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On Tuesday, July 1, 2021 the Point of the Mountain State Land Authority Board held a remote work session via the Zoom Meeting platform:

<https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_11t67FdJTpC2Y5Eu7F_lAQ>

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 pm.

* **WELCOME**

Chair Lowry Snow welcomed the board and consultants to the work session and explained the discussion today will help give direction for decisions to be made at the July 13th Board meeting.

Director Alan Matheson explained that the framework master plan should be completed within the next few weeks. Supplemental studies will help to provide information with more details for the plan. In the next few months, we will issue an RFQ to the development community. That solicitation must include a clear statement of what a developer’s role will be at The Point. Today’s discussion, hopefully, will clarify the direction we will take relative to the master developer structure.

* **MASTER DEVELOPER STRUCTURE FOR THE POINT PROPERTY**

Chair Snow welcomed advisory committee members Jim Zboril and Don Whyte to the meeting and invited them to introduce themselves and summarize their experience in the development field.

Consultant Erin Talking led the meeting discussion and reviewed proposed options for development strategies for The Point property. Presentation highlights included:

* + Two approaches previously considered
    - Proactive Approach – state as the master developer, identify district developers
    - Conservative Approach – One Master Developer
  + Developer Feedback
  + Tried and True Models for Large Scale Development of Public Sites
    - Master Developer for Full Site – Walter Reed (110 acres)
    - Master Developer for Infrastructure – Novus Innovation Corridor (355 acres)
    - District Developer (Philadelphia Navy Yard (1,100 acres)
  + Case Study Comparison
  + Developer Strategies and Variation for Consideration
    - Refinement of District Developer Strategy
    - A Blended Master Developer-District Developer Strategy
    - Refinement of Original District Developer Strategy (State as master developer)
    - One Master Developer Only Responsible for Horizontal (only responsible for infrastructure)

There was extensive discussion concerning the developer strategies and how they would work for The Point project.

Questions arose concerning the timing of development, possible models used to incentivize performance, goals for economic development in the area and formulas for land value. There was discussion concerning the different scenarios with hiring a master developer, the costs, long term value and benefits as well as the pace of development.

Consultant Steven Kellenberg provided clarification concerning the role of the master developer and explained that the master developer would have three jobs:

* + Determine and coordinate the backbone infrastructure for the first phase
  + Be the horizontal land developer for the first phase – parks, streets, refine master plan, create parcels for development and develop parts of the property
  + Provide land to flip to other developers

Board members expressed their views concerning the development and requested the infrastructure funding mechanism be clear. There were also questions concerning how to attract a quality developer for phase one and the importance that a transit infrastructure be in place.

There were comments concerning an exit strategy -- if the board was not pleased with the direction a master developer was taking they could engage a different firm. Clarification was given that part of the negotiation of picking the master developer is that they commit to adhering to certain parameters of the program and the urban design. Consultant Steve Kellenberg reminded the group that one of the interim studies will develop a set of design guidelines for the project so we can better control the project. Provided guidelines would include street character landscape, design, and architectural character for buildings. The framework plan is driven by the key vision elements and design guidelines will provide detail for creating clear vision and cohesion for the project.

It was noted that the board will be asked to vote on one of the developer strategies at the July 13th meeting. Board members expressed appreciation for the informative discussion which will be instrumental in helping with decisions for the next meeting.

Chair Snow suggested that we prepare a summary of this meeting and that staff and consultants develop a clear recommendation for the board meeting. There appears to be support for a blended master developer-district developer strategy which should be the focus of our conversation at the next meeting. Board members expressed their support.

* **ADJOURN**

Chair Snow asked for a motion to adjourn.

## MOTION: Representative Steve Handy moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 pm.