.

REUSE ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Reuse Alternative	Community Fit	Site / Technical Fit	Demand Evidence	Owner / Operator / End User	Financial & Operating Durability	Next Validation Step
Employment + enterprise hub	High: jobs, small business, childcare, river access	Moderate: mixed uses need phasing and utilities	Makers waitlist; manufacturer and operator interest	RRA land; mission operators; master developer TBD	Potentially viable with phased public investment, blended capital, affordable-space cross-subsidy, and mission operators; not yet underwritten.	Market/operating study and concept cost
Logistics / warehouse campus	Low–moderate: jobs but fewer community services	High on core; truck/rail access questions	Regional demand general, no committed user	Private developer/operator	Potentially financeable with an anchor user, but community-benefit and traffic-mitigation conditions would be required.	Traffic, wage, and community-benefit analysis
Riverfront mixed-use district	Moderate: amenities and tax base; displacement risk	Moderate–low due cleanup/flood and market timing	No housing/retail market test	Master developer required	High capital and market risk; long absorption and affordability protections make near-term durability uncertain.	Market study and anti-displacement analysis
Clean-energy + light industry	Moderate–high: jobs and productive reuse	Moderate: power and environmental fit unknown	One sector inquiry; no anchor	Energy developer + industrial users	Could be viable with power upgrades and anchor demand; operating model and user commitments remain unproven.	Power study and end-user outreach

Selected Reuse & End-User Pathway

Selected reuse and reason	Preferred hybrid: flexible light-industrial/maker space, food enterprise hub, community-college training, childcare, and river greenway. Selected because it best combines remediation, accessible jobs, small-business growth, services, and place-based benefit.
Community validation still needed	Validate affordability levels, job quality, truck/traffic impacts, childcare need, river access, operating subsidy, and resident response to final site layout.
Likely owner / developer	RRA retains land during predevelopment; later options include ground lease to a mission-aligned master developer or parcel-specific ownership.
Likely operator / occupant / end user	Community college; Riverbend Food Collaborative; Makers Cooperative; manufacturer or other light-industrial tenants; childcare operator—each subject to feasibility and commitments.
Approvals and infrastructure required	Mixed-use approvals; childcare licensing; utility/sewer upgrades; flood-resilience design; environmental remedy; transit/sidewalk connection; rail decision.
Complementary investments required	Housing stabilization nearby; workforce recruitment/support; small-business finance; transit service; public-realm maintenance; commercial-affordability mechanism.
Long-term stewardship and operating model	RRA-led district governance with long-term ground leases, operating agreements, reserve requirements, affordability covenants, and public benefit reporting.

04 Reuse Vision, Market Reality & End-User Pathway

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Connects cleanup or preparation to a viable, community-supported use and responsible long-term operator.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Pathway mapping; end-user journey; demand validation; alignment among place, people, operations, and market.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Reuse alternatives brief	Draft	Planning + RRA	Planning / Reuse Alternatives v0.2	Complete scored comparison by Day 60
Market/end-user scan	Not started	Economic development consultant	Market folder / Interview Plan v0.1	Complete demand and operator interviews by Day 75
Development concept	In progress	Planning / design team	Design / Concept Plan v0.3	Update after technical and market findings
Long-term ownership and stewardship pathway	Not started	RRA / legal / finance	Operating-model outline / not yet approved	Recommend ownership, operator, affordability, and reserve model

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C01 defines benefits; C03 constrains site options; C05 assigns decisions; C06 procures analysis; C07 tests finance and durability.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	The likely break is between community vision, technical feasibility, end-user demand, and the operating economics of public-benefit uses.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	Commission one integrated reuse/market/operating study with a resident checkpoint before concept selection.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	A community-backed concept and early demand signals from makers, education, food, and industry partners.	Top constraint / unknown	No validated reuse mix, operator/developer pathway, or long-term operating model.
Target condition	A selected concept supported by community, technical, market, operating, and ownership evidence.	Evidence that will show progress	Approved alternatives memo; market/operating report; operator/end-user commitments; concept budget and stewardship pathway.
Accountable owner	City Planning + RRA project manager	Review date / trigger	Community checkpoint Day 75; concept approval Day 90.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Approve reuse decision criteria and required evidence.	RRA / Resident Circle / Planning	Day 10	Signed criteria and alternatives scope
30 days	Procure market, end-user, and operating-feasibility work.	Planning / PM	Day 30	Executed contract and interview plan
60 days	Compare alternatives and test developer/operator structures.	Consultant / partners	Day 60	Draft scored alternatives and pro forma ranges
90 days	Select preferred concept after community checkpoint.	RRA Board / Resident Circle	Day 90	Board decision and updated concept pathway

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who is accountable for moving the project forward?	2	RRA sponsor authority in bylaws and board records; interim economic-development lead identified.	No dedicated project manager with time, authority, budget, and cross-partner accountability.
What decisions belong to residents, public entities, owners, technical advisors, and capital partners?	2	RRA/City approval rules, Resident Circle charter, and agency requirements; no integrated decision-rights matrix.	Decision rights for benefits, concept changes, procurement, capital asks, and operator selection are undefined.
Are partner roles, contributions, and handoffs explicit?	2	Partner letters and meeting notes; most contributions and handoffs remain nonbinding.	Concrete contributions, dependencies, acceptance criteria, and handoffs are not documented.
Is there a regular operating cadence and a way to resolve conflict or delay?	1	Informal monthly coordination calls; no adopted escalation process or shared decision log.	No standing cadence, escalation path, decision log, or conflict-resolution process.
Would the partnership remain active if no grant were currently open?	2	Partners were active before the current opportunity, but continuity depends on individuals rather than an operating structure.	Without funded coordination or charter, the group is unlikely to maintain regular project work between notices.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
2 • Emerging		**3 • Functional**		When charter, accountable PM, decision rights, partner roles, and monthly cadence are adopted.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Trusted relationships are a strong base, but informal authority and grant-driven coordination make community commitments, technical decisions, and delivery vulnerable to delay or drift.

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

B. GOVERNANCE, ROLES & HANDOFFS BUILDER

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

Clarify accountability, decision rights, contributions, operating cadence, and the handoffs most likely to fail.

PARTNER ROLES, CONTRIBUTIONS & HANDOFFS

Partner / Group	Interest / Authority	Concrete Contribution	Accountable Role	Key Handoff / Dependency	Commitment Status
RRA	Owner, sponsor, redevelopment authority	Land, approvals, procurement, public accountability	Project sponsor; appoint PM	PM receives authority, budget, and current records from RRA and City.	Partial
City departments	Budget, planning, infrastructure, compliance	Staff, data, match, utilities, legal and finance	Functional leads by discipline	Each department names a lead and hands decisions and data to the PM on schedule.	Informal
Resident Circle + East River CDC	Community benefit and neighborhood stability	Lived expertise, outreach, data, accountability	Benefit co-owner and checkpoint	Community commitments must be translated into design, procurement, and reporting decisions.	Emerging
Community College	Training and potential occupancy	Program design, demand, possible lease/operations	Training-program lead	Program demand and operating terms must inform the reuse concept and pro forma.	Letter only
Food Collaborative + Makers Co-op	Affordable space and enterprise programming	Demand data, operating concepts, tenant pipeline	End-user / operator design partners	Tenant/operator requirements must feed the space plan, rents, and programming.	Letter only
Valley CDFI + Regional Foundation	Flexible capital and project preparation	Underwriting, grants, recoverable capital, convening	Capital-advisory partners	Technical findings and uses/sources must reach underwriting and grant decisions.	Early relationship

Decision Rights & Operating Cadence

Decision / Function	Recommends	Decides / Accountable	Executes	Consulted / Informed
Approve milestone, budget, and capital commitments	PM + Finance	RRA Board / City as required	PM / departments	Residents, partners, funders
Select reuse concept and material changes	Planning + technical team + residents	RRA Board	PM / design team	Operators, capital partners, public
Procure technical and professional services	PM + department lead	RRA / City procurement authority	Procurement staff	Counsel, technical advisors, residents as relevant
Adopt community-benefit commitments	Resident Circle + CDC + PM	RRA Board	PM / operator / developer	City, funders, adjacent neighborhoods
Make funding and investment requests	PM + Finance + capital advisor	RRA Board / City	Assigned relationship owner	Residents, technical team, operators

Meeting cadence: _____ Escalation path: _____ Decision record location: _____

05 Governance, Partnerships & Accountable Ownership

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Defines who makes decisions, who performs the work, and how partners coordinate beyond letters of support.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Governance design; partner-role mapping; interface and handoff design; operating cadence; trust and accountability.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Governance charter	In progress	RRA Executive Director	Governance folder / Charter v0.2	Adopt and appoint PM by Day 30
Partner-role map	Draft	Project manager / Planning	Governance folder / Partner Map v0.2	Convert letters into contributions by Day 60
Decision-rights matrix	Draft	RRA counsel	Governance folder / Decision Matrix v0.1	Approve with charter by Day 30
Meeting and escalation cadence	Not started	Project manager	Charter v0.2 / proposed cadence	Launch monthly steering and biweekly delivery cadence

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	Every component depends on C05 for authority, ownership, decisions, conflict resolution, and handoffs.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	The de facto coordinator lacks explicit authority; partners can assume someone else owns tasks; resident input may not reach formal decisions.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	RRA Board appoints a PM and adopts the charter, decision matrix, cadence, and commitment template.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Strong, credible relationships and a public sponsor with legal authority.	Top constraint / unknown	No accountable project manager or formal operating rules.
Target condition	A functional governance structure that works between opportunities and assigns every decision, contribution, and handoff.	Evidence that will show progress	Appointed PM; adopted charter and decision matrix; signed partner commitments; recurring meetings and decision log.
Accountable owner	RRA Executive Director / appointed PM	Review date / trigger	Day 30; governance effectiveness review Day 90.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Name interim PM and confirm sponsor/department authority.	RRA Board / City Manager	Day 7	Written appointment and authority memo
30 days	Adopt charter, decision rights, cadence, and escalation path.	RRA / counsel / partners	Day 30	Board resolution and meeting calendar
60 days	Convert interest letters into contribution and handoff agreements.	PM / partners	Day 60	Signed MOUs or commitment sheets
90 days	Test governance through milestone decision and after-action review.	PM / steering team	Day 90	Decision log and governance improvement actions

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Who will perform project management, procurement, compliance, and reporting?	1	City procurement, finance, and grants functions plus RRA staff roles; no integrated project-manager assignment.	No one owns integrated project management, schedule, procurement, compliance, and reporting.
What expertise is available internally, through partners, or through consultants?	2	On-call environmental consultant, City departments, East River CDC, counsel, and community-college expertise.	Contracts, scopes, hours, funding, and handoffs for the proposed phase are not committed.
Are predevelopment costs and capacity gaps visible?	1	Draft $850,000 predevelopment budget and consultant estimates; staffing and capacity plan not approved.	Cost basis, procurement path, contingency, funding status, and staff time are not approved.
Can the organization manage cash flow, match, reimbursement, and grant conditions?	2	City grant history and finance capacity; draft cash-flow notes and early bridge discussion with Valley CDFI.	Reimbursement exposure above $250,000, bridge funding, indirect costs, and partner documentation are unresolved.
What capacity must be built now rather than after award?	1	Draft capacity assessment proposing a project manager/owner representative, compliance support, and data stewardship.	No build/buy/borrow plan or funded capacity package exists before award.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
1 • Unformed		**3 • Functional**		When the $850K phase has a funded team, procurement schedule, cash-flow plan, and delivery/compliance structure.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Insufficient delivery capacity could delay work, weaken engagement, create compliance failures, and prevent the community from realizing benefits even if money is awarded.

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

B. CAPACITY & PREDEVELOPMENT BUILDER

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

Identify delivery functions, capacity gaps, predevelopment costs, and the strategy to build, buy, or borrow capacity.

DELIVERY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

Delivery Function	Current Source / Lead	Capacity Level	Gap or Risk	Build / Buy / Borrow Strategy
Project management	City ED / RRA interim	Low	No dedicated integrated owner; decisions, schedules, and partner work are fragmented.	Buy/borrow 0.8 FTE owner's representative; assign authority
Procurement and contracting	City procurement + RRA	Medium	Core capacity exists, but there is no project-specific procurement schedule or early consultant strategy.	Build procurement plan; buy specialized support
Environmental / engineering / technical	On-call environmental consultant	Medium	On-call scope may not cover integrated district work or competitive procurement requirements.	Extend only allowable tasks; competitively procure integrated team
Community engagement and accountability	East River CDC + Resident Circle	Medium	Trusted capacity exists but is not funded or connected to formal decision rights.	Fund CDC agreement and resident participation
Financial management / cash flow / match	City Finance	Medium	Reimbursement exposure, bridge financing, match documentation, indirect costs, and contingency remain unresolved.	Create cash-flow forecast; borrow/secure bridge facility
Grant compliance and reporting	Grants manager after award	Low now	The role begins after award; compliance requirements are not shaping scopes, records, or agreements now.	Allocate 0.25 FTE now and build compliance calendar
Legal / real estate / risk	City attorney / RRA counsel	Medium	Rail, title, liability, and environmental issues may exceed routine municipal legal capacity.	Buy special real-estate/environmental counsel
Communications, data, and records	Planning analyst	Low	No shared evidence workspace, version control, records protocol, or assigned data steward.	Build shared evidence workspace and assign data owner

Predevelopment Budget & Technical Assistance Plan

Activity / Deliverable	Estimated Cost	Funding Status / Source	Timing	Procurement / Delivery Lead
Technical due diligence: environment, utilities, flood, geotech	$275,000	City $50K identified; state/EPA/TA requests pending	Months 1–6	Integrated technical consultant
Reuse, market, end-user and operating feasibility	$150,000	Foundation concept request; no commitment	Months 1–5	Planning / market advisor
Development concept, master plan and cost estimate	$175,000	Candidate state planning grant	Months 4–10	Design/engineering team
Community benefit, anti-displacement and engagement	$100,000	City $25K + foundation/partner request	Months 1–12	East River CDC
PM, procurement, legal and capital structuring	$150,000	City $25K; CDFI/foundation gap	Months 0–12	Owner's rep + counsel + capital advisor

06 Predevelopment & Delivery Capacity

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Ensures the applicant and partnership can scope, procure, manage, and deliver the project.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Capacity and gap analysis; implementation infrastructure; build-buy-borrow choices; operational pathway design.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Capacity assessment	Draft	Interim PM	Delivery folder / Capacity Matrix v0.2	Approve build/buy/borrow plan Day 30
Predevelopment budget	Draft	City Finance + PM	Finance folder / Predevelopment Budget v0.2	Validate costs and contingency Day 45
Technical assistance plan	In progress	PM + partners	Delivery folder / TA Request Tracker v0.1	Submit agency/foundation/CDFI requests Day 60
Delivery and grant-management plan	Not started	PM + grants manager	PM scope outline / plan not yet approved	Approve delivery, procurement, compliance, and cash-flow plan Day 75

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C03 and C04 define technical scopes; C05 supplies authority; C07 finances the work; C08 provides records and reporting.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	Capacity is assumed after award rather than budgeted before award; departments and consultants do not share one delivery plan.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	Appoint PM, approve the predevelopment budget/procurement schedule, and secure capacity/bridge commitments.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Capable staff, an on-call consultant, a trusted CDC, and grant-management experience.	Top constraint / unknown	No funded integrated team, project manager, procurement plan, or cash-flow solution.
Target condition	A functional delivery system able to scope, procure, manage, engage, comply, finance cash flow, and report.	Evidence that will show progress	Executed PM/consultant/CDC scopes; approved procurement and cash-flow plans; assigned grants/data functions.
Accountable owner	Appointed project manager + City Finance	Review date / trigger	Day 30 capacity decision; readiness review before each procurement.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Appoint interim PM and inventory every delivery function and gap.	RRA / City	Day 7	Authority memo and completed capacity matrix
30 days	Approve $850K scope, budget, procurement, and build/buy/borrow plan.	PM / Finance / Procurement	Day 30	Board-approved delivery package
60 days	Secure technical, engagement, legal, compliance, and bridge commitments.	PM / partners / CDFI	Day 60	Executed or conditional commitment documents
90 days	Launch funded team with integrated schedule and reporting system.	PM / steering team	Day 90	Kickoff, baseline schedule, compliance calendar

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
What is the next fundable phase - not merely the total project cost?	2	Draft $850,000 Predevelopment and Investment Readiness scope and budget.	Uses, cost basis, approvals, and funding commitments are still draft.
Which costs require grants, flexible capital, debt, equity, guarantees, or owner investment?	1	Draft six-phase capital sequence and preliminary uses-and-sources worksheet.	Costs are not mapped to the capital type best suited to each phase and risk.
What match, leverage, bridge, or predevelopment resources are needed?	1	Proposed City contribution; state, foundation, and CDFI conversations; no complete commitment package.	Match, bridge, reimbursement, first-loss/flexible capital, and contingency are not assembled.
What must occur before later capital can participate?	1	Preliminary capital decision tree and developer/CDFI feedback on prerequisite studies, control, and approvals.	No documented capital decision tree shows which milestone unlocks which later source.
Is there a credible sequence from current condition through reuse and stewardship?	1	Draft six-phase roadmap from predevelopment through cleanup, infrastructure, vertical development, tenant launch, and stewardship.	No credible phased path from predevelopment through cleanup, infrastructure, vertical development, occupancy, and stewardship.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
1 • Unformed		**3 • Functional**		When $850K uses/sources are approved and later phases, prerequisites, relationship owners, and timing are mapped.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Without a sequence, the team may chase the largest available grant, leave critical predevelopment unfunded, or accept capital that changes the project’s community purpose.

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

B. FUNDING SEQUENCE & CAPITAL PARTNER BUILDER

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

Break the project into fundable phases and identify the resource, prerequisite, timing, and gap for each phase.

FUNDING SEQUENCE MAP

Phase / Milestone	Use of Funds	Amount / Range	Capital Type	Candidate Source(s)	Prerequisite	Timing	Gap / Risk
1. Predevelopment readiness	Studies, concept, benefits, PM, capital plan	$0.85M	Public + philanthropy + flexible/recoverable	City; state planning/brownfield; foundation; TA; CDFI; partners	Governance, scopes, budget	Months 0-12	$550K not committed
2. Control + cleanup design	Rail acquisition, final design, permits	$1.8M	Public grant + philanthropy + owner	City/state/EPA-type sources; foundation	Studies and option/title resolved	Months 6-18	Acquisition timing / eligibility
3. Cleanup + demolition	Remediation, asbestos, selective demolition	$7.7M	Public grants + owner + developer contribution	Environmental grants; state; local; developer	Approved remedy and cost; procurement	Months 12-30	Cost escalation / match
4. Infrastructure + public realm	Utilities, roads, stormwater, river trail	$11.0M	Public infrastructure + philanthropy + debt	State/federal infrastructure; utility; city; foundation	Site plan, easements, end-user demand	Months 18-36	Sewer/flood scope
5. Vertical development	Rehab/new buildings and shared facilities	$21.0M	Debt + equity + tax credits + grants	Developer; CDFI/banks; mission investors; credits	Tenants/operators; cleanup; underwriting	Months 24-60	Operating gap / market risk
6. Fit-out + enterprise launch	Tenant equipment, working capital, childcare	$5.0M	Tenant equity/debt + grants + recoverable capital	Tenants; CDFI; workforce/small-business sources	Leases, operating plans, financing	Months 36-60	Small-tenant credit / affordability

Capital types may include public grant, philanthropy, recoverable or flexible capital, debt, equity, guarantee, tax credit, owner investment, or in-kind support.

Capital Partner Map

Partner / Source	Type	Best Fit / Role	Relationship Status	Next Contact / Ask	Owner
City / RRA / state agencies	Public	Match, planning, site control, cleanup and infrastructure	Active; no complete ask	Approve $100K and coordinated state request	PM / Finance
Regional Foundation	Philanthropy	Community benefit, engagement, feasibility, first-loss/flexible prep capital	Relationship active; concept shared	Request $200K tied to system and milestone	RRA Chair / CDC
Environmental / infrastructure agencies	Public / TA	Assessment, cleanup, technical assistance, infrastructure	Early consultation	Validate eligibility and sequence; request TA	Env. lead / Public Works
Valley Community Capital	CDFI	Recoverable predevelopment, bridge, later construction/permanent debt	Interested; needs governance and sources	Structure $150K recoverable/bridge option	Finance Director
Mission developer + end users	Private / mission	Equity, guarantees, leases, operator investment	Not selected; early interest	Market sounding after technical/reuse package	PM / market advisor

07 Capital Roadmap & Funding Sequence

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Matches each project phase and risk to the right public, philanthropic, and private resource.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Braided-resource alignment; capital sequencing; milestone-based funding; matching resource type to use and risk.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Uses-and-sources map	Draft	Finance + capital advisor	Capital folder / Uses & Sources v0.2	Validate $850K costs and commitments Day 60
Funding sequence	Draft	Capital advisor	Capital folder / Six-Phase Roadmap v0.2	Map prerequisites and later phases Day 60
Capital partner map	In progress	Relationship owners	Capital folder / Relationship Map v0.2	Complete meetings and asks by Day 75
Funding gap and timing analysis	Not started	Finance / PM	Cash-flow assumptions draft / analysis not yet complete	Cash-flow, match, timing and contingency analysis Day 60

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C01 protects purpose; C03/C04 define risks and demand; C05 assigns asks; C06 defines costs and capacity; C08 supplies evidence.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	The total project estimate is disconnected from milestone decisions, and funding relationships are not owned or sequenced.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	Finance, CDFI, foundation, and PM jointly approve the $850K uses/sources and full prerequisite map.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	A newly defined predevelopment milestone and early public, philanthropic, CDFI, and private relationships.	Top constraint / unknown	No approved phased capital roadmap, match/bridge structure, or prerequisite sequence.
Target condition	A functional roadmap matching each phase and risk to best-fit capital with relationship owners and timing.	Evidence that will show progress	Approved $850K sources; signed/conditional commitments; six-phase map; cash-flow analysis; next-contact calendar.
Accountable owner	City Finance Director + capital advisor	Review date / trigger	Day 60 capital review; monthly thereafter.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Confirm $850K uses, cost assumptions, and city contribution ceiling.	Finance / PM / consultants	Day 15	Validated budget and cash-flow baseline
30 days	Map six phases, prerequisites, capital types, and candidate sources.	Capital advisor / technical team	Day 30	Funding sequence v0.2
60 days	Make relationship-based predevelopment, match, TA, and bridge asks.	Named relationship owners	Day 60	Meeting notes and written responses
90 days	Approve capitalized milestone and next-source strategy.	RRA Board / City	Day 90	Board-approved sources and contingency plan

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

A. EVIDENCE & MATURITY ASSESSMENT

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

SCORING REMINDER

1 = Unformed • 2 = Emerging • 3 = Functional • 4 = Durable. Base the score on current evidence and operating practice.

Readiness Evidence Question	Score 1-4	Evidence / Source	Gap, Unknown, or Disagreement
Can the project produce a clear need, scope, budget, schedule, and benefit case?	2	Community-need data, Project Brief v0.3, draft budget, and concept schedule; no integrated approved package.	No integrated, board-approved project brief, schedule, source citations, or version-controlled assumptions.
Are baseline conditions and proposed outcomes documented?	2	Planning demographic/economic data, 2024 environmental baseline, and draft community-benefit metrics.	Baselines are not tied to selected outcomes, geography, timeframes, and reporting owners.
What evidence is required for decisions, applications, and community accountability?	2	Current application checklists, technical records, board decision needs, and resident-accountability commitments.	No evidence index shows what is current, decision-ready, missing, or due for update.
How will progress, commitments, risks, and outcomes be tracked?	1	Separate grant reports, meeting minutes, consultant schedules, and partner records; no shared tracker.	No shared milestone/risk tracker, benefit scorecard, decision log, or public accountability schedule.
How will lessons update the pipeline and improve the next project?	1	Prior application files and informal debrief notes; no standard after-action or pipeline-update routine.	No after-action routine or mechanism updates the pipeline, templates, governance, or next project.

Suggested evidence may include plans, agreements, current data, technical records, budgets, decision logs, meeting records, operating procedures, commitments, or completed products. Record “unknown” when evidence is not available.

Component-Level Judgment

Current maturity		Target maturity		Review date / trigger
2 • Emerging		**3 • Functional**		When integrated evidence file, baselines/commitments, decision log, and risk/milestone tracker are active.

Community Benefit Test

How does the current condition of this component advance, weaken, or put at risk the intended community benefit?	Riverbend has meaningful evidence, but scattered files and weak feedback routines make it harder to compete, make decisions, protect commitments, and improve the next project.

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

B. EVIDENCE FILE, OUTCOMES & LEARNING BUILDER

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

Organize the evidence needed for decisions and applications, then define how progress and learning will be maintained.

PROJECT EVIDENCE FILE

Required Artifact / Evidence	Status	Location / Link	Owner	Last / Next Update
Community need / purpose statement	Usable	Community Priorities / Plan folder	City Planning + East River CDC	Updated Aug 2026 / review Day 60
Project scope and current phase	Draft	Project Brief v0.3	Project manager	Board approval Day 90
Budget / uses and sources	Draft	Finance / Budget v0.2	City Finance + project manager	Validate Day 45
Schedule and milestones	Not started	Shared project workspace	Project manager	Baseline schedule Day 30
Site control / eligibility / technical records	Partial / multiple files	RRA / Environmental / Legal folders	RRA counsel + technical lead	Index and update after each finding
Reuse / market / end-user evidence	Draft / scattered	Planning / partner letters	City Planning + economic-development lead	Complete feasibility Day 75
Community benefit commitments	Draft	Benefit Charter v0.2	East River CDC + Resident Circle + RRA	Adopt Day 60
Partner roles and commitments	Not started	Governance folder	Project manager + partner leads	Signed commitments Day 60
Baseline conditions and outcome measures	Partial	Planning data files	Planning data lead + scorecard owners	Approve baselines and geography Day 75
Funding history / prior decisions / lessons	Scattered	Finance / Grants folders	Grants manager + project manager	Create decision/lessons log Day 45

Outcome & Commitment Scorecard

Outcome / Commitment	Baseline	Target	Timeframe	Data Source / Method	Reporting Owner
Acres remediated / controlled	0 remediated; 38 public acres	38 acres remediated; all critical parcels controlled	By end of Phase 3	Environmental completion records / deeds	Technical lead / RRA
Quality jobs created	0 on site	250 jobs; 70% accessible without BA	Year 5 after opening	Employer agreements and annual reports	ED / workforce board
Adjacent-neighborhood hiring	0 project jobs	35% of hires from adjacent ZIP codes	Annual through Year 5	Employer HR reports with privacy protocol	Workforce board / CDC
Affordable production spaces	0	20 spaces at defined below-market terms	At opening; annual review	Executed leases and rent survey	Operator / RRA
Childcare and river access	0 slots; no public connection	60 slots; 0.8-mile public river connection	At opening / Phase 4	Operator license; construction acceptance	Operator / Public Works

08 Evidence, Narrative, Delivery & Learning

C. OPERATING PRODUCTS, INTERFACES & ACTION PLAN

Builds the evidence and feedback system needed to compete, implement, demonstrate benefit, and improve.

Connection to Building Systems that Work: Shared measures; feedback loops; learning routines; evidence files; narrative grounded in system performance.

MINIMUM OPERATING PRODUCTS

Operating Product	Status	Owner	Location / Version	Next Update / Decision
Project brief and evidence file	In progress	PM + data lead	Shared workspace / Evidence Index v0.1	Complete index and project brief Day 45
Outcome and commitment scorecard	Draft	CDC / Planning / operators	Accountability folder / Scorecard v0.2	Adopt baselines, targets, and owners Day 75
Risk/milestone tracker	Not started	PM	Tracker template / not yet launched	Launch at team kickoff; update biweekly
After-action and learning record	Not started	PM / steering team	Learning-record template / not yet launched	Complete after milestone decision and each funding cycle

Suggested status language: Not started • In progress • Usable for current project • Maintained / repeatable

System Interfaces & Handoffs

Which other components must function before this component can advance?	C08 receives evidence from all components and returns it through decisions, applications, public reporting, and portfolio learning.
Where is information, authority, responsibility, or trust most likely to break down?	Ownership and version control are unclear; technical, financial, community, and partner files do not converge into one decision-ready record.
What partner, decision, or handoff is required next?	PM creates the evidence index, assigns artifact owners/update dates, and launches scorecard, risk tracker, and decision log.

Component Summary

Strongest asset	Substantial community, plan, environmental, and socioeconomic evidence already exists.	Top constraint / unknown	Evidence is scattered and not connected to decisions, outcomes, risks, or learning.
Target condition	A functional evidence and feedback system for the current phase with clear owners and update triggers.	Evidence that will show progress	Current project brief; indexed source file; baselines/targets; risk/milestone tracker; decision and after-action records.
Accountable owner	Project manager + Planning data lead	Review date / trigger	Evidence review biweekly; scorecard quarterly; after every milestone/funding decision.

30/60/90-Day Component Action Plan

Timing	Action / Deliverable	Owner & Partners	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
Now	Create shared workspace, evidence index, version rules, and artifact owners.	PM / data lead	Day 10	Accessible index and governance protocol
30 days	Approve project brief, baseline schedule, risk tracker, and decision log.	PM / steering team	Day 30	Current controlled documents
60 days	Adopt outcome/commitment scorecard and reporting methods.	CDC / Planning / operators	Day 60	Approved scorecard with owners
90 days	Complete after-action review and update pipeline/templates.	Steering team	Day 90	Learning record and revised operating process

4 | Riverbend Funding-Ready System Synthesis

The synthesis converts Riverbend's eight component assessments into one operating pathway for the $850,000 predevelopment milestone and a repeatable system for later projects and funding cycles.

A. Priority Constraints & Dependencies

Priority	Constraint / Unknown	Components Affected	Root Cause / Broken Interface	Prerequisite Action	Owner / Due
1	No accountable delivery owner / team	05, 06, 08	Legal sponsor exists, but operating ownership and funded capacity were assumed rather than designed.	Appoint PM; adopt charter; fund delivery package.	RRA Board / Day 30
2	Reuse / end-user path not validated	01, 03, 04, 07	Community vision has not been translated through technical, market, operating, and capital tests.	Commission integrated feasibility and resident decision checkpoint.	Planning + PM / Day 75
3	Predevelopment capital not sequenced	06, 07, 08	Team framed a total project and candidate grants, not a fundable milestone with best-fit capital.	Approve $850K uses/sources, cash-flow plan, and partner asks.	Finance + CDFI / Day 90
4	Rail parcel and technical unknowns	03, 04, 07	Option expiry, title, environmental, utility, flood, and geotech work are on separate tracks.	Extend option and complete integrated due-diligence scope.	RRA counsel + technical lead / Day 60
5	Community benefits lack operating accountability	01, 05, 08	Engagement is strong but commitments are not tied to decision rights, owners, data, and reporting.	Adopt Benefit Charter, resident seats, and outcome scorecard.	CDC + RRA / Day 75

B. Next Fundable Milestone

Current project condition / phase	Early predevelopment. The core site is publicly controlled and community priorities and Phase I/II evidence exist, but the preferred reuse, project governance, delivery capacity, and capital pathway remain fragmented.
Next fundable milestone	RRA and City approve and fully capitalize an $850,000, 12-month Predevelopment and Investment Readiness Phase, with accountable leadership, scopes, procurement, partner commitments, and evidence systems ready to launch.
Why this milestone matters	The phase converts a compelling vision and known site into a decision-ready, financeable cleanup and development pathway. It resolves the unknowns that later grants, debt, equity, operators, and developers cannot responsibly absorb.
Conditions that must be true first	PM appointed; rail option/title strategy; Benefit Charter; integrated scopes and budget; procurement/cash-flow plan; reuse study; partner roles; predevelopment sources; evidence and risk systems.
Estimated cost or range	$850,000, including contingency within approved component budgets.
Likely resource types	City and state public funds; philanthropy; technical assistance; CDFI recoverable/flexible capital or bridge; partner cash and in-kind support.
Decision / opportunity timing	Authorize within 90 days; launch Q1 2027; major concept/capital decision by Month 10–12.
Milestone owner	RRA Executive Director as sponsor; appointed project manager accountable for delivery.

C. Funding Readiness Statement

In one paragraph, summarize what is ready, what is not yet ready, what must happen next, and why the project is worth advancing.

Riverbend is worth advancing because it combines public control of most of the district, strong community direction, usable environmental evidence, and credible demand signals. It is not yet Funding Ready for a large implementation award. The community must first establish accountable governance and delivery capacity, validate the reuse and end-user pathway, resolve district technical unknowns, formalize community-benefit commitments, and fully capitalize the $850,000 predevelopment phase. Completing those actions through the eight-component operating system will create a defined next milestone and position later public, philanthropic, CDFI, and private capital to participate in sequence.

5 | Integrated 30/60/90-Day Funding-Ready Action Plan

Timing	Component(s)	Action / Deliverable	Accountable Owner	Partners / Resources	Due Date	Evidence of Completion
NOW	05, 06	Appoint interim PM and confirm sponsor, authority, decision path, and core team.	RRA Board	City Manager; departments	Day 7	Appointment and authority memo
NOW	03	Extend rail option; authorize title, access, eligibility, and integrated technical scope.	RRA counsel	Environmental/civil team	Day 15	Executed option and approved scope
30 DAYS	01, 05	Adopt Benefit Charter, resident decision role, and governance/meeting cadence.	RRA + CDC	Resident Circle; counsel	Day 30	Board resolutions and calendar
30 DAYS	06, 08	Approve $850K budget, procurement, cash-flow, evidence, and risk-management plan.	PM + Finance	Procurement; grants; data lead	Day 30	Approved delivery package
60 DAYS	04	Complete alternatives, market/operator interviews, and community checkpoint.	Planning + market advisor	Residents; potential users	Day 60	Draft feasibility and decision record
60 DAYS	07	Complete phase map and make public, philanthropic, TA, CDFI, and partner asks.	Finance + capital advisor	Relationship owners	Day 60	Uses/sources and written responses
90 DAYS	03, 04, 07	Integrate findings into selected concept, cost range, prerequisites, and later capital path.	PM + technical team	Planning; finance; residents	Day 90	Board-ready investment-readiness package
90 DAYS	01–08	Approve and capitalize predevelopment milestone; launch team and review cadence.	RRA Board / City	All partners	Day 90	Executed commitments, kickoff, schedule

The integrated plan should focus on the few actions that unlock the next milestone, not create an exhaustive list of every desirable activity.

Operating Cadence

Review / Meeting	Purpose	Participants	Cadence / Next Date
Project delivery review	Coordinate schedule, risks, decisions, procurement, and deliverables.	PM; function leads; consultants	Biweekly; first meeting Day 14
Community benefit / accountability review	Review engagement, commitments, displacement risks, and public scorecard.	Resident Circle; CDC; PM; RRA	Monthly; first review Day 30
Capital and funding review	Review uses/sources, cash flow, match, partner asks, and prerequisites.	Finance; PM; capital advisor; source owners	Monthly; first review Day 30
Portfolio and learning review	Update site/project stages, dependencies, evidence, and lessons.	Planning; RRA; departments; CDC	Quarterly; first review Day 90

6 | Maintain Funding Readiness: Portfolio Learning & Reassessment

Reassessment Triggers

- [ ] A major technical finding changes site risk, scope, cost, or reuse feasibility.
- [ ] Ownership, access, eligibility, or liability status changes.
- [ ] A partner, project sponsor, end user, developer, or capital source enters or exits.
- [ ] A funding opportunity is released, awarded, declined, or delayed.
- [ ] Community priorities, benefit commitments, or displacement risks change.
- [ ] A milestone is completed, missed, or materially revised.

After-Action & Learning Record

Milestone / funding cycle reviewed	Initial Riverbend Funding Readiness Evaluation, Gap Summary, and complete eight-component system build for the $850K predevelopment milestone.
What worked and should be repeated?	Early public acquisition, sustained resident engagement, baseline environmental assessment, and trusted relationships created a strong foundation.
What failed, slowed, or created rework?	Coordination was triggered by grant notices; no single owner integrated decisions; total cost was discussed before the next fundable milestone; evidence remained scattered.
Which component or interface was the root cause?	The root cause was the interface among C05 governance, C06 delivery capacity, C07 capital sequence, and C08 evidence/learning.
What new evidence or capability was created?	A shared readiness profile, target rationale, risk register, delivery-capacity plan, phase budget, capital map, Benefit Charter, and evidence index.
What should change in the project pipeline or operating process?	Every priority project will now have a defined stage, accountable owner, next fundable milestone, evidence file, dependency map, component maturity profile, capital sequence, and readiness evaluation before an application is pursued.
Who owns the update and by when?	Project manager updates the Riverbend file biweekly; Planning updates the portfolio process within 30 days; RRA Board reviews after each milestone and funding decision.

Version Control

Version	Date	Project / Portfolio	Primary Changes	Approved / Reviewed By
1.0	Sep. 17, 2026	Riverbend Works District	Initial three-category readiness evaluation, gap summary, and complete eight-component worked example.	RRA / RI training example
1.1	Oct. 15, 2026	Riverbend Works District	Illustrative update: PM appointed, governance adopted, rail option extended, scopes approved.	RRA Board / Steering Team
1.2	Dec. 15, 2026	Riverbend Works District	Illustrative update: reuse selected, Benefit Charter adopted, $850K phase capitalized and launched.	RRA Board / City / Partners

OPERATING PRINCIPLE

The objective is not to complete the workbook once. The objective is to maintain a shared, evidence-based readiness system that improves as projects and funding cycles advance.

Appendix | Notices, Attribution & Suggested RI Use

Model Notice

RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ is a working model of the Redevelopment Institute. All rights reserved. Riverbend Works District is a fictionalized training example based on common redevelopment conditions. Its community, organizations, budgets, capital sources, project facts, scores, decisions, and timelines are illustrative and do not describe one actual project.

Attribution Notice

The RI Funding Readiness Operating System™ is a Redevelopment Institute model informed by the systems-building principles and tools developed in Will Warren's Building Systems that Work: A Rural Guide to Aligning Workforce, Economic Development and Opportunity.

Use Limitation

This toolkit is an organizational, project-pipeline, and funding-readiness tool. It is not legal, environmental, engineering, accounting, investment, procurement, or grant-compliance advice. Project teams should obtain qualified professional guidance appropriate to the site, transaction, funding source, and jurisdiction.

Information governance: Completed worksheets may contain sensitive project, ownership, financial, environmental, or partner information. Establish appropriate access, retention, version-control, and sharing rules before use.

Trademark Status

The ™ symbol indicates a claimed trademark or service-mark designation. It does not indicate federal registration. Do not use the ® symbol unless registration has been granted.

Suggested RI Applications

Product	Role
RI Three-Category Readiness Evaluation™	An evidence-based evaluation of application, project, and systems readiness used to determine the current readiness position and identify gaps before entering the complete toolkit.
RI Funding Readiness Gap Summary™	The consolidated record of readiness gaps, missing evidence or decisions, and the FROS components that should receive particular attention during the full system build.
RI Project Readiness Profile™	The evidence-based full-tool output showing current and target maturity, operating products, ownership, handoffs, and actions across all eight components.
RI Funding Sequence Map™	The phased capital roadmap connecting milestones, uses, prerequisites, public/philanthropic/private sources, and timing.
RI Readiness Action Plan™	The accountable 30/60/90-day implementation pathway for building missing operating conditions and advancing the pipeline.
RI Funding Readiness Clinic™	A facilitated application of the complete model to a live site, connected initiative, or community project pipeline.