

Minutes
Planning, Development and Real Estate Committee
February 28, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. Present were:

Committee Members:

Mr. Christopher Zimmerman (Chair)
Ms. Elizabeth Hewlett
Mr. Jim Graham
Mr. Peter Benjamin
Mr. Emeka Moneme
Mr. Gordon Linton
Mrs. Catherine Hudgins
Mr. Anthony Giancola
Mr. Jeff McKay

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 10, 2008 meeting were approved as submitted.

Action Item

A. Joint Development Guidelines

Mr. Bottigheimer presented the Joint Development Guidelines to the Committee.

Mrs. Hudgins asked what the timing was for bringing the local jurisdictions into the process and if a specific timing aspect could be introduced. Mr. Bottigheimer stated that the timing of consolidation would vary by project and situation, but that the information would be shared very early in the process. Mrs. Hudgins then asked for a clarification of the meaning of "early". Mr. Bottigheimer stated that the intent is to be contemporaneous and that in each case the timeframe would be specified up-front to the Board.

Mrs. Hudgins then stated that she hoped Metro could develop a policy to encourage workforce housing as part of transit-oriented development. Mr. Bottigheimer replied that workforce housing would be addressed as part of the transit-oriented development policy that staff will bring to the Board this fall.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that he supported affordable housing. Mr. Graham asked what is contained in the present guidelines concerning affordable housing. Mr. Bottigheimer referred the Committee to paragraph 1.1.1 "Goals", number 5. After discussion of Goal #5, Mr. Graham proposed shortening the first sentence of the Goal to read "Support other transit agency goals as they arise, including affordable housing." The Committee agreed. Mr. Graham expressed his appreciation for all the work that had been done by the Joint Development Task Force and Metro staff.

Mr. Graham referred to section 6.2.8 "Alternate Processes" for soliciting proposals and asked whether the Request for Prior Experience (RFPE) procedure [7.3] would create a stable of developers, i.e., a fixed, short list of developers that would be used over and over again. Mr. Bottigheimer answered no and stated that a fresh list would be created for each solicitation. Mr. Graham then asked if it was correct that in the event there were too few or too many applying, Metro would do a Request For Qualifications (RFQ). Mr. Bottigheimer stated yes and that in each case staff would request Board approval of a proposed solicitation approach [6.2.6].

Mr. Graham asked why there is a need for a two-step solicitation process [7.0] and why a two-step process would result in better solicitations. Mr. Linton answered that the RFQ process is helpful for learning what is out there. Mr. Linton further stated that it will generate interest and that the information received in reply to the RFQ could be used to improve the quality of the Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Mr. Moneme stated that a two-step process would give the Authority the time to get the best people involved.

Mr. Graham asked where the guidelines state that the Board has to approve the first step. Mr. Zimmerman referred to section 6.2.6 "Board Authorization" which provides the necessary language.

Mr. Graham asked why Metro would involve a third party to conduct the solicitation [section 7.4 "Advertise Solicitation"]. Mr. Bottigheimer stated that staff heard from many people that having this flexibility would be valuable.

Mr. Graham asked if section 7.14 "Adjacent Property Owner" mirrored existing policy. Mr. Bottigheimer answered yes.

Mr. Graham asked if section 7.16 "Subsequent Process" meant that the developer would have to go from A to Z and then from A to Z again. Mr. Bottigheimer answered yes.

Mr. Linton stated that the goal of joint development is to improve transit and that with these guidelines, Metro will do a much better job of promoting improved station access. Mr. Linton further stated that these procedures will enable Metro to establish up front what it wants so developers won't experience changes of direction. He praised the input and work done in revising the Policies and Guidelines.

Ms. Hewlett stated that what had been missing up to now has been the joint part of joint development, the front-end coordination, and that while the process may be longer, the new process will achieve a buy-in and produce a better project.

Mr. Giancola stated that he appreciated the effort that has gone into the report and guidelines; that the RFQ process is beneficial, adds time, but results in a better project.

Mr. Graham asked if the guidelines apply only to new projects. Ms. O'Keeffe replied yes. For clarity, she also suggested extending the final Resolve of the Resolution so that it read "That this Resolution shall be effective immediately and shall apply to all new joint development solicitations issued and proposals received after the effective date." The committee agreed.

Mr. Bottigheimer recommended that the Committee approve the Joint Development Policies and Guidelines.

Ms. Hewlett moved that the Joint Development Guidelines be approved as submitted with the recommended changes by Mr. Graham; the motion was seconded by Mrs. Hudgins. The Committee voted in favor of the resolution as amended; the vote was unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.