



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
Ben Eysseleinck
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

Agenda

April 10, 2013

3:00 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. Interviews – 10-15 minute presentation, 10-15 questions from review committee each.
 - a. Capstone Collegiate Communities, LLC and Vlahakis Companies 3:15-3:45
 - b. Urban Cultural and Arts District, LLC. David C. Vanderklok & Project Partners 3:50-4:20
 - c. DTN 4:25-4:55
 - d. MTB Partners, LLC and Visser Brothers Development 5:00-5:30
 - e. Lurvey White Ventures 5:35-6:05
6. Break 6:05-6:30
7. Discussion of Criteria Scoring Procedure
8. Public Comment
9. 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

Meeting Minutes

March 27, 2013 – 4:00 PM
54-B District Court, Courtroom 2
101 Linden Street

1. Call to Order

Jester called the meeting to order at 4:01. At the taking of the roll, Dempsey and Schmitt were absent. Dempsey arrived later in the meeting.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mullins added Approval of Minutes to the Agenda which was e-mailed out. Wolf said the public comment period might be more appropriate towards the beginning of the meeting. Jester said when we get to Qualifications Scoring, he will solicit public comment on that, and also when they discuss Agenda Items 6 and 7. Jones Fisk moved to approve the Agenda with the addition of Approval of Minutes; Szymusiak seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

McCaffrey moved to approve the minutes as written; Lahanas seconded the motion. It was noted that the meeting started at 3:35 p.m. instead of 5:35 p.m. Wolf proposed four amendments to the minutes which he said he would e-mail to Soliday. Vote on approval of the minutes with the changes as discussed: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Written Communications

- E-mail from Bert Seyfarth
- Letter from Jacob D. Horner, CPA, Asst. Vice President, Great Lakes Capital Fund
- Letter from Colin Cronin, DTN Management Company
- Letter from Thomas R. Eckhardt, Eckhardt & Associates
- E-mail from Eliot Singer

5. Qualifications Scoring

Jester indicated at this meeting the Team would review the proposals from all of the proponents with respect to the five criteria in the first section of the RFQ/P, Qualifications. He said one of the qualifications concerns financial capacity; their evaluation will depend

upon results of the review by a small subcommittee of proprietary information which this committee will not see. He said the scoring they did as their homework will not be final. He stated each member has independently read the proposals and came up with a score. They will discuss the scores to see why there are such variations in the scoring. He asked the Team to move the interviews up to the next meeting instead of the second meeting.

Public Comment:

Alice Dreger, 621 Sunset Lane, indicated she lives in the Oakwood Neighborhood near the project. She said the sewer study that was budgeted by City Council was done for their neighborhood and she is delighted that money might go to fix the sewer. She said she is speaking for herself and indicated sometimes their neighborhood is portrayed as anti-development. They have invested a lot of money in our homes and don't like the vacant properties and would like to see them used for development of the City. They would like something sustainable. She expressed concerns about the capabilities of the developers with regard to economic development, and concerns about traffic as far as their children being able to play safely in the neighborhood. They want to see the kind of development that does not increase crime, drunkenness or any other kinds of conflicts. She said their neighborhood is disappointed that they are not represented on this committee. She invited developers to contact her and she will set up another potluck in their neighborhood. She said a student development would increase their concerns.

There was no other public comment.

Jester passed out a summary of scores of the six proposals; he said they will not be considering #3.

Dempsey arrived.

Qualification Criterion #1 – 20 possible points

Experience in completing projects of the complexity and significance of what is envisioned for this site.

Capstone/Vlahakis – Average 12.4; Range 10-18

Wolf said he had difficulty with the scoring, especially from the standpoint of how to arrive at a score on one item that ranges from 0 to 10 and one that ranges from 0 to 20. He suggested that in addition to the Average and Range, the mode or most frequent score or median would be important. He said he would like more detailed data and asked that the median and the mode be provided.

Mansfield said he gave Capstone a higher score. He decided to break the 20 possible points into different groups as follows: complexity – is there a simple scale that is involved; i.e. have they done a \$100 million project or not; scope – if it is a mixed use or pizza shop; and quantity – have they done one \$100 million dollar project or 20 of them. He allowed 10 points for size, 5 for scope and 5 for quantity. He said Capstone has done several projects over \$100 million; all of these projects have been in college towns and in an academic environment; they have done more than one of these projects.

Szymusiak said he scored them in the average 10 range because their focus has been student housing, with not a lot of experience in mixed use or urban development. Lahanas agreed with Mansfield and gave them a 10 because we asked for mixed use, mixed market, different generational housing which appeals to a diversity of people. He felt they are big in scope but one dimensional. Wolf asked if they

have completed any non-student or any non-housing projects. He said after scoring all the developers, he reconsidered some because they listed were in alphabetical order and his scoring process evolved as he went along. Jester said he scored them all three times.

DTN – Average 11.9, Range 7 to 16

Troost said he gave developers either a high, medium or low rating. He assigned DTN a 7, the low rating. He said he did not find from the proposal submitted that the complexity was there. Hittner said since he scored Capstone at 10; he scored DTN in relation to Capstone. He said he was concerned about the size and complexity of projects that DTN has managed. He noted they have a somewhat broader range of commercial buildings, but they are smaller than what Capstone has done. Sneathen said one of the issues he has with the process is the relativeness of the scoring. He said DTN is his third choice of all of the proposals. He rated them better than Capstone because they have additional office and retail experience that Capstone does not have, but still rated them mid-range. Tricia Foster said the scoring relates to what we were provided, and this location requires smaller developments. She took that into consideration and said there are some mixed-use opportunities other than that which was presented by Capstone, which is primarily multi-family.

Mullins added that she scored DTN high because of the quantity of the work they have done and because they have consistently completed projects, even though not at the same scale as this project.

Lurvey White Ventures – Average 14.4, Range 8 to 20

Szymusiak said he gave them an 8 because when he looked at their list of completed projects, he found them to be mostly institutional. He said the Riverfront Center kind of fits into the mold, but is only one building. He said they do not have a track record in building large, multi-use buildings.

McCaffrey said he gave them a high score because they have worked in the private sector, government, and nonprofit projects. Troost said he gave them a high rating and looked at their team – as a group they should be able to handle a project of this complexity. Jones Fisk gave them an 18 because of who they partner with and what those companies do. She said she went online and saw that what they proposed is what they have built. Now a lot of what is built is what the Planning Commission sees in the renderings.

Jester asked if there were any concerns with the scoring. Lahanas said he had the concern of whether he is scoring just the people putting up the proposal or who they are partnering with. He said he tended to score just the people submitting and not their potential partners. He added that in-person interviews would be helpful for this reason.

MTB & Visser Brothers – Average 13.3, Range 8 to 20

Dempsey said they probably have the most similar project in scope with the original City Center Project; however, that was over 10 years ago and they had different partners on that project. They have a good track record, but for a prototype, suburban-type development. He stated this is urban development. So he gave them a lower score. Jester agreed. He said he lives in City Center I and thinks the result was pretty good. He said that was pretty different than anything else they had done. A lot of the early stages of CCI were done by the City and Downtown Development Authority through various contracts before the

developer came in, so he was not confident that they could successfully do the early parts, so he gave them a lower score.

Hittner said he gave them a lower score because CCI appeared to be commercial big box buildings. He said from his aesthetics standpoint CCI is utilitarian and does not need to be replicated downtown.

McCaffrey said he gave them a high score because he went on the strength of their work in the downtown and the fact that they worked with the community.

The Parkside Project – Christopher Jerome and Carpenter Group – Average 10.8, Range 5 to 20

Lahanas said the entity putting in a proposal did not have that much experience, but their partner has a lot of experience. Since he didn't know who will be doing the work, he gave them a low score.

Troost said he gave them a high score because their collective proposal was good. He said in looking at their collective package, the projects they have done in urban environments, such as Charles Square in Cambridge, Massachusetts, were creative and interesting. Jones Fisk concurred and gave them a 16. She liked the Hanover Inn and Liberty Hotel Project in Westin. Hittner said he scored them in the middle because Carpenter has the capacity to operate in complex projects if they are on board. He said they know less about Mr. Jerome, so he scored them in the middle.

Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intrigue – Average 10.1; Range 1 to 18

Wolf said he scored them in the middle because there was not enough information. He said even though they had nice renderings, there was not enough detail in the proposals, so he gave them a 10. Hittner said he gave them one point because he did not know who they were dealing with. He said they did not identify themselves in the initial proposal, and even in the follow-up questions they did not give a list of credentials.

Qualification Criterion #2 – 15 possible points

Qualifications, financial capacity and track record of key personnel and development entity.

Capstone/Vlahakis – Average 12.2, Range 8 to 15

Hittner said he gave them a low score because Capstone can build and make money off student housing, but whether or not they can do retail or restaurants is not clear. Troost gave them a high score since they have a proven track record in the country and have built at many university campuses all over. They are starting to mix in gateway elements, which are mixes of uses on the ground floor. Foster said she rated them at 12 because they are a proven commodity and can get the job done.

DTN – Average 11.3, Range 5 to 15

Troost said he gave them a 5 because he looked at the financial issue and their track record and did not find that they have dealt with projects across the spectrum. McCaffrey felt they have the capacity to get the job done. Hittner gave them an 8 and rated them equal to Capstone. He said this is their biggest and most complex project. They are successful midsize operators. He said their equity and finance numbers look formulated, and there was not a lot of detail to the numbers they presented.

Lurvey White Ventures – Average 12.6, Range 8 to 15

Szymusiak said he gave them an 8. He reasoned that although they displayed the ability to get some jobs done, they are using public funding. They have done some complex projects using other money; i.e. state money and tax credits. He rated them similar to Capstone and DTN.

MTB & Visser Brothers – Average 11.2, Range 6 to 15

Mansfield agreed with Dempsey's description and said they have a track record in suburban prototypes.

The Parkside Project – Average 9.3, Range 3 to 15

Lahanas said he scored them low because there is no assurance that the second entity is committed to the project, and the local partner doesn't have a track record. Wolf said he scored them higher because he looked at the experience of the potential partner and was impressed by that. Jones Fisk said she gave them a high score because the individual pages in the matrix said "in the past 10 years Carpenter & Company has successfully development projects." Haskell said she agreed with Lahanas because the legal connection between Carpenter and Jerome was not clear. Foster said it was difficult for her to rate them highly for the same reason. Hittner said he gave them a 12 based on the assumption that Carpenter was involved in this. He questioned whether the proposal is something that Carpenter presented to Mr. Jerome or if it was Jerome's proposal with the idea that Carpenter would participate, and stated it would be helpful to know this.

Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intrigue – Average 8.9, Range 1 to 12

Hittner said he gave them a 1 because he did not think they answered any of the questions. The 1 was on the basis of the projects they have had some hand in seeing through fruition. Jester said on this criterion he was looking for five capacities – site programming, design, project management, financial management, and the ability to work with the community. He just saw them as most qualified in design and working with the community.

Lahanas suggested that the developers bring their partners to the interviews.

Qualification Criterion #4 – 5 possible points

Experience in implementing green building practices such as those required for LEED certification and low-impact development such as innovative storm water management systems.

Capstone/Vlahakis – Average 2.6, Range 0 to 5

McCaffrey said they have LEED engineers on their staff and partner with an architect that has LEED staff on their team. Troost said they have one gold certified project and are attempting to get a silver certification. Szymusiak said if you need a LEED certified building, you hire a contractor/engineer with LEED certification, so he rated them all average. Dempsey said he rated most of them low. He said he wants to see people quantify it; i.e. how many buildings, what percent of the buildings are LEED certified. He indicated in one of the proposals the architect has a great background, but he wants to see the owners and the buildings they built. He didn't think anyone did a great job in demonstrating this.

DTN – Average 2.4, Range 1 to 3

Jones Fisk said she gave them a 3 because they did some storm water management projects with the Ingham County Drain Commissioner which they noted. Hittner said they don't claim any LEED experience or qualifications, yet they said they experience in dealing with the Drain Commissioner's office regarding storm water run-off.

Lurvey White Ventures – Average 3.3, Range 1 to 5

Troost said they mentioned they have a LEED Silver certification, and they show a LEED platinum project on their website. Sneathen said he rated them low because he questioned what their relationship is with the people they listed on the sheet. None of their projects showed LEED certification. Mullins added that DTN, for example, usually builds things that are leased out and utility costs are passed on to renters. Lurvey White has institutional clients that are demanding LEED certification and energy savings.

MTB & Visser Brothers – Average 1.3, Range 0 to 3

Szymusiak said he gave them a 2; and the scores were pretty uniform across. Mansfield gave them and The Parkside Project a 0 because of lack of information.

The Parkside Project – Average .9, Range 0 to 2

Jester noted there was lack of information.

Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intrigue – Average 4.3, Range 0 to 5

Troost said he gave them an 8 for a LEED Gold and a LEED Silver in their resume. Mansfield mentioned that they have clever storm water treatment. Wolf said he gave them a 5 because they were the only ones to address both parts of the requirement.

Qualification Criterion #5

Proven experience conducting community input/visioning sessions or design charrettes.

Capstone/Vlahakis – Average 1.3, Range 0 to 3

Sneathen said he gave everyone a 3 other than those who have actually done charrettes. Lahanas gave them a low score because they have to show a greater diversity of uses. Jester also gave them a 0. He said they never used this intensity of community input. Mansfield said there is a charrette experience vs. a willingness to do this, and he did not see this from most of them.

DTN – Average 1.8, Range 0 to 3

Szymusiak said he gave them a 3. He looked at their willingness to work with the community in terms of putting together a vision and said they are a local, known entity and would have more familiarity with the neighborhoods. Jones Fisk said she scored them a 2 because of her experience of being on the

Planning Commission and said in one of their projects in the Bailey Neighborhood they did not reach out to the neighborhood at all. That project did not go through. Hittner said he gave them a 1 because of that project in the Bailey neighborhood.

Lurvey White Ventures – Average 3.5, Range 0 to 5

Troost said he gave them a good score because of their partnership with Projects for Public Spaces and said you don't get much better than that. He also scored them highly because of just knowing their portfolio; he said they are a very credible organization in running charrettes. Dempsey agreed that Projects for Public Spaces is good, but he focused on proven experience of the development entity doing the charrettes on their own, so he scored most of the developers low.

MTB & Visser Brothers – Average 1.6, Range 0 to 5

Sneathen said his score was in error; he wanted to give them a 3 instead of a 5. Wolf said they did not provide much information to show community involvement, so it was difficult to give them anything other than 0.

The Parkside Project – Average 2.1, Range 0 to 5

Wolf said Jerome seemed to talk about his experience in having community involvement in Lansing. Szymusiak scored them a 3 because of his familiarity of the Red Cedar proposals.

Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intrigue – Average 3.5, Range 0 to 5

Mullins said they cited the PNC Bank which is a much smaller project, but there were several community meetings for that and there was a good outcome. Szymusiak also ranked them high because he is familiar with the way they do business and was involved with them when he worked for the City of Lansing. Wolf graded them highly and agreed with Szymusiak. He said they cite involvement with charrettes; he said we have to evaluate the developers on how they present themselves.

Qualification Criterion #6 – 5 possible points

History of utilizing high-quality design and materials in past projects.

Capstone/Vlahakis – Average 2.9, Range 1 to 5

Troost said this category is very subjective. He gave everyone middle of the road scores because it depends on the money they have for the project. McCaffrey concurred and said we did not have any information on how they will accomplish high design standards.

DTN – Average 3.0, Range 2 to 5

Mullins cited the investment DTN has made in the exterior of their existing buildings around town, including landscaping and building materials. She said she has been impressed with the aesthetics of their work; i.e. new construction on Burcham that was done a few years ago and the new signs on a couple of their properties along Abbot Road which were done in the last few months.

Lurvey White Ventures – Average 3.4, Range 1 to 5

Wolf said their renderings looked better than renderings from the other developers. Foster gave them a 1 because she is less familiar with that developer and struggled with the history piece. She said she does not know what the buildings they have built actually look like. Hittner said their buildings appear to be high quality buildings, not cookie cutter.

MTB & Visser Brothers – Average 2.8, Range 1 to 3

Dempsey said they were doing prototype development spec'd out by the corporate entity, so there was not a lot of room for creativity.

The Parkside Project – Average 3.4, Range 1 to 5

Szymusiak said who we are dealing with dictates the difference in the scores.

Urban Cultural Arts & Studio Intrigue – Average 3.8, Range 1 to 5

Lahanas said the examples were good examples and that if you drive by the buildings, you will see they look timeless.

Jester said from the minutes we can get the questions for the interviews. Mansfield said there were numerous cases where he docked points because not enough information was given.

6. Discussion of Financial Review Committee

Jester said they want to look deeply into the financial capacity of the proponents. The plan is for Haskell and Yeadon to look at this information. Yeadon said the committee can be declared a public body when they have decision-making power; but it is important to note that whoever is ultimately appointed will be on an information gathering only subcommittee and would not have any decision making power. The subcommittee will be reporting to this body. Lahanas questioned whether we will be reviewing all six companies. Haskell recommended short listing this at some point because to do an adequate job of due diligence, the subcommittee will have to review a lot of involved financial documents and risk assessment, so six would be excessive. Lahanas suggested reviewing the qualifications of the final three.

Jester questioned how long the process would take after the short list. Haskell said it will depend on participants' willingness to divulge information. She guessed it would take two or three weeks to go through the information.

Hittner expressed concern about the subcommittee not being able to score the proposals. Jester said each of the proponents made some representations about their financial capacity to do the project. He expected that the subcommittee could look over the proprietary information provided and decide whether what they represented in their public proposal accurately reflects their financial capacity or if they see reasons for concern. Wolf said the other component of financial capacity is cost estimates and requires some knowledge of construction costs.

Jester said we will set this aside for further discussion at the next meeting.

Mullins read the aggregate scores.

7. Discussion of Proposed Interview Format

Jester said at the last meeting they adopted a process that said the committee would score qualifications today, score the proposals at their next meeting, and interview applicants at the following meeting. He felt we should communicate to the proponents the issues that were raised today – what we saw that concerned us and invite them to come to our next meeting and go through the interview process. After that the committee could revise their scores. At the meeting after that the committee would bring all of the scores together and see if they can come to a consensus.

Lahanas asked if they can ask the principal people to come forward, so they know who they are scoring. Mullins said we would provide them with questions up front and ask them to give a presentation. There was discussion about whether or not to ask the same questions of everyone and how many people to interview. Jester said if we do the interviews at the next meeting we should interview all of them. Foster said we need to understand who we are dealing with and that she would be supportive of modifying the process. She said they should interview all the applicants because the scores are so close.

Jester moved the meeting to Conference Room A as another group had the room reserved.

The meeting reconvened at 6:05 p.m. in Conference Room A.

Jester reviewed the total average scores.

The committee discussed whether or not to interview all the developers at one meeting. Lahanas said the developers will be interviewed by Council also. The consensus was to do the interviews at one meeting and to give each developer the same amount of time. It was decided if a developer could not be present to not allow them to use video conferencing. Yeadon mentioned it would have to be visible to the public. Jester said they would defer activities for remaining meetings and schedule interviews on the 10th. Yeadon asked if we would let them give a presentation and then have them answer questions. Dempsey suggested giving them a list of questions ahead of time and have follow-up questions if we need clarification. Jester said we should ask them to speak to the criteria in order, and in doing so to take note of the discussion the committee had; the follow-up questions will be embedded under the headings of the criteria.

Szymusiak moved to conduct interviews on April 10 per Tim Dempsey's recommendation and defer the rest of their schedule to subsequent meetings. Troost said the developers should bring their teams to the interviews and speak to their relationship of having worked together before. Foster said we should know who is coming. Lahanas said they should bring the people we will be working with.

Mullins asked if we're just going to ask them to address the qualifications criteria only or to address the proposal criteria. Jester answered just to ask about their qualifications, because the designs will change during the planning process. Yeadon made a friendly amendment to ask staff to draft the particular document that will be sent to the applicants instructing them what it is the committee will be looking for with regard to qualifications, who we will be working with, and setting 30-minute time limits on the interviews. George Lahanas seconded the motion as amended.

Vote on motion as amended: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Proposal Criteria Scoring Procedure

This item was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

Wolf asked for a copy of the background to the summary spreadsheet. Mullins will send that out.

Jester said after the interviews we will ask everyone to re-score the qualifications if they wish and then score the proposals on April 17.

9. Public Comment

Jeff Baten said he thought it would make it easier to look at financial capacity by having the developer put \$50 million in escrow and draw from that. Or he suggested the City require the developer to bring to the table \$12.5 million in cash, considering institutional financing comes in at 75% of the loan value, plus the \$5.2 million owed on the land. He said we should also require a commitment letter from the developer's lender. We should ask the developer if they would be willing to self-fund the project, including the farmers market, TIF, the road, infrastructure, etc. and the City would pay them back later.

10. Adjournment

Lahanas moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:25 p.m., Mansfield seconded the motion. Vote: All yeas. Motion carried unanimously.

Lori Mullins - raw scores

From: Alice Dreger <alicedreger@gmail.com>
To: Lori Mullins <lmullin@cityofeastlansing.com>
Date: 3/28/2013 9:55 AM
Subject: raw scores

Hi, Lori,

Last night, several people intelligently raised questions about how the individual numbers might help us understand blind spots and trends in the review process. On that note, could you send me the raw scores broken down by item and team member? Thanks.

I'm so excited to see things finally moving forward on the area down the hill. It's been hard to walk through that mess every time we walk downtown (which in our family is just about every day). And thanks again for help spelling "Szymusiak" last night -- I could hear my Polish mother saying in my head, "It's spelled just like it sounds!" Yeah, right, Mom!

Alice

Lori Mullins - Location of meeting tomorrow

From: BJ Nocera <bjnocera@gmail.com>
To: Lori Mullins <lmullin@cityofeastlansing.com>
Date: 4/9/2013 9:34 AM
Subject: Location of meeting tomorrow

Good morning, Lori! Just checking in to find out the time and location of the April 10th City Center II meeting. Could you let me know on that? Thank you!

In thinking about the project and its long term ramifications, has a poll or survey ever been conducted regarding the interest in baby boomers, early retirees, and/or alumni seeking semi-permanent or permanent housing in the downtown area? We have only been back for a little over one year after having been out of state for 23 years so I do realize I am coming to this project a bit late in the game. My husband and I, as you well know :-), do want to live permanently in the downtown area.

Also, in regards to the retail portion of each of these projects, in general, does the developer attempt to fill the retail space or is that something other parties are responsible for? I have noticed that with both The Residents and the Lofts next to it, that their retail space remains available for leasing with no obvious tenants so I am wondering how this all plays out. Filling the empty retail elements of these projects plus the hoped-for City Center II project does seem a bit daunting. Is there ever a citizen's committee to assist with trying to get these spaces filled?

Just some thoughts. Thank you to you and the entire Planning Committee - this is a huge undertaking and I appreciate the attention being paid to the due process and always coming back to the statement: It must be good for the community as a whole. I remain hopeful that one or more of the projects will be found acceptable and be able to move forward to construction and residency.

Betty Nocera



PLANNING, BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT

Quality Services for a Quality Community

MEMORANDUM

TO: Park District Proposal Review Committee

FROM: Amy Schlusler-Owens

DATE: 4/9/2013

SUBJECT: Senior Housing Survey

City of East Lansing
PLANNING, BUILDING &
DEVELOPMENT
410 Abbot Road
East Lansing, MI 48823
(517) 319-6930
www.cityofeastlansing.com

With the American Community Survey citing estimates that senior residents account for nearly 17% of the City's population, the City and community agencies recognize a need in assessing existing and future housing opportunities for aging residents.

On February 7, 2013, the Friends of the East Lansing Seniors' Program, Prime Time Senior Program, and City of East Lansing received approval for a \$5,000 grant project. For the project, a housing survey titled "Welcome Home: A Housing Assessment for Senior Residents," will be created and sent to approximately 5,000 East Lansing residents aged 55 and above, and advertised to MSU alumni. Copies of the survey will be mailed to senior East Lansing registered voters, and a digital version of the survey will be available on-line. One thousand seven hundred Prime Time Senior participants will be e-mailed digital copies of the survey.

In the survey, residents will be asked to provide detailed feedback on two main areas of concentration. The first area includes questions aimed at assessing the current housing status of residents, including types of housing that residents currently live in; i.e. familial composites, monthly financial resources, etc. The second area of focus will center on the types of housing senior residents would like to live in or have considered for future development. Housing types may include co-op or mixed use structures. Information gathered will be used in consideration of future housing opportunities and documented in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Upon completion of the survey, data will be aggregated and community forums will be held to gain further insight on the need for housing accommodations.

To date, City staff has begun work on the development of the survey. In August, the survey is scheduled for distribution through mail and e-mail correspondences. Up to five community forums will begin in November. A survey report, highlighting the survey and community forum results, will be completed by February of 2014 and submitted to the Michigan Environmental Action Council, East Lansing City Council, and consultants working on the City's Comprehensive Plan at that time.

If I can provide any additional information regarding the Senior Housing Survey, please feel free to contact me through e-mail or phone (517)319-6931 at anytime.

>>> Eliot Singer <picaresquescholar@gmail.com> 4/10/2013 9:19 AM >>>
To the Review Committee

I hope to catch some of the later presentations (weather permitting), but even if I could come at the beginning of the session, there is still no opportunity to speak before, rather than after.

I want to point out that the story about personal property tax delinquencies related to bar/restaurant renewals has once again brought Mr. Vlahakis' tax delinquency record (or, as he prefers, that of limited liability companies associated with him) in focus. Not only is there a pattern of serial tax delinquencies with Dublin Square (real property and personal property), his exposure in City Pulse a few years ago, and the subsequent failed slander suit for using his name, has not changed the serial tax delinquency pattern in Lansing. Also, although I have only done a cursory check of Ingham County Register of Deeds records, even the cursory check is very disturbing in terms of risk profile.

Concerning the interviews, I think there is a very important topic not included in the questions that needs to be raised with some applicants: city debt financing. Two of the applicants, Lurvey-White and MBT-Visser, indicated an expectation of city debt financing of parking structure, etc.; Capstone-Vlahakis hedged, but from what I hear about how Capstone and other student rental developers handle parking when they have to build it themselves that is not comforting.

What we need to know is whether Lurvey-White or MBT-Visser would be willing to work with the city and community to seek an alternative, presumably tax increment financing reimbursements for the developer, to city debt financing. I feel the RFQ/P did not adequately represent the financial and political situation in East Lansing with regard to city debt financing.

As someone who has been adamant about exposing the city's financial mistakes involving development, my feeling is we need to look at the Park District as a public works project and seek to optimize the financial versus quality needs of the community, rather than looking for the best financial return, if that leads to concentrated student rentals and student-oriented businesses. This may require absorbing some losses on the existing city debt, because the simple fact is the city made a huge financial mistake buying the Evergreen properties. We cannot afford to take on any more debt, but it may be possible to work through a compromise in order to get an attractive project, and I would like to know if Lurvey-White or MBT-Visser would be willing to seek such a solution.

Eliot Singer



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 ¼ 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.

COMMITTEE SCORING

#	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	

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Average	Range
1	10	10	11	1	10	12	7	11	12	7	18	5			17	10	10.1	1-18
2	10	9	8	1	8	10	10	10	10	8	12	5			11	12	8.9	1-12
3																	0.0	
4	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	1	5	5			5	4	4.3	0-5
5	0	0	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	1	5	5			4	4	3.5	0-5
6	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

Interview Instructions to Park District RFQP Respondents, April 1, 2013:

As you know, the Park District Proposal Review Team has invited you and your partners on your Park District Proposal to attend an interview on April 10, 2013. We would strongly encourage you to have the team members presenting on that day, be the same team members who would be our primary contact throughout the planning and implementation of a project.

Please plan to provide a 10-15 minute presentation introducing your team and addressing the following items. These presentation items were based upon the Qualifications Review Criteria and the discussion that was held at the Park District Proposal Review Team meeting on March 27. The draft minutes of that meeting will be available on the project website www.cityofeastlansing.com/parkdistrict on April 3, 2013. The presentation will be followed by a 10-15 minute question and answer period with the Park District Proposal Review Team.

It may be helpful to consider the scoring weight of the review criteria when preparing your presentation and allocate appropriate time to the first two presentation items. Please succinctly address all topics in your presentation and during the question and answer period as they represent the criteria upon which the Committee will be basing its decision.

1. Please describe the role that each of your team members will have in your proposed project and the experience that they have in that role in completing projects of the scale, complexity and significance of what our community would envision on this site, including mixed-use projects and housing which is designed and marketed to a mixed market, including owner-occupied housing if applicable. Also, explain how the members of your team have worked together in the past and the way in which teamwork will be structured and managed. (20 points)
2. Please describe the qualifications of each of the key team members in terms of ability and history of programming site use, building community support, and obtaining financing for and completing large-scale projects. Also, please describe the legal relationship between the partners within the development team. (15 points)
3. Please describe your development team's philosophy and capability in terms of green building practices as well as your thoughts in terms of how green building practices should be employed at the Park District. (5 points)
4. Please describe your development teams experience conducting community visioning sessions and/or design charrettes and incorporating the resulting vision into your developments as well as how you would propose to conduct community charrettes in advance of moving forward with a project at the Park District. (5 points)
5. Please describe your development team's use of high-quality materials on past projects and what our community could expect to see if you were chosen as the developer for the park district. Some of the properties within the project area are also within the Historic District boundaries. Therefore, please describe any specific examples of your Team's experience working under the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines on Rehabilitation related to Historic Districts and how you would make the case for changing those properties. (5 points)
6. Please provide a brief overview of your proposal including your interest in incorporating the communities desires into your plans, your plan to attract new businesses into the project and your plan to expand green space into the public space within the project area. Please do not submit additional drawings of the proposed project. (35 points)