

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

MEETING DATE: March 8, 2018

TITLE: Approval of respondents for advancement into phase two of the 325 Blake Road Request for Qualifications process

RES. NUMBER: 18-019

PREPARED BY: Michael Hayman

E-MAIL: mhayman@minnehahacreek.org **TELEPHONE:** 952-471-8226

REVIEWED BY: Administrator Counsel Program Mgr.
 Board Committee Engineer Other

WORKSHOP ACTION:

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advance to Board mtg. Consent Agenda. | <input type="checkbox"/> Advance to Board meeting for discussion prior to action. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to a future workshop (date):_____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to taskforce or committee (date):_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Return to staff for additional work. | <input type="checkbox"/> No further action requested. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Requesting final action March 8, 2018 to maintain RFQ selection process schedule | |

PURPOSE or ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of respondents for advancement into phase two of the 325 Blake Road Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process.

The proposed action will advance five of six RFQ respondents into phase two of the RFQ selection process, a supplemental information request procedure to gather more information from the selected group of respondents. This request will occur prior to the interview process commencing in order to assist in determining if the selected respondent group should be further reduced.

PROJECT/PROGRAM LOCATION:

325 Blake Road North, Hopkins MN

PROJECT TIMELINE:

See draft *325 Blake Road Master Developer Selection Process* and associated schedule (attached).

PAST BOARD ACTION:

November 9, 2017 RBA 17-068 Authorization to release solicitation for Master Developer (RFQ)

SUMMARY:

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) purchased 325 Blake Road in 2011 as a key piece of the Minnehaha Greenway, more than 50 acres of continuous green space along Minnehaha Creek through Hopkins and St. Louis Park. With plans to treat over 260 acres of regional stormwater and restore over 1,000 feet of Minnehaha Creek frontage, the MCWD endeavors to transfer portions of the site not utilized for watershed restoration in order to accomplish the vision of the community at large.

This redevelopment will be a critical site in a greater effort to revitalize the Blake Road corridor in Hopkins, the site of the Blake Road Station on the Green Line Extension-Southwest Light Rail (LRT) line and a host of other redevelopment work. The property offers a unique opportunity for mixed-use, transit-oriented development within a brief walk of vast amenities, transit connections and green space.

As part of the redevelopment planning process, the MCWD, in partnership with the City of Hopkins (City) and the Southwest Community Works Blake Road Station Subcommittee – consisting of representative from Hennepin County, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, Edina, and other community leaders – developed a request for qualifications (RFQ) for a master developer on the current 325 Blake Road site.

Responses to the RFQ were due on February 14, 2018. The MCWD received responses from six development teams: Anderson Companies, Doran, Kraus-Anderson, LMC (Lennar Multifamily Communities), PLACE and Sherman Associates.

Upon receipt of responses, RFQ submissions were distributed to the staff committee – MCWD, Hopkins, Hennepin County and NTH (MCWD advisor) – for preliminary review, focusing on completeness and consistency with criteria provided in the RFQ. The staff committee completed their review and convened on Tuesday, February 20, 2018 to discuss their evaluations and compile information for distribution to the joint working group (three MCWD Board Managers and two City Council members).

The joint working group received the RFQ responses, preliminary evaluation material and evaluation forms on February 21, 2018. Subsequently, on February 27, 2018 the joint working group met to deliberate and select respondents to remain under consideration and be brought before the Southwest Community Works Subcommittee and the MCWD Board of Managers.

During the joint working group deliberations, it was discussed that five of the six respondents provided sufficient information to indicate their ability to successfully acquire and develop the site. The joint working group also discussed that, of the five development teams, the responses provided varying degrees of information regarding factors such as contingencies, acquisition process, redevelopment vision, integration of the site into the surrounding community and so on. Due to the lack of some of this critical information, the joint working group agreed that a supplemental information request – a second phase information gathering process – would benefit all parties in moving towards a successful negotiation. This supplemental information request will focus specifically on clarifying assumptions of the MCWD and City, as well as each of the respondents, and delve further into the topic of contingencies and acquisition process in order to align all parties prior to initiating interviews.

On March 2, 2018, with assistance of members of the joint working group, staff provided the Southwest Community Works Blake Road Station Subcommittee an overview of the RFQ responses, and the recommendation of the joint working group to advance five developer teams into a phase two informational request. The Subcommittee discussed responses and concurred that the joint working group recommendation would best position the MCWD, the City and partners in its pursuit of creating a successful partnership with a selected developer.

In preparation for the March 8, 2018 Board meeting, Managers are asked to review the selected respondents as provided by the joint working group, as well as all other RFQ proposals and evaluator input as they deem necessary, and make a determination on the group of respondents from which additional information will be requested in advance of selecting candidates for interviews.

The draft selection process and schedule are attached for review and input and represent the modified schedule based on the recommendation of the joint working group to gather more information. The modifications remain representative of the process and schedule set forth in the RFQ. As documented in the RFQ, the MCWD reserves the right to modify the process to obtain supplemental information as needed to inform the MCWD's selection of a development team that best fits the vision for the Minnehaha Creek Greenway, the Blake Road Corridor and the community goals and guiding principles forth in the RFQ.

In summary, upon review and deliberation, the joint working group recommends initiating the supplemental information request process to gather more information from the selected group of respondents. This request will occur prior to the interview process commencing in order to assist in determining if the selected group should be further reduced. The supplemental information request will be drafted in consultation with the MCWD's advisors from NTH, and will be reviewed by the joint working group and Southwest Community Works Blake Road Station Subcommittee prior to release.

At the upcoming Board meeting, staff will provide a presentation recapping the process to date, discuss the review of submittals and feedback from the joint working group and Southwest Community Works Blake Road Subcommittee, and highlight next steps in the selection process.

Attachments:

- RFQ response summary table
- *325 Blake Road Master Developer Selection Process* and associated schedule

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NUMBER: 18-019

TITLE: **Approval of Respondents for Advancement into Phase Two of the 325 Blake Road Request for Qualifications Process**

WHEREAS; the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) purchased 325 Blake Road (the "Property") in 2011 as a key piece of the Minnehaha Greenway, more than 50 acres of continuous green space along Minnehaha Creek through Hopkins and St. Louis Park;

WHEREAS; the MCWD has undertaken to transfer the Property for redevelopment while retaining fee or easement rights along the creek corridor to treat over 260 acres of regional stormwater, and to restore and preserve over 1,000 feet of the riparian edge for water quality, habitat and recreation purposes;

WHEREAS; a mixed-use, transit-oriented development of the Property is central to a broad redevelopment intent to revitalize the Blake Road corridor in the City of Hopkins ("City"), in which a range of public goals is sought to be achieved by the City, Hennepin County ("County") and other public agencies;

WHEREAS; the MCWD, in partnership with the City and the Southwest Community Works Blake Road Station Subcommittee ("Subcommittee") – consisting of the City and County, the Cities of St. Louis Park and Edina, and other community representatives – developed a request for qualifications (RFQ) for a master developer for the Property;

WHEREAS; with partner input, MCWD staff developed a document titled "Master Developer Selection Process," setting forth the procedure to review RFQ responses and select a master developer ("Selection Process"), which was reviewed with the Operations and Programs Committee and Planning and Policy Committee, and has been followed in the review steps recited below;

WHEREAS; on December 18, 2017, the MCWD released the RFQ with a submittal deadline of February 14, 2018, and subsequently received timely submittals from six development teams: Anderson Companies, Doran, Kraus-Anderson, LMC (Lennar Multifamily Communities), PLACE and Sherman Associates;

WHEREAS; a staff committee comprising MCWD, City and County staff and MCWD's real estate consultant, NTH, reviewed submittals and, on February 20, 2018, met to discuss evaluations and compile information for a joint working group comprising three MCWD Board members and two City Council members;

WHEREAS; on February 27, 2018, the joint working group met to review the materials prepared and transmitted by the staff committee;

WHEREAS; in the judgment of the joint working group, five of the six respondents have sufficiently indicated their ability to successfully acquire and develop the Property, but each submittal lacks certain information that would be beneficial to evaluate the likelihood of a successful negotiation of the Property transaction;

WHEREAS; the joint working group, accordingly, recommends that the group respondents for further consideration be reduced to five, and that respondents be asked to supply further detail before selections for interview, principally concerning assumptions that will underlie judgments of value and development schedule, contingencies and acquisition process;

WHEREAS; on March 2, 2018, MCWD staff and joint working group members met with the Subcommittee to review the evaluation and the joint working group recommendations to advance five respondents and to request further information from these respondents, and the Subcommittee concurred that these steps would best position the MCWD to continue toward a successful partnership with a selected developer;

WHEREAS; all Board members have had access to the submittals of all six respondents and to all evaluation materials prepared by the staff committee and joint working group; and

WHEREAS; a supplemental information request is contemplated by the Selection Process and is consistent with the RFQ;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the MCWD will proceed at this time with five master developer candidates: Anderson Companies, Doran, Kraus-Anderson, LMC (Lennar Multifamily Communities) and Sherman Associates;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MCWD staff, in consultation with other members of the staff working group and MCWD consultants, will draft supplemental information requests, which staff will review with the joint working group and the Subcommittee and, in its judgment, modify accordingly, before transmittal to respondents.

Resolution Number 18-019 was moved by Manager _____, seconded by Manager _____.
Motion to adopt the resolution ___ ayes, ___ nays, ___ abstentions. Date: _____.

Secretary Date: _____

MCWD Response Comparison

| | KA | Doran | Anderson Companies | Sherman | LMC / Lennar | PLACE |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| GENERAL BACKGROUND | | | | | | |
| Proposed Team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kraus-Anderson – development and construction • Timberland Partners – TOD residential developer • CalAtlantic – homebuilder • LHB – design • Kimley-Horn - design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doran – master developer • Doran Architecture – design • Doran Construction – construction • CommonBond – affordable housing • MN Assistance Council for Veterans – housing partner | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anderson Companies – master developer and construction manager. • Augustana – Sr. housing • EDI – Senior consultant • Ron Clark – for-sale townhomes • Anderson JV – Med Office and multi-family • Anders Co – design-builder • Leo Daly – Architect • Hart Howerton - Site Planning & Landscape • WSB – civil engineer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sherman Associates – developer • Kaas Wilson – architecture and design • Solution Blue – civil engineer • Craftman Construction – construction manager (affiliate entity of Sherman Associates) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMC/Lennar – master developer • Dominion – affordable developer • BKV Group – design and engineering • Sambatek – civil consultant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLACE – nonprofit community builder/developer • Stahl – contractor • Stantec – engineering • MSR – design • Rachel Contracting • LIFT – engineering • Horwitz – HVAC • Escape Fire Protection • Wells Concrete – precast • Collins Electric • Doug Speedling Builders – carpentry • Allianz – insurance |
| Preliminary Development Concept | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 multi-family buildings, 400-450 units, organized to provide mixed-income opportunities. • 49 for-sale townhouses • 2 flex/retail buildings and parking, if needed. • Community recreation area • Tallest buildings on Blake Road, height stepping down towards creek. • Limited streets and surface parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 650 new apartments – market rate, affordable, and supportive housing for veterans • Resident owned townhomes • Restaurant • Bike and care share terminal • Community feature and park area, provide gathering place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of affordable (goal of 20-30%), market-rate senior and multi-family apartments, and high-quality for-sale townhomes • Medical/retail. • Shared community and park space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two 4-story market rate buildings, 232 units • One 4-story mixed income/affordable building, 60 units, 60% AMI • Hotel, 4-stories, 94 keys • Commercial/retail, 4-stories, 33,000 sf. • Pavilion, splash pad, community space • 109 shared surface parking stalls for retail space and hotel • Significant surface parking for residential | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-story market rate, 250 units • 4-story workforce, 150 units • 40 townhomes • Community building, kayak launch | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living and working spaces across income spectrum • Family dwellings • Retail • Hotel • Renewable energy and food systems • Community spaces • Car and bicycle sharing programs • Environmental sustainability |
| Proposed Financial Approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Development Agreement to outline clear pathway to closing. • Fair purchase price and success based public investment package with savings shared with MCWD and City of Hopkins | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land price to be negotiated following completion of agreements, could take 6-9 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document goals and determine appropriate return parameters in order to negotiate purchase prices (for each partner) and any necessary assistance. • Shared due diligence costs. • Closing once entitlements are obtained, financing finalized, and pre-leasing realized. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land price determined collaboratively based on appraisal value, estimated project costs, and environmental conditions (6-12 months following selection.) • Contingent on approvals, including final approval of SWLRT. • Hotel and retail contingent on market demand. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely include appraisal or other negotiated settlement. • Gap financing mechanisms may be required to accomplish objectives and provide reasonable rate of return. • Coincide with SWLRT. • Share due diligence costs, \$300,000-\$500,000 over 2-3 yrs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site acquisition at closing of construction financing, estimated 18=36 months after execution of a Master Development Agreement. • MCWD made “whole” for acquisition and holding costs. • Could close earlier upon receipt of site acquisition funds from City of Hopkins and/or Met Council. |

| | KA | Doran | Anderson Companies | Sherman | LMC / Lennar | PLACE |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1. EXPERIENCE | | | | | | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 120 year history of urban and suburban work Timberland – TOD development experience | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doran and CommonBond have 30+ years of experience Recent work includes the Moline. Demonstrated familiarity and understanding of the process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20+ years of experience Hart Howerton has worked on Cottageville & Minnehaha Creek Corridor Project team is familiar with the area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong proposed team Experience with a variety of commercial development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experienced project team with national residential experience. Strong affordable partner. Combined team has delivered over 3,500 homes in area over last 3 years, including townhomes, 9 new Section 42 communities, and over 900 luxury apartment homes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLACE is a nonprofit Community builder founded in 2005. They have participated in \$1B of development. |
| Weaknesses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KA has less experience with residential development Team doesn't include an affordable housing developer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear about role of MN Veteran Assistance Council – separate housing? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response did not include affordable housing partner, although concept plan showed "workforce homes". | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response did not include affordable housing partner – Sherman has experience with affordable developments. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLACE is a relatively young organization, with a handful of completed projects. Concern about sharing organizational resources with the Via project in Saint Louis Park. |
| Other Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Net zero carbon is a goal. Has the team worked on net zero project? Reputation for delivering project on or under budget. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is CommonBond providing veteran housing as part of the project? Would CommonBond manage this property? Doran has quite a few projects around the metro area; do they have capacity for another project in their pipeline? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the teams worked together on a combined master development? Mentioned use of translators due to diverse community; recognized community engagement process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> History of moving forward with projects when other developers were cautious. Complex projects - renovated Cedar Riverside. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLACE is currently working on Via in St. Louis Park, hasn't broken ground. |
| Rating | Very good / Good | Very Good | Very good / Good | Very Good | Very Good | Marginal |
| 2. FINANCIAL ABILITY AND PHASING | | | | | | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KA, \$900M bonding capacity, substantial balance sheet and 5M sf portfolio asset base KA Development is backed by KA Construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong financial capability - Doran has developed over 30 projects valued at \$1.5B Doran doesn't need a partner for the financing of the project Doran and CommonBond have experience with grants, TIF, tax credits, private financing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$60M bonding capacity Team has worked to get multiple sources of public funding. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has developed over \$2B of projects with \$200M – 250M annually. Experienced leveraging multiple financing tools. Strong lender references. Has the financial capacity to complete the transaction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lennar and Dominion have experience with TIF, tax credits, and grants through Met Council, Henn.Cty, and DEED. Lennar - joint ventures for total development cost of \$6B, \$3.2B active pre-development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLACE suggests using the same sources and relationships as the Via project in St. Louis Park. |
| Weaknesses | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land price negotiations with each partner. Multiple closings after entitlements and pre-leasing. No formal financial information or structure. Utilized MCWD as property holder until various approvals or financial are developed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contingent upon approval of SWLRT Hotel and retail contingent on market demand, could be switched to residential. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial project costs over 2-3 years (\$300-\$500k) shared by Project Team and Project Owners (MCWD & Hopkins) MCWD and City of Hopkins to participate in financial underwriting to achieve reasonable rate of return | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little detail provided regarding funding. PLACE wouldn't close on the site until construction financing is finalized or site acquisition funds from Hopkins and/or Met Council. |

| | KA | Doran | Anderson Companies | Sherman | LMC / Lennar | PLACE |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Other Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal included preliminary schedule, construction in four overlapping phases. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project built in 3 phases. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of due diligence, design and engineering costs – Anderson project team or includes MCWD? | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed as two phases – townhome and affordable followed by market rate rental. | |
| Rating | Excellent / Very Good | Excellent / Very Good | Good | Good | Good | Marginal |
| 3. VISION FOR THE SITE | | | | | | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear understanding of the goals for the site and value of Minnehaha Creek and TOD. Desire to get people to the project to enjoy the Creek. Green space and pedestrian connections – little to no surface parking in preliminary site plan. Long term owner/operator | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision of market rate and affordable apartments, supportive veteran housing, townhomes, designed in relationship with natural environment of Minnehaha Creek. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master plan to be developed in collaborative process that includes MCWD, Hopkins, and community focused on TOD. Embraces natural amenity with plans for community park for residents and community. Vision includes senior housing, market rate and workforce homes, and medical/retail. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision for a transit-oriented, mixed-use development including a variety of housing types: market rate, affordable, hotel, and commercial/retail Green space and pedestrian connections Long term owner | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes and expects public engagement. Experience with L&H Station redevelopment project at Lake Street and Hiawatha Ave. in Minneapolis. BKV provided design and public engagement services. Concept plan included green space along Blake. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Community Builder” that strives to achieve affordable living, job creation, economic development, arts and cultural development. Mixed income dwellings, office space, creative micro-storefronts, hotel, and patent-pending renewable energy and food system, E-Generation. Community involvement |
| Weaknesses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacking details of affordable housing component and how the team will engage with community stakeholders. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision outlined in cover letter, however the proposal didn't include much detail on the vision or how they'd work with the community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No affordable housing proposed despite concept plans including workforce homes. Senior housing may not be an appropriate fit for the site; residents might not take full advantage of public transit on site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed income separate from market rate apartments and was furthest away from transit station. Preliminary plan includes a lot of surface parking. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary vision isn't particularly creative. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't address market demand for proposed development components – feasibility? |
| Other Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional costs for a Net Zero Carbon project? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not include a concept plan (NOTE: wasn't an RFQ requirement) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept plan (not required in RFQ) isn't detailed as to where components would go on the site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherman has experience with affordable housing, but it is not their primary focus. The RFQ response did not include a separate affordable developer. Site concept seemed inviting, but did not necessarily reflect great imagination. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualifier: “incorporation of as many of the Project Objectives as economically feasible” | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development to include “hundreds” of mixed-income residential dwelling units. |
| Rating | Excellent/Very Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good/Marginal |
| 4. QUALITY OF RESPONSE | | | | | | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response was specific to the site and hand delivered by KA – high level of interest. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well organized, professional. Included financial reference and sample projects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal included preliminary concepts for redevelopment and included thoughts on engineering strategies for water management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive response with details information on financial approach and contingencies. Project summary included building sizes, unit counts, etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only response to directly addressed each of the specific questions in the RFQ.. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong vision for dynamic development and community involvement. |

| | KA | Doran | Anderson Companies | Sherman | LMC / Lennar | PLACE |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Weakness | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light on details regarding how they would work with the community and their vision for the site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some confusion of roles between Augustana and EDI. Developer and operator? | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Didn't address the feasibility of the vision, market demand. |
| Other Comments | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not include a concept plan (NOTE: wasn't an RFQ requirement) | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not include a concept plan (NOTE: wasn't an RFQ requirement) |
| Rating | Very Good | Very Good / Good | Good | Good | Good | Good/Marginal |

| 5. SUMMARY EVALUATION RATING | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Summary | Very Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good/Marginal |
| Narrative Justification | Understood project objectives and opportunities on the site. Devoted time and resources to the response. KA lacks deep residential experience but brought together a strong team with Timberland. Mentioned mixed-income housing but didn't provide detail on affordable housing piece. | Deep experience with residential development. | Strong experience with suburban development. Concern about multiple closings and pre-leasing requirements. | Extensive experience with residential development. Identified significant contingencies that would need to be addressed. | Experienced residential developer, strong affordable partner. Questions about contingencies and pre-closing costs. | Enthusiastic RFQ response regarding vision for a dynamic TOD development with mixed-income residences. |



325 Blake Road Master Developer Selection Process

The following is the projected process the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) will use to select a Master Developer for the 325 Blake Road site. The MCWD reserves the right to modify the schedule at its discretion in order to best position the site to meet the vision, goals and guiding principles set forth in the RFQ:

1. Upon receiving submissions by the deadline of February 14, 2018, proposals will be entered into a preliminary tracking spreadsheet (company, contact info, etc.).
2. The RFQ submissions will be distributed to the staff committee for preliminary review. The staff committee will consist of approximately five (5) evaluators comprised of MCWD, Hopkins and Hennepin County staff. A redevelopment advisor (outside consultant) may also be asked to provide preliminary review of submittals. This review will focus on completeness and consistency with criteria provided in the RFQ. This review will determine whether or not each team is qualified to advance to further consideration by utilizing the following process:
 - a. Each staff member will review each submittal and complete an evaluation sheet to assess proposals;
 - b. Each staff member will provide comments on proposal content, quality and the overall developer team based on previous experience and professional judgement;
 - c. The staff committee will convene, discuss proposals, and group submissions into an overall ranking system based on quality. The groupings will be positioned on a scale of quality (Excellent – Very Good – Good – Marginal – Unsatisfactory).
 - d. A recommendation of respondents for further consideration will be provided to the joint working group based on this initial review.
3. All proposals found to be complete, and their associated evaluation sheets, comments, and overall rankings will be forwarded to the joint working group (a sub-quora of three (3) MCWD Board Managers and two (2) City Council members) for review.
4. The joint working group will review all proposals individually and provide comments on proposal content, quality and the overall developer team based on their review, staff input and professional judgement. An evaluation sheet similar to the one used by the staff committee will be provided.
5. The joint working group will meet to deliberate and select development teams to advance as respondents for further consideration to the MCWD Board of Managers. All Board Managers will have access to all responses as well as the evaluation input provided throughout the review process.
6. Prior to MCWD Board consideration and approval of selected respondents, the joint working group will present the merits of said respondents to the Southwest Community Works Blake Road Subcommittee for feedback. The Subcommittee will play an advisory role to the joint working group providing input on

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.

the recommendation that the joint working group is bringing before the MCWD Board. Input from the subcommittee will be available to all Board Managers (via written documentation).

7. The MCWD Board of Managers will review the recommendation as provided by the joint working group, as well as all other RFQ proposals and evaluator input as they deem necessary, and make a determination on the group of respondents to be advanced by the joint working group. The Board will take formal action in selecting respondents for further consideration based on input provided by the joint working group. The Board may also take action on the need to seek clarification based on the initial responses provided by the development teams. At its discretion, the Board may modify the process in order to request additional information as necessary and choose to advance any number of developer teams it finds qualified.
8. Dependent on the need for clarification based on the initial review process and Board direction, the joint working group may proceed through a supplemental information request process to gather more information from the selected group of respondents. This request will occur prior to the interview process commencing in order to assist in determining if the group should be further reduced.
9. If said supplemental information request process is initiated, the joint working group will consider responses to the information request and reconvene to deliberate and select up to three (3) development teams to advance into the interview process.
10. The MCWD Board of Managers will review the revised group, as provided by the joint working group, and make a determination on the group of respondents to be advanced by the joint working group into the interview process.
11. The joint working group, with staff assistance, will interview select respondents and participate in tours:
 - a. All attempts will be made to schedule site tours as one event, with respondents providing the location of their choosing within the Twin Cities metro area. If a selected developer does not have a local project to tour all attempts will be made to provide a virtual tour or other presentation highlighting the project of their choosing. These tours will be open to all MCWD Board Managers and City Council members.
 - b. Interviews will either be conducted at the same time as the tour, if convenient and time allows. Alternatively, the joint working group may decide to tour each site provided by selected respondents, and reconvene to conduct interviews at a subsequent date/time.
12. Upon conclusion of the interviews and tours the joint working group will deliberate on the merits of each of the developer teams and provide an opinion of selection to the MCWD Board of Managers.
13. The MCWD Board of Managers, on advice and counsel of the joint working group, will make a final selection of the master developer team it wishes to begin its partnership with and initiate the Master Development Agreement process.
14. The MCWD Board of Managers may or may not select a developer with which to enter into a Master Development Agreement.

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



The following is the draft schedule of key dates for selecting a Master Developer for the 325 Blake Road site. For more detail regarding process steps, refer to the draft *325 Blake Road Master Developer Selection Process* document:

| Date | Group | Facilitator | Process step |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| February 14, 2018 February 20, 2018 | Staff Committee | MCWD Staff | Preliminary review and scoring of RFQ submittals by joint staff committee (step 2). Submittals will be distributed on February 14. The staff team will meet on February 20. |
| February 21, 2018 | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Distribution of RFQ submittals and preliminary staff scoring sheets to Joint Working Group (step 3) |
| February 27, 2018 5:30 pm MCWD Office | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Joint Working Group review, deliberation and selection of respondents for further consideration. To be hosted at MCWD's Office (steps 4-5) |
| March 2, 2018 10:00 am Hopkins City Hall | SW Community Works Subcommittee | Joint Working Group and Staff | Presentation of respondents to the Southwest Community Works Blake Road Subcommittee for input (step 6) |
| March 8, 2018 | MCWD Board | MCWD Staff | MCWD Board of Managers review of respondents from Joint Working Group and formal action to select respondents for further consideration (step 7) |
| March 12-April 2, 2018 | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Supplemental information request to gather more information from the selected group (step 8) |
| April 2-9, 2018* | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Joint Working Group consideration of responses to the supplemental information request and deliberation to select up to three (3) development teams to advance into the interview process (step 9) |
| April 12, 2018 | MCWD Board | MCWD Staff | MCWD Board of Managers review of evaluation from Joint Working Group and formal action to select respondents to advance for tours and interviews (step 10) |

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| April 16-30, 2018* | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Site tours and interviews. Tours will be open to all MCWD Board Managers and City Council. Interviews will likely be conducted on a separate date (step 11a-11b) |
| May 7-15, 2018* | Joint Working Group | Staff Committee | Joint Working Group deliberation and opinion of Master Developer selection to provide to the MCWD Board. (step 12) |
| May 24, 2018 | MCWD Board | MCWD Staff | MCWD Board of Managers, on advice and counsel of the joint working group, will make a final selection of the Master Developer (step 13) |

* Specific date and time to be determined as process proceeds.

DRAFT

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.

