

**OFFICERS**

Chair  
Hamid R. Moghadam  
AMB Property Corporation

President and CEO  
Steven A. Wechsler

First Vice Chair  
David E. Simon  
Simon Property Group

Second Vice Chair  
R. Scot Sellers  
Archstone-Smith

Treasurer  
Christopher J. Nassetta  
Host Marriott Corporation

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Andrew M. Alexander  
Weingarten Realty Investors

Thomas F. August  
Prentiss Properties Trust

Thomas D. Bell, Jr.  
Cousins Properties Incorporated

Bryce Blair  
AvalonBay Communities, Inc.

David C. Bloom  
Chelsea Property Group, Inc.

K. Dane Brooksher  
ProLogis

John Bucksbaum  
General Growth Properties, Inc.

Debra A. Cafaro  
Ventas, Inc.

Richard J. Campo  
Camden Property Trust

Thomas A. Carr  
CarrAmerica Realty Corporation

Terry M. Considine  
AIMCO

Arthur M. Coppola  
The Macerich Company

Thomas J. Corcoran Jr.  
TelCor Lodging Trust Incorporated

Edmund B. Cronin, Jr.  
Washington Real Estate Investment Trust

Anthony W. Deering  
The Rouse Company

Bruce W. Duncan  
Equity Residential

Thomas D. Eckert  
Capital Automotive REIT

John N. Foy  
CBL & Associates Properties, Inc.

John S. Gates, Jr.  
CenterPoint Properties Trust

John C. Goff  
Crescent Real Estate Equities Company

Rick R. Holley  
Plum Creek Timber Company, Inc.

Edward H. Linde  
Boston Properties, Inc.

Thomas H. Lowder  
Colonial Properties Trust

Peter S. Lowy  
Westfield America, Inc.

Michael Pralle  
GE Capital Real Estate

Scott Rechler  
Reckson Associates Realty Corp.

Nelson C. Rising  
Catellus Development Corporation

Steven G. Rogers  
Parkway Properties, Inc.

Steven Roth  
Vornado Realty Trust

Glenn J. Ruffano  
New Plan Excel Realty Trust

William D. Sanders  
Sanders Partners Incorporated

Warren E. Spieker, Jr.  
Spieker Partners

Martin E. Stein, Jr.  
Regency Centers Corporation

Garrett Thornburg  
Thornburg Mortgage, Inc.

Chris D. Wheeler  
Gables Residential Trust

Donald C. Wood  
Federal Realty Investment Trust

Richard S. Ziman  
Arden Realty, Inc.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS®



**VIA E-MAIL**

December 22, 2003

Mr. Jonathan G. Katz  
Secretary  
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission  
450 Fifth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20549

**Re: Security Holder Director Nominations (File No. S7-19-03)**

Dear Mr. Katz:

The National Association of Real Estate Investments Trusts® (“NAREIT”) submits the following comments in response to the SEC’s request for public comments with regard to proposed rules that would, under certain circumstances, require public companies to include in their proxy materials security holder nominees for election as director. NAREIT is the national trade association for real estate investment trusts (“REITs”) and other publicly traded real estate companies. Members include REITs and other businesses that own, operate and finance income producing real estate, as well as those firms and individuals who advise, study and service those businesses.

NAREIT’s purpose in providing comments on these proposed rules is not to disagree with the policies and underlying rationale articulated in this Release. Rather, our purpose is to request clarification with respect to certain of the proposed rules because, as the SEC itself has said, it has put forth a “complex proposal” that raises a number of important questions. Our concerns include the following:

*Clarify the Notice Requirement.* We believe that further clarification of the 80-day notice requirement would be helpful and necessary to avoid substantive conflict with advance notice bylaw provisions. As proposed, a nominating security holder or group is required to provide notice to the company of its intent to require the inclusion of that security holder’s nominee on the company’s proxy card no later than 80 days before the date that the company mails its proxy materials for the annual meeting. However, most if not all companies, have established notice and other timing procedures with regard to directors nominations in their governing instruments (*i.e.*, advance notice bylaw provisions) that often require lengthier advance notice (*i.e.*, 120 days prior to the date the company mails its proxy materials). What happens if the nominating security holder misses the advance notice bylaw date for business to be properly brought before a meeting of security holders (including the election of directors) contained in the company’s bylaws yet timely files notice under the proposed rules? If the company must include the nominee on its proxy card in accordance with the proposed rules, must it override its own bylaw provisions and



present such nominee for election at the meeting? Would it not simplify the notice requirements for all parties if any such notice provisions set forth in a company's governing instruments also governed the notice requirement for the purpose of security holder nominations under the proposed rules?

*Independence Standard.* We believe that the requirement that a security holder nominee be required to meet the definition of "independence" that is generally applicable to the directors of the company should be further clarified. It is not clear from the proposed rules whether security holder nominees would be required to satisfy objective categorical standards for director independence adopted by a company that may even go beyond the independence standards adopted by the self regulatory organizations ("SROs"). Does this mean that the nominee must simply pass the "bright line" conditions that disqualify a director from being independent? If a company establishes categorical objective standards, must the security holder nominee satisfy these objective standards as well?

*State Law Prohibitions.* Although the SEC has stated the proposed rules would not provide security holders with the right to nominate directors where it is prohibited by state law, very little guidance is given as to what this actually means. For example, if allowed under state law, can a company adopt stricter bylaw nomination procedures in its charter or bylaw, or opt into applicable state laws that prohibit security holder nominations, after final rules are adopted?

*Timing.* We note that several commenters have expressed concerns that nomination triggering events could occur after January 1, 2004 (which would be prior to any effective date of the proposal) and that a later date would be more appropriate. We echo that concern and request that the SEC consider imposing a later date in order for both companies and security holders to fully understand the complex procedures involved, especially in light of the fact that no final rules have yet been adopted. In particular, we are concerned that any security holder proposal providing that a company becomes subject to the nomination procedure in proposed Rule 14a-11(a) made prior to the final implementation of the rule could create confusion. What happens if a company's security holders approve the nomination procedure in the proposed rules at its 2004 annual meeting, but then the procedure is subsequently modified in the final rules? Does the security holder action become void? Is it automatically modified to comport with the final rules? Many new corporate governance rules adopted in the recent past by Congress, the SEC, and self regulatory organizations have included phase-in periods and we suggest the same approach for this proposal.

NAREIT appreciates this opportunity to provide its views on these important rules to the SEC. Please contact Robert Cohen, NAREIT's National Policy Counsel, or me at (202) 739-9400 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Respectfully submitted,



Tony M. Edwards  
Senior Vice President and General Counsel