



# 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.