



# **DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

---

Park District Proposal Review Team

**Park District  
Proposal Review Team**

William Mansfield  
Douglas Jester  
Julie Jones Fisk  
Konrad Hittner  
Tricia Foster  
Ken Szymusiak  
Steve Troost  
Pat Wolf  
George Lahanas  
Mary Haskell  
Todd Sneathen  
Tim Dempsey  
Tim McCaffrey  
Darcy Schmitt  
Tom Yeadon  
Lori Mullins

**Staff Support**

Terri Soliday

**City of East Lansing  
DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING &  
COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT**  
410 Abbot Road  
East Lansing, MI 48823

(517) 319-6930

[www.cityofeastlansing.com](http://www.cityofeastlansing.com)

## **Agenda**

**March 27, 2013**

**4:00 PM**

**Court Room 2**

**54-B District Court**

**101 Linden Street**

1. Call to order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Written Communications
5. Qualifications Scoring
6. Discussion of Financial Review Subcommittee
7. Discussion of Proposed Interview Format
8. Proposal Criteria Scoring Procedure
9. Public Comment
10. Adjournment



# DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Park District Proposal Review Team

## Park District Proposal Review Team

Douglas Jester, Chair  
William Mansfield  
Julie Jones Fisk  
Konrad Hittner  
Tricia Foster  
Ken Szymusiak  
Steve Troost  
Pat Wolf  
George Lahanas  
Mary Haskell  
Todd Sneathen  
Tim Dempsey  
Tim McCaffrey  
Darcy Schmitt  
Tom Yeadon  
Lori Mullins

## Staff Support

Terri Soliday

City of East Lansing  
DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING &  
COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT  
410 Abbot Road  
East Lansing, MI 48823

(517) 319-6930  
[www.cityofeastlansing.com](http://www.cityofeastlansing.com)

## Meeting Minutes

March 7, 2013 - 3:30 PM  
54-B District Court, Courtroom 2  
101 Linden Street

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mullins opened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. She said the Park District Proposal Review Team is an ad hoc committee of the DDA. The purpose of the Team is to review the proposals, score them and make a recommendation to the DDA and City Council. Their intent is to forward on no more than three proposals to Council, which makes the final decision. Mullins stated she hoped that the Team could make their referral in April.

The members of the Committee then introduced themselves. Everyone was present except for Ken Szymusiak and Darcy Schmitt.

### 2. Appointment of Chairperson

Yeadon nominated Doug Jester to serve as Chairperson; Mansfield seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Written Correspondence

- E-mail and letter from Phil Bellfy
- Letter from DTN Management indicated they were unsuccessful in finalizing terms with Strathmore as part of the Park District RFQP and requesting to modify their plan
- Letter from Core Campus withdrawing their application as they were not successful in reaching an agreement with the property owner
- E-mail from Elliot Singer
- Betty Nocera
- E-mail from David Shane
- E-mail from Firas Joseph
- Letter from Christine Root
- Letter from Mr. or Mrs. Eldridge

Szymusiak arrived at 3:39 p.m.

#### **4. Consideration of Proposed Review Process**

Jester said the purpose of the first meeting is to go over the process and look over the review matrix drafted by CBRE and discuss the questions which the team members have. At their second meeting they will begin scoring the proposals. There will be a subgroup formed to look at financial qualifications. After that determination we will look at the criteria of those firms and then make a final recommendation to City Council.

Tricia Foster of CBRE Martin explained the scoring comparison for respondents of the RFQP. She said the matrix can be modified if needed. She said we would eliminate Core Campus.

Jones-Fisk moved to use the weighted scoring on the matrix instead of 1 through 10 scoring, with the provision to discuss the weighting further; Hittner seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **5. Discussion of RFQP and Review Criteria**

Mullins said the RFQP was drafted based on community input, and the scoring criteria came out of that process and was given to the developers when they submitted their proposals.

The Committee discussed what an applicant should provide for Qualifications Criterion (QC) #1 – experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site. Jester said all members should make notes of how they arrive at their scoring.

There was discussion on whether the team members should just look at the information submitted in the proposal or to get more information elsewhere; i.e. on a developer's website. The consensus was that scoring should be based on the proposal alone.

There was a discussion as to what financial information would remain confidential. Yeadon said a FOIA says if an entity seeking a public contract and submits documents to a public body, those are open to the public. If a public body wants to keep those documents confidential, it's difficult. This body would rely on information from the financial subcommittee.

Lahanas said we are just going to judge the applications based on what is in the proposals and will not wait for the financial review.

Jester said at our next meeting we will be reviewing our individual scoring. The initial scoring will be our homework; the team will do the scoring in public at our next meeting.

There was discussion about QC #6 regarding history of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects. Dempsey said in the development agreement we can include materials specifications.

Mullins stated that the team should just work on the Qualifications Criteria for the next meeting.

There was considerable discussion about whether or not to accept an amendment from DTN since they were not able to acquire the privately owned properties prior to this meeting. There was also discussion about fairness to all the respondents if DTN is allowed to submit an amendment.

They also discussed how to consider a proposal when a developer says it is seeking to get control of other privately owned properties. Dempsey said when reviewing the proposal we have to assume that the developer does not have control of the other properties. The team was in general agreement that they did not want to allow submission of amended proposals at this time.

Jester said at the next meeting they will just be discussing the Qualifications Criteria.

Szymusiak moved to accept the review criteria as presented with the clarification of scoring based on available points rather than 1-10; Hittner seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

## **6. Discussion of questions to be asked of RFQP respondents**

Mullins said staff will forward a set of questions from the team to the RFQP respondents, and we will receive responses before the next meeting. A three-page list of questions was provided as a starting point. For the Proposal Criteria, there was considerable discussion among the team as to whether to provide the same questions to all respondents, or to allow questions specific to the individual proposals. Two or three questions in the list were seen as general, such as information about the use of incentives and ownership of land.

Lahanas suggested when we narrow it down to three applicants, to have them make presentations to the Review Team and ask them specific questions at that time.

Mullins clarified that this is the first step of the review process; this team comes up with the top one to three (or no) developers. She anticipates that City Council will want to do interviews and their own review process. Upon selection of a development team to work with, there is still a lot to be done, including entering into a memorandum of understanding, holding public charrettes, and looking at financing. Once it's determined there is a project that is financially feasible that the community can support, the City would enter into a development agreement. There is also the site plan approval process at the Planning Commission level.

The team felt it was important to know what entity the City would be negotiating a development agreement with and asked Yeadon to work with staff on these questions.

Lahanas moved to request that the City Attorney draft three or four questions to determine the ownership and membership of the LLCs, as well as the public incentives to be utilized and final ownership of the project. Szymusiak seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

## **7. Discussion of future meeting dates and times**

Mullins said the next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 27 at 4 p.m. The Team agreed to hold meetings at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, April 10 and Wednesday, April 17.

Julie Jones Fisk moved to adopt those dates; Hittner seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

## **8. Public Comment**

Maureen McCabe Power, 1200 Blanchette Drive, asked everyone to use the microphones so the audience may hear more clearly.

Chris Root, 729 Sunset, thanked the team for putting importance on who we will be dealing with and their qualifications. She mentioned it is important to know a developer's experience in doing residential construction other than student rentals. She also asked that the Comprehensive Plan be considered in selecting a developer.

Dempsey said there will also be the input from the pre-RFQP forums.

Jeff Baten asked the team to take the time to do the research and look at cities such as Madison, Iowa City and Ann Arbor and what has made them vibrant.

## **9. Adjournment**

Dempsey moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:10 p.m., Mansfield seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

>>> Bert Seyfarth <bert.seyfarth@gmail.com> 3/7/2013 5:12 PM >>>

Ms Mullins,

Thanks for forwarding this to: CC2 committee and City Council.

Would developer be able to handle an increased scope of work should the scope be broadened to include land not currently owned by the city?

I've opined in the past that the scope of work should include consideration of the surface parking lot directly west of People's Church. This surface lot is large enough to accommodate a parking garage at least as large as that which was proposed in the now defunct Strathmore Proposal. That ramp needed much less land than was purchased on Evergreen. Given the value of downtown land, it would seem prudent to consider selling the Evergreen Properties to the developer and, if the city must follow its parking regs for the downtown district, use a part of the proceeds to buy the surface parking lot and build the ramp there.

I continue to believe that Valley Court Park must be extended east to Abbot Road. Such an extension would make a permanent pedestrian link to the rest of the downtown. Designed properly, it would be home to large scale civic activities like the Art Fair. Surrounded by new development, it would provide welcome respite from daily hustle and bustle. This extension would not have to increase the size of the park because, the western side of VCP has been marginalized by poorly considered uses. Some of the western end of VCP land could be developed. The current service alley would remain and serve new development east of the service drive. I would hope that any new developer would see the wisdom of designing any new build to face onto the park.

Lastly the site of the city owned community building should be a part of the mix.

As decision makers, you have the opportunity to do something really special here. Such opportunities are rare and important. Realizing the potential is difficult, takes vision and a lot of work but the rewards for doing so will be felt for decades, if not centuries, to come.

Bert Seyfarth, architect  
340 Northlawn  
48823  
517 332 5928



MANAGEMENT CO.

March 25, 2013

City of East Lansing  
Lori Mullins, Community and Economic Development Administrator  
Park District RFP Review Team  
City of East Lansing  
410 Abbott Rd  
East Lansing, MI 48223

Dear Lori & Park District Review Team,

DTN Management Co., and DTN Park District, LLC, have executed an agreement with CADA Investment Group, LLC ("CADA") and City Center Two Project, LLC ("CCTP") for the exclusive rights to include the privately owned properties of the Park District RFQP as part of the DTN Management Co., RFQP Proposal, and for DTN Park District, LLC, to be the Master Developer of the DTN Management Co., Park District RFQP proposal.

Therefore, DTN Management Co. can and will again pursue our original Park District RFQP proposal including all of the privately owned parcels.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Colin Cronin'.

Colin Cronin  
DTN Management Co.

March 25, 2013

Mr. Tim Dempsey  
Director of Planning and Community Development  
City of East Lansing  
410 Abbot Road  
East Lansing, MI 48823

**RE: Park District – Request for Proposal (“RFP”)**

Dear Mr. Dempsey:

Please be advised that this office represents CADA Investment Group, LLC (“CADA”) and City Center Two Project, LLC (“CCTP”) the owners of the following properties:

**100 West Grand River**

**120 – 140 West Grand River**

**341 – 345 Evergreen.**

We have been authorized to confirm to you that CADA and CCTP have entered into an agreement with DTN Management (“DTN”) to control and develop the above-described properties (“Properties”). Please be further advised that CADA and CCTP consent to the inclusion of the Properties in DTN’s response to the RFP and have agreed to assign any and all previously existing development rights and incentives to DTN.

Please contact me should you have any questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

**ECKHARDT & ASSOCIATES, PC**

  
Thomas R. Eckhardt

---

1427 W. Saginaw, Suite 150  
East Lansing, MI 48823

**TELEPHONE:**  
(517) 336-6736  
**FACSIMILE:**  
(517) 336-4499



March 25, 2013

Sent Via Email

Lori Mullins, LLA  
Community and Economic Development Administrator  
City of East Lansing  
410 Abbot Road  
East Lansing, MI 48823

Dear Lori:

I am writing to express my support of the Request for Proposal submitted by Lurvey White Ventures to the City of East Lansing to transform the East Lansing Park District.

The Park District Redevelopment is an extremely challenging project. I have lived in East Lansing for the past 12 years and was very disappointed by the failure of the previous developer. For a community as diverse and progressive as East Lansing to have obsolete structures like those in the Park District in its downtown is simply unacceptable.

I don't say this to criticize anyone with respect to City Center II. The failure of that project was largely brought on by the financial crisis and we just need to dust ourselves off and move on. I only mention the failure to highlight the extreme importance of the City/DDA to select the right developer for this project. It will be a long, tough process and partnering with the wrong developer will only exacerbate the problem and keep the blight around even longer. East Lansing is already behind other communities on revitalizing our downtown. We have such great assets to leverage and it would be a shame to miss out on such a great opportunity to re-energize our City.

I recently attended a meeting for the Detroit Regional Chamber where Dr. Richard Florida, the famous Urbanist, spoke to the attendees about the extreme importance of urban cores. He emphasized that a vibrant, diverse, and dense urban core is the new "factory" that will facilitate entrepreneurialism, creativity, and prosperity. He likened this to the actual factories that were part of Michigan's economic boom in the 1950s. We must build these new "factories" in our Urban Cores using strategies like placemaking. This is consistent with the vision that Governor Snyder has shared with the Michigan Sense of Place Council, of which I am a member.

David Lurvey and Ridgeway White are first-class developers. I have worked with them on the development of a new building for the Michigan School for the Deaf in Flint which has been extremely impactful on that community and the distressed population the school serves. I have also worked with Ridgeway in his capacity at the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation on several other projects that have greatly benefited downtown Flint like the redevelopment of the Durant Hotel and the Rowe Building. Both of these projects were extremely difficult to execute and have been incredibly beneficial to the community.

David and Ridgeway have excellent vision for rebuilding communities. They have a history of successfully executing very difficult projects. They have the tact and skill necessary to pull together all kinds of different stakeholders to make a project successful: public, private, and philanthropic groups. Their proposal is well thought-out and would be a jewel for our City for years to come. Most importantly, they have the financial capacity and knowledge to put together the financing for such a challenging project. I would be proud to have them create this vision in my City.

Please feel free to share this letter with the City Council, DDA Board and anyone else as appropriate. If I can be of any assistance to City Staff, Council or the DDA Board in their decision making process on this matter I am available at your convenience.

Best,



Jacob D. Horner, CPA  
Assistant Vice President  
Great Lakes Capital Fund  
O: 517-364-8943  
C: 517-449-9838  
[jhorner@capfund.net](mailto:jhorner@capfund.net)

**Lori Mullins - RE: Park District Proposals Update**

**From:** Peter Dewan <peterd@lymansheets.com>  
**To:** 'Lori Mullins' <lmullin@cityofeastlansing.com>  
**Date:** 3/11/2013 9:09 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Park District Proposals Update

Lori,

I understand multiple respondents to the RFP attempted to negotiate with Strathmore to purchase the properties on Grand River and yet that didn't preclude them from submitting a proposal based upon the criteria that was released by the City. DTN has the unfair advantage of being able to submitted a revised proposal after the deadline has expired and also with the benefit of being able to observe all the other proposals that have already been submitted on time. This is not fair to enhance DTN awareness of what the competing proposals look like.



**Peter Dewan**  
 Lyman & Sheets Insurance Agency  
*Protecting What's Important Since 1874*  
[peterd@lymansheets.com](mailto:peterd@lymansheets.com) | [www.lymansheets.com](http://www.lymansheets.com)  
 P: 800-618-0856 | F: 517-371-1881  
[Follow us on Facebook!](#) | [Connect with us on LinkedIn!](#)

Confirmation required when requesting coverage or changes by email

Notice: This message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain or disseminate this message or any attachment. If you have received this message in error, please call the sender immediately at 800-618-0856 and delete all copies of the message and any attachment. Neither the transmission of this message or any attachment, nor any error in transmission or delivery shall constitute waiver of any applicable legal privilege.

---

**From:** Lori Mullins [mailto:lmullin@cityofeastlansing.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2013 7:40 AM  
**To:** Peter Dewan  
**Subject:** Re: Park District Proposals Update

Peter, One update is a withdrawal and the other is a communication saying that they have not been able to negotiate a deal regarding the adjacent private property. I see this more as communication than as allowing them to make changes that benefit their chances of being selected.  
 Lori

>>> Peter Dewan <peterd@lymansheets.com> 3/8/2013 7:05:18 PM >>>

It doesn't appear to me to be an appropriate RFP process for a respondent to revise their plan once they have had an opportunity to review all other responses. Can you explain the City's thoughts? Everyone operated on the same deadline with the same data. I would hope for all respondents that the process remains transparent.

I appreciate your review and response.

Peter Dewan

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 8, 2013, at 5:24 PM, "Lori Mullins" <lmullin@cityofeastlansing.com> wrote:

Hello,

This message is being sent to everyone who has requested updates on the Park District Proposals.

I am writing to make you aware that one of the Park District proposals has been revised (DTN Management Co) and one has been withdrawn (Core Campus, LLC). Please see the updates here.

<http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/Home/Sites/EconomicDevelopment/CurrentProjects/ParkDistrictPlanningArea/SubmittedProposals/>

Also, the first meeting of the Park District Proposal Review Committee was held yesterday. The second meeting will be held on March 27 at 4:00 PM in Court Room 2, at 101 Linden Street. The third and forth meetings have been scheduled for April 10 at

3:00 PM and April 17 at 3:00 PM. The locations for the third and forth meetings have not been set yet. Meeting agendas will be posted in advance of the meetings and minutes will be posted upon approval by the committee. All of the committee's meetings are open to the public and the agendas include time for public comments.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Lori Mullins, LLA

Community and Economic Development Administrator

City of East Lansing

Office 517-319-6887

Cell 517-881-6909

---

East Lansing e-news is just a click away. Sign up to receive East Lansing's Dialog e-newsletter and other e-publications. Just visit <http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/news> today!

---

East Lansing e-news is just a click away. Sign up to receive East Lansing's Dialog e-newsletter and other e-publications. Just visit <http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/news> today!

>>> Eliot Singer <picaresquescholar@gmail.com> 3/26/2013 8:50 PM >>>

It makes no sense why there are written comments before the committee deliberates and oral comments from community members after, so I will resort to writing.

I want to remind you that the \$10 million completed project qualification was intended as an absolute cut-off, not as something to be factored into scoring. This qualification was strengthened at the behest of citizens and the only business-savvy member of Council, because East Lansing and other cities have troubled histories with abandoned, incomplete, or changed projects, due to developers who get in over their heads.

There is no evidence DTN has completed a \$10 million project, although there are some on the drawing board (which makes matters worse). Also, being represented on the DDA, DTN has a conflict of interest.

The Park District RFQP is the last chance, after the City Center II and St. Anne Lofts debacles, for East Lansing government to show it has changed and is willing to pursue development with an open, objective, process, true community-based input (not just going through the motions), risk-management, and eschewing cronyism and special interests.



## Scoring Comparison for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area East Lansing

		Capstone/Vlahakis		DTN		Lurvey White Ventures		MTB & Visser Brothers		The Parkside Project		Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Imtrigue		
#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	12.4	10-18	11.9	7-16	14.4	8-20	13.3	8-20	10.8	5-20	10.1	1-18
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	12.2	8-15	11.3	5-15	12.6	8-15	11.2	6-15	9.3	3-15	8.9	1-12
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	2.6	0-5	2.4	1-3	3.3	1-5	1.3	0-3	0.9	0-2	4.3	0-5
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	1.3	0-3	1.8	0-3	3.5	0-5	1.6	0-5	2.1	0-5	3.5	0-5
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	2.9	1-5	3.0	2-5	3.4	1-5	2.8	1-3	3.4	1-5	3.8	1-5
Qualifications Criteria:		65	31.4		30.4		37.3		30.2		26.6		30.5	
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15			15		15		15		15		15	
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10			10		10		10		10		10	
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10			10		10		10		10		10	
Proposal Criteria:		35			35		35		35		35		35	
Total Final Score:		100			65.4		72.3		65.2		61.6		65.5	



# Proposal Scoring for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area, East Lansing

**Development Entity** **Capstone Collegiate Communities and Vlahakis Companies**

**Project History** \$3.3 billion over 22 years including East Lansing projects: The Lodges of East Lansing on Hannah Boulevard and University Commons of Abott Road

**Financial Capacity** \$240 million in developments financed in 2013. Kayne Anderson Real Estate Advisors has served as an equity partner in many recent developments totaling over \$380 million.

**Proposed Development** Combine the City's property of 2.6 acres with property owned by 327 Abbot Road, LLC of 0.75 acres which includes Dublin Square to create 30,000 SF of retail, 30,000 SF of office and 280 residential units. Also included in the overall development would be the 0.47 and 0.5 acre parcels south of the proposed site. Other considerations would potentially include a hotel and/or a public parking garage.

**Vision Statement** Create a vibrant mixed use community in the heart of downtown East Lansing through a close working relationship with the City and the community; a plan which is financeable and which will break ground next spring

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	12.4
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	12.2
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	2.6
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	1.3
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	2.9
Qualifications Criteria:		65	31.4
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15	
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10	
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10	
Proposal Criteria:		35	
Total Final Score:		100	

COMMITTEE SCORING																Average	Range
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
18	18	11	10	10	10	13	10	10	10	15	10			14	15	12.4	10-18
12	11	13	8	10	12	15	12	8	15	15	15			13	12	12.2	8-15
2	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	0	4	5			2	2	2.6	0-5
0	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	2	1			3	2	1.3	0-3
2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5			3	4	2.9	1-5
34	33	31	22	27	30	35	30	25	28	39	36	0	0	35	35		



# Proposal Scoring for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area, East Lansing

**Development Entity** Legal Entity TBD and related to DTN Management Company

**Project History** Local investor, developer and owner-operator with considerable experience with similar developments in this market and the Greater Lansing Area: The Vista at the Heights in Lansing (2013), Aspen Lakes in Holt, Waterbury Place in Okemos, The Hamptons of Meridian in Okemos, The Quarry in DeWitt and 300 Grand River in East Lansing (2013).

**Financial Capacity** Through various partnerships, DTN owns/manages properties valued in excess of \$400 million. DTN's financial partners provided over \$112 million in financing for DTN's various projects over the past few years. Recently, DTN was provided financing from Wells Fargo for the construction of the Waterbury Place mixed-use development at the corner of Hagadorn and Mount Hope Roads and within 3 months of project completion acquired permanent financing from Fannie Mae. DTN's proposal includes letters of intent for financing for the Park District Planning Area project from Wells Fargo, Arbor Commercial Mortgage and Key Bank.

**Proposed Development** There are four areas of conceptual development within the Park District and around Valley Court Park. The first two areas are directly related to the RFQP while the third is outside the scope of the RFQP and the fourth is conceptual. All four components combine to form DTN's vision of a 10-story mixed-use building, a five-story mixed-use building, a central parking structure, a skywalk, a year round farmers market (City), and an outdoor performing arts stage (City) to revitalize the Park District and the entirety of Valley Court Park. DTN is currently negotiating a Letter of Intent with Strathmore Development Co. for the purchase of 3 parcels of land within the project scope. DTN has agreements to develop the Biggby coffee location east of Delta Street with the vacant land west of Delta Street as part of a separately proposed development.

**Vision Statement** Create a walkable, LEED certified, sustainable, residential, commercial and lifestyle "anchor" for the west end of downtown East Lansing; a mixture of residential, commercial, retail and new park amenities will leverage each other to create an environment residents want to live and businesses want to be.

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	11.9
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	11.3
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	2.4
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	1.8
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	3.0
Qualifications Criteria:		65	30.4
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15	
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10	
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10	
Proposal Criteria:		35	
Total Final Score:		100	

COMMITTEE SCORING																Average	Range
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
13	14	10	8	12	15	7	12	12	11	15	10			16	12	11.9	7-16
11	10	10	8	13	12	5	12	10	13	15	12			13	14	11.3	5-15
2	3	3	1	3	2	1	3	3	1	3	3			3	2	2.4	1-3
0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3	2	1	3	2			3	2	1.8	0-3
3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3			3	5	3.0	2-5
29	30	27	20	33	35	17	33	31	28	39	30	0	0	38	35		





# Proposal Scoring for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area, East Lansing

**Development Entity** Lurvey White Ventures

**Project History** LWV has successfully overseen the completion of a wide range of institutional, high-tech, commercial, retail, restaurant, housing and mixed-use development projects in Flint, MI such as: Michigan School for the Deaf, Luke M. Powers Catholic High School Campus, Blackstone's Pub & Grill, The Community Foundation, Wade Trim Engineering and Riverfront Center.

**Financial Capacity** LWV developed \$36 million in projects in 2012. The principals have also completed multiple tax credit and mixed use projects totaling over \$100 million while overseeing over \$400 million in construction for third parties. Included in the proposal is a letter of reference from JPMorgan Chase Bank.

**Proposed Development** **Version One:** Four mixed-use buildings, a year round farmers market and market district park extending the footprint of Valley Court Park, a 120 room hotel with 200 person banquet center, 5,000 SF of office space with 9 potential retail options, 14 upscale lofts/condos with 100 residential housing units, and 350 parking spaces. **Version Two:** A traditional brick paved pedestrian Main Street with six mixed-use buildings, 16 new ground-floor shops, a year round farmers market, a 120 room hotel with 200 person banquet center, 20,000 SF of office space, 32 loft condominiums, 75 apartments, 120 student housing beds and 350 parking spaces.

**Vision Statement** Create a new Main Street adjacent to a year-round farmers market with a combination of historic and modern features to create a tree-lined, pedestrian-friendly area with multiple activities; Valley Court Park will provide for community members to stroll, relax, eat, dine and be entertained.

## COMMITTEE SCORING

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score	COMMITTEE SCORING																Average	Range
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	14.4	12	14	18	15	10	15	20	8	14	8	19	20		15	14	14.4	8-20	
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	12.6	12	13	14	12	12	12	15	8	10	13	15	15		13	13	12.6	8-15	
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0																		
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	3.3	3	3	4	5	4	2	5	3	4	1	5	2		1	4	3.3	1-5	
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	3.5	0	0	5	5	5	1	5	4	4	1	4	5		5	5	3.5	0-5	
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	3.4	3	3	5	5	4	3	3	3	5	3	3	1		3	4	3.4	1-5	
Qualifications Criteria:		65	37.3	30	33	46	42	35	33	48	26	37	26	46	43	0	0	37	40		
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score																		
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15																			
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10																			
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10																			
Proposal Criteria:		35																			
Total Final Score:		100																			



**Development Entity**      **Legal Entity TBD and related to MTB Partners and Visser Brothers**

**Project History**  
 With a focus on income producing properties, MTB Partners has completed a wide range of commercial development projects including retail, office, industrial and mixed use projects such as: CVS/City Center Retail/Condos in East Lansing, Barnes & Noble/CCII in East Lansing and City Center Parking Structure (700 cars) in East Lansing. Visser Brothers has historically been one of the largest property owners in west Michigan and has a diversified commercial real estate portfolio of over 4 million SF (retail, industrial, office and residential) as well as ownership of 4 hotel properties in western Michigan. The company is currently constructing a fifth hotel in Grand Rapids.

**Financial Capacity**  
 MTB Partners is/was a 50% ownership partner in the initial City Center mixed-use buildings at MAC and Albert Street, and has been a principal owner/developer in \$100 million worth of commercial projects over the past 12 years. The partnership is well capitalized and capable of meeting the financial needs of the project and included in the proposal references from Fifth Third Bank, Talmer Bank & Trust and American National Insurance Company.

**Proposed Development**  
 The proposed development in the Park District includes: 1) 100 room limited service hotel, 2) 15,000 SF retail space targeting an urban grocer, 3) 360 space, publicly owned and operated, parking deck, 4) 80-100 units of mixed-market rental housing to be situated above the parking structure, 5) 60-80 units of "senior" rental housing (predicated on demand), 6) Approximately 1/4 acre of open green space nearest the existing park for public gatherings (i.e. farmers market, concert in the park grandstand), 7) A Wharton Center affiliated theater component if viable, 8) Pedestrian friendly elements will be incorporated into the site plan to promote walking traffic to and from the park district area, 9) extension and realignment of the section of Albert Avenue, west of Abbot Road or relocating the main entrance to the park district area to the public parking lot.

**Vision Statement**  
 "Park Village" a Class A mixed-use urban development with particular attention to the needs of the residents of the community to further promote a symbiotic relationship with Michigan State University. The developer will attempt to minimize the environmental impact of the project while keeping "green" practices in mind. The project will anchor the west end of the downtown and broaden the appeal of the CBD.

**COMMITTEE SCORING**

**Average    Range**

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Average	Range
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	13.3	10	10	18	8	17	10	13	12	13	9	20	20			16	10	13.3	8-20
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	11.2	6	8	14	8	12	12	10	11	10	13	15	15			13	10	11.2	6-15
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0																		
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	1.3	0	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	3	0	2	2			1	1	1.3	0-3
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	1.6	0	0	4	1	1	2	1	2	4	0	2	2			3	1	1.6	0-5
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	2.8	3	3	5	2	3	2	3	3	4	1	3	1			3	3	2.8	1-3
	Qualifications Criteria:	65	30.2	19	21	43	19	35	28	28	30	34	23	42	40	0	0	36	25		
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score																		
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15																			
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10																			
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10																			
	Proposal Criteria:	35																			
	Total Final Score:	100																			



# Proposal Scoring for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area, East Lansing

**Development Entity** **The Parkside Project LLC a part of Carpenter & Company**

**Project History** Carpenter & Company has devoted its resources to the development of hotels, mixed-use projects and retail properties including: developed the five-star St. Regis Hotel at the corner of Third and Mission Streets in San Francisco, CA; Charles Square, a mixed-use project located between the Charles River and Harvard Square in Cambridge, MA; and the redevelopment of 240,000 SF Princeton MarketFair specialty retail center in Princeton, NJ.

**Financial Capacity** In the past 10 years Carpenter & Company has successfully developed projects valued today at more than \$1 billion.

**Proposed Development** Create an ongoing process of rebuilding trust, building consensus and community support and leverage the expertise and financial capabilities of this world-class developer with extensive experience in complex mixed-use projects—often in academic settings: 1) continue the process of seeking community input and support begun in creating the RFQP; 2) engage owners of adjacent private parcels; 3) create conceptual rendering and project pro forma; 4) coordinate process with City for public vote on sale of properties (per charter); 5) negotiate a Development Agreement between City & Developer; 6) seek formal approval by East Lansing City Council AND design a mid-rise or high-rise mixed use development with a distinguished design that respects community businesses and neighborhoods.

**Vision Statement** Combine strong community input with world-class development credentials to transform the Park District into a source of pride and desirable use. Such a collaboration is the logical approach to not only address the financial issues that now face East Lansing residents, but also the best way to develop something meaningful from the present collection of empty and underutilized buildings scattered across multiple parcels.

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	10.8
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	9.3
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	0.9
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	2.1
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	3.4
Qualifications Criteria:		65	26.6
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15	
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10	
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10	
Proposal Criteria:		35	
Total Final Score:		100	

COMMITTEE SCORING																Average	Range
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
10	10	16	12	18	5	20	11	4	5	15	5			10	10	10.8	5-20
12	10	14	12	14	5	15	8	3	5	10	5			7	10	9.3	3-15
0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	0	2	1			1	2	0.9	0-2
0	0	0	5	4	4	1	3	2	0	3	2			3	3	2.1	0-5
5	5	5	4	4	2	5	3	2	3	3	1			3	3	3.4	1-5
27	25	35	33	42	16	42	27	13	13	33	14	0	0	24	28		



# Proposal Scoring for respondents of the RFQP for the Park District Planning Area, East Lansing

**Development Entity** Urban Cultural and Arts District, LLC with authorized representative: Studio Intrigue Architects, LLC

**Project History** The entity's Architect has a long history of coordinating and leading project development discussion with groups at all levels—neighborhood, general public and faculty including: Lansing City Market in Lansing, Midtown Mixed-use Center in Lansing, Spine Center in East Lansing, 3515 N. Coolidge in East Lansing and The Residences in East Lansing.

**Financial Capacity** "The members of the entity have the financial capability to deliver a project of this scope and complexity"

**Proposed Development** Two, 10-story towers, one hotel and one apartment/condominium structure; a 3-story commercial/office structure; a six-level parking deck; a 3-story apartment building and an open air structure with a farmers market all connected by a pedway.

**Vision Statement** Overcome underutilization and redevelop into a vibrant, mixed use center while achieving common goals by strengthening the neighborhood; providing housing opportunities for people of all ages; improving the quality and vitality of the City's commercial/downtown district; promoting a growing economy, and sustaining greater density and integration of uses. Reinforce of 'sense-of-place' with a unique blend of comfort, opportunity and energy. This public/private partnership opportunity will increase the city's tax base while providing a reasonable return-on-investment. The project will create several hundred short-term construction jobs while securing several dozen part and full time jobs.

#	Qualifications Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.	20	10.1
2	Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.	15	8.9
3	Access to sufficient capital to complete the project as conceptually proposed, as well as reasonable estimates of project costs and sources and uses of funds.	15	0.0
4	Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.	5	4.3
5	Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions and/or design charrettes.	5	3.5
6	History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.	5	3.8
Qualifications Criteria:		65	30.5
#	Proposal Criteria	Points Allowed	Score
1	Proposal clearly integrates the stated preferences of the community.	15	
2	Demonstration of a sustainable plan to bring new businesses into the project, which will be assets in terms of providing jobs and services to our community.	10	
3	Provides a plan to expand green space into public areas, including streetscaping and plaza spaces.	10	
Proposal Criteria:		35	
Total Final Score:		100	

COMMITTEE SCORING																Average	Range
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
10	10	11	1	10	12	7	11	12	7	18	5			17	10	10.1	1-18
10	9	8	1	8	10	10	10	10	8	12	5			11	12	8.9	1-12
5	5	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	1	5	5			5	4	4.3	0-5
0	0	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	1	5	5			4	4	3.5	0-5
4	5	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	2	3	5			3	4	3.8	1-5
29	29	33	11	33	34	30	32	35	19	43	25	0	0	40	34		

## Member Ranking for Review

	Capstone/Vlahakis	DTN	Lurvey White Ventures	MBT & Visser Brothers	The Parkside Project	Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intric
#	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
1	1	3	2	6	5	3
2	1	3	1	6	5	4
3	5	6	1	2	3	4
4	3	4	1	5	2	6
5	6	4	2	2	1	4
6	4	1	3	5	6	2
7	3	6	1	5	2	4
8	3	1	6	3	5	2
9	5	4	1	3	6	2
10	1	1	3	3	6	5
11	4	4	1	3	6	2
12	3	4	1	2	6	5
15	5	2	4	2	6	1
16	1	1	3	6	5	3
total						
	45	44	30	53	64	47
Rank						
	3	2	1	5	6	4