

LEGAL LANGUAGE SERVICES

TRANSCRIPTION OF AUDIO

DESIGNATED AS: 805025

Tape 5 Side B

Mr. Kennedy: Other questions for the developer.

UM1: Mr. Kennedy, may we finish our answer to Mr. Beck's question or are we out of time?

Mr. Kennedy: I want to give you that time. If you take a minute to wrap up, sure.

UM2: Okay. You also asked about the architectural aspect of the design in relationship to the things that John Husky and the others presented. Basically, the strategy was to have courtyards, each one of which was dedicated in some form or manner to the uses that were immediately adjacent. So the senior portion of it, there was in essence the seniors would have their space that was their space. We had separate lobbies. We had, so again, there was always a notion that that portion of the project would have a type of identity that was both unto itself and at the same time related to the project as a whole. We had different common rooms. You know, we tried to integrate the commercial, which we didn't talk about that much today, into that whole experience as well. What Ann mentioned is very important. It wasn't that obvious, but you could live in a unit with a stoop and at the same time have the means of getting in and out of that unit as a person who was disabled. So all of those things were built into the project and the thinking basically was fundamentally to try to make a courtyard project, each courtyard having a specific identity that in some way related either to the family housing the senior housing or the homeowner housing.

Mr. Kennedy: Okay. Well thank you very much. I think I gave most of the other developers an opportunity to say 30 seconds or so. But you've gone so far over, I'll give you 20 seconds to wrap up.

UM3: Thank you members of the committee for the job that you're doing. We know it's a tough and stressful job. We really, really appreciate the fact that you listened to us and you asked questions and we wish you Godspeed. You have some tough decisions to make but we recognize that so thank you very much.

Mr. Kennedy: Thank you. As the chair of the committee, I'd just like to thank Renaissance [Folks], LLP for your presentation this afternoon and wish you well as you break down your presentation and excuse yourself from the room. Thank you.

UM4: Hello everyone. Can I call this meeting to order please. Hello, hello. I'm not gonna get loud like [UI]. We need to have a group discussion regarding the team that just left the floor. Can we start at my left over here with Hugo please.

Hugo: Thank you. It was kind of a difficult presentation to follow I felt. Probably the fact that they had two proposals going at the same time, it was even more confusing. I couldn't understand the architecture that they propose and how it fits in in that particular site. I think it was a little unresolved. I don't think that the open spaces had enough visibility form the street and, in that sense, it was not a really successful approach. [UI]

UM5: My comments are on the architecture as well. That was a very qualified team. That architectural firm, I do know a little bit about them. I've seen some of their work. They're a top-notch architectural team. With the design they proposed to us though, I thought it was a little bit ambiguous. Quite frankly, I did not like the retail entrance on the corner there. It didn't do anything for me. I mean it was very close, kind of hugged or clustered around the corner. I thought their site plan was okay though and really the design is, you know, most of my general comments are and again, in terms of that team's capabilities and their capacity to do things, I think their track record speaks pretty high volumes. But, again, you gotta look at collectively can they come together in a holistic fashion and put together a project that could really fit down the street. Those are my general comments. Oh, I do need to bring up something, John, that I mentioned earlier. I know that all these, I've never been on a committee that doesn't go over, but at 4:45 I have something to do, I've got to go.

UM4: Well then what I'd like you to do is totally your point, leave your sheets with Jim [UI] and staff will put your results.

UM5: All right, let me get going on that.

UM4: Okay. Staff will put your results, not in terms of the total score, but give [UI] your number one, who's your number two and who's your number three and who's your number four and so another committee member doesn't have that responsibility. What I'd invite you to do

because you're not in the room is take a record of who your number one is, who your number two is, who your number three is, who your number four, provide it to Jim or Theresa and we'll record it at that time in which we all are going to record that information.

UM5: Okay, let me get going on that.

UM4: Okay. Go ahead [UI].

UM6: My comment's real brief. Apparently they're qualified, you know, they have some nice looking projects, the Burbank location, northern California of. One gentleman, black guy, he just kept making reference to another developer and I wasn't impressed with that. I mean if you're confident in your abilities and your own team, why you have to downplay somebody else's qualifications? That kind of, that was [UI]. I wasn't impressed with that. Then again there he kept over-selling his team and then didn't even know the guy graduated MIT. UCLA and MIT is like Pluto and Venus.

[UI – voice and laughter in background].

UM4: Sean.

Sean: Know your partners. Yeah, just some general comments and, you know, a little more on my experience with [UI] I was up in San Francisco when the [Brannon] project was done and, you know, they did do a fabulous job on that project. It was a really wonderful thing. So I think that the team itself is probably strong in terms of development experience, capability, bringing [meda] in I think actually

helps in terms of the financing which otherwise would have been a hole with them because Lambert has, they actually started off doing retail and commercial development first and then got into housing afterwards. So actually I think the team ends up being really well-rounded. The architectural treatment I thought was in some respects a cookie-cutter of Solomon's work and not necessarily respectful of this community and, you know, sort of the more historical context of the site. That being said, I thought, you know, they probably could alter that as they would go through a design process that would have sort of community involvement with it. And, you know, they seem committed to that. So, otherwise, you know, some of their numbers were a little off in some respects in terms of the market pricing they had and I thought that was a little aggressive. But otherwise they, on the sale side, but otherwise I thought it was, you know, a pretty good team, someone you could probably work with.

UM4: [Door].

UF1: I thought the team individually are all pretty strong. But put together, I was awfully confused. I mean it was just, I wrote confused. I mean, they all were very...but it just doesn't seem like they were very cohesive. So that was a little troubling. And, you know, I guess I was getting, I was telling [UI] any questions. But it's very hard, and I think I'm kind of looking at four of them because I'm rank...I'm trying to do the points and I'm getting awfully confused. I'm going

back and I'm adjusting the points because to some extent I think Chris brought it up best is that our evaluations form itself doesn't actually let us judge the proposal and, or doesn't give it as much credibility. And so you may have a really strong team who has the financial wherewithal to do the project stronger than others, but then there are other aspects of it that would give you [repause – sic] to select them. And so I'm telling you this now because I'm having trouble figuring out who's one, two, three and four. And if I do it purely on the points, there's a very good chance that someone who's best for the community is not going to score well in light of this criteria. So I'm having trouble right now. I'll pass on.

UM4: [Mario]

UF2: Ditto.

UM4: Miss Cooper.

Miss Cooper: From the moment that they started making their presentation, I think they wanted more to, for us to go on what they had done than what they were gonna present to us. And I just, it just left me blank.

UM4: [Harden] Carter.

Harden Carter: Yeah [UI] everything that everybody said was, I believe is true and particularly the scoring issue here that I'm kind of surprised, I was kind of hoping that whatever we did, we just give it to you in a pile and let you guys add them up. And whoever comes out on top is whoever comes out. That's what I was...to go ahead and try to do this

one, two, three, four, I can do it but, I could do it but that's what I thought was gonna happen. Thank you.

UM7: I felt like I'm watching the super stars game east versus west NBA. I do enjoy a simple Clippers game or Lakers game than watching 5 super stars playing for the court and there's no character, there's no team spirit. There's no, you know, belongingness to the community here. These people have come from all sects of the industry, finance, landscape, I'm sorry, architect, so forth and so on, and lawyer, etc. But I felt like they're lacking the basic concept; the community that needs a community-oriented developer, who's gonna do the best thing for this community. Can they do the job? Perhaps they can. I wouldn't take the gamble on them though. It's their first trial as a team together. They haven't done anything like this before. I don't know if I can trust them with this assignment. I do trust their talents, however. Now, a couple of other comments about these people. They spoke more of themselves than the project. That troubled me a little bit. They were bragging about their talents and the qualifications for the last, for the first 30 minutes. Financially they're very strong. They're the strongest of all 4 teams. And these people can put a project together and they can execute, they can deliver. There's no question about it. They're talented. They're well-financed, knowledgeable, with experience. However, they do lack some track record in Pasadena. They do lack experience and track record in these

kinds of projects. I want to be very careful about that. You know, I think we should choose someone that's gonna show humbleness, modesty and a connection to what the community [UI] project. And I didn't feel that this group has that. That's all I have to say.

UM8: This may not be the appropriate time for me to address this, but let me just say this. The process that we have undertaken from the beginning, like the creation of mankind or humankind, was imperfect. We all recognize that. I'm not suggesting that the process has not been flawless, but in order for us to be effective, I think this is one way to get us through this so we can end our day.

UM9: In regards to the team that just left, I agree with what Mike said, [Door], I think the sentiments are going around the table the same. As far as this process is concerned, I think we're a pretty diverse group of individuals. We've heard 4 teams. From what I've learned from everyone around this table, we are intelligent enough to pick who we want to pick right now. I don't see the problem here. I'm not gonna have a problem with the point system. I'm not gonna have a problem.

UM10: I wish it was that simple, I guess, I don't know. I think someone said this earlier. Now that we've met all 4 teams, there's a tendency that I want to go and pick the best one then put them together. But I mean everyone has their pluses and minuses. At the same time I'm thinking we're never gonna find the right team that has worked together, that's done this yesterday and they're gonna do it tomorrow. Being an

architect myself, you know, every time we go after a project, we put a team together internal to our offices. So you take the best grouping together for the best success and you take your shot at it. That being said, there's a lot of talent here and I think they were recognizing their own fields and but I am concerned about their working relationships in the past and specifically when the [UI] was talking about not even knowing fundamental information on his own team, which was somewhat bothersome. It tells you that it's a temporary marriage, which doesn't give you the comfort. That being said, I felt the project had some merits. I think they were finally come to the point where there was some problematic elements that seemed to sense where residential areas are divided whatever, you know, seniors are have their own courtyard, the families have their own. Maybe there is a magic about the parking that cannot be completely subterranean because of cost and so that midway point makes sense. Commercial, there was parking addressed also, surface parking that was addressed in another project that this one had also addressed. So there is positives and negatives. But in general, I think they ranked higher than some of the others. But that's gonna, we'll have to wait and see how that all [shelled] out for [UI]. Thanks.

UM4: Chris.

Chris: As always [UI] I'd like to [UI] some of these line elements and I think that this group had the one that was the second group we felt that had

[UI] subterranean parking. And [UI] the first group that had semi-subterranean parking also had an additional level of parking, one and a half levels below as well as the other side of the project which was I think one level below. So I think that, of the proposals that did not go for fully subterranean parking, that this was the better one, that they had a more, it seemed that they had the podium plan and accessing the podium was done in a way that was seemed to make more sense from an urban design perspective than the [Bakewell] Company's semi-subterranean...

UM4: Excuse me just for a minute, Chris.

Chris: Sure.

UM4: I'd ask you to do things that I didn't ask you to do earlier. One, have for your own personal records who you ranked what and their totals next to it and take that with you.

UM5: Okay, thank you.

UM4: I'm sorry, Chris, go ahead.

Chris: No problem. So, from a design perspective, I think that the team is gonna be capable, even though that what they showed us from the, it goes the same, it's the same thing I said about Heritage Housing Partners, which is that they didn't show us a whole lot at this stage of design but based on what we did see and track record and capabilities of the team, I think we're gonna get the best architectural product out of those, one of those two teams. So that for me means a lot coming

from the design perspective. And, again, back to my original comment about I think that every single team we saw today is gonna be capable of doing the project. I think all four of them are capable enough to pull it off. Which is kind of amazing because they're, these are the only four we have and they are all, they're all qualified, which is really lucky I think on the part of the city. But so those are my comments.

UM4: Mr. [UI]

UM11: Yeah, first of all I think they did, they may be a good development team but I think there was an oversell they went on from the beginning. The second part is that the development that they showed pictures of was usually multi-storied buildings and more or less like a downtown type of setting. And so I don't, I didn't get the feel for community in their presentation. That's basically my comment.

UM4: Okay. At this time, everyone has had an opportunity to share their thoughts on the last presenter, which was Renaissance Oak, LLC. At this time, I'd like to invite you to deliberate by yourselves for about five minutes and make your totals and then after that five minutes, I would like to ask Theresa and Jim to record on the flip chart who you individually have ranked your one, your two, your three, your four in terms of their presentations as it relates to the documentation in terms of recordation of your thoughts and your totals, your names, let me just be sure I have this right. Proposer would be the proposer by the name of their development. For example, the first one would be Heritage

Housing Partners and [UI] LACDC as an example in abbreviation.

You are the reviewer. The project name is Heritage Housing, is that correct? Heritage Square? Thank you for helping me. Heritage Square. And the date and your total points. [UI- background voice]

No, no, I have Heritage Square as the name of the project name. [UI – background voice] No, no, tell us, Jim, just for sure so for a project name that we can record that correctly. I believe it was Heritage Square. [UI – background] Okay, okay and the other thing that I'd like to open for a quick discussion, don't be hard on me, we need to end this today, is do you want it to be strictly anonymous or do you want the ability just to say who your number one is, your number two is, your number three and your number four as it relates to your totals, your name is on the document. That's one question. I have another question. My, as the chair, I'm recommending that we provide these documents to staff and that staff commits to us that these are not to be shared with anyone. [UI – background voices]. No, no, no, no, that's not true. That's absolutely not true because let me tell you why. [UI] Let me tell you why. If that analysis is correct, then why haven't we, as a group, opened this up for the public? [UI] [UI – background voices] But we had a ruling, if I recall, from Chris Fuller that said specifically what...the ruling was that these are not...our deliberations are not public. Go ahead Doris. [UI – background voice]

UF3: What if, yeah, you can give it to me and it'll be, because, yeah.

UM12: But at what point in my conversations...

UM4: Wait a moment. Let me try to get an understanding. I hear some unreadiness on my right that we should not have to place our names on scoring sheets. So we've been operating as a democratic process heretofore. My recommendation is that we should place our names on the documentation. That is the only way to identify later that our scoring matched the numerals that we put up there. Though you may have some unreadiness, I don't see any other way to move forward, unless there's someone else can tell me a better way. I do like [Dora's] recommendation in some respect about providing it to the consultant, Kaiser Marsten, who has been part of this process. But then again, we are tasked not by Kaiser Marsten, we are tasked by the City of Pasadena. [UI – background voices]. No. Well the recommendation is that we vote by secret ballot. I don't have any problem with that but there is a scoring tool that must be provided to city staff. I don't think we can change that at the end of this day. Go ahead Miss Eisenberg.

Miss Eisenberg: I sit on a northwest commission and I have to deliberate on [UI] funds and who gets what. I never hand these in.

UM4: But in this case, for the seriousness of what we've engaged in, my recommendation is that we provide that to city staff as a record of our votes.

Miss Eisenberg: And Dora, just let me, because this is in regards to a negotiation of land, I think it may not, I'm not an attorney but it may not fall under

that public information because this is, you guys own the city owns the land. So that you can do that in closed session. It does not have to be, you don't have to put out that information. So I think if you give it to the city, I'm not an attorney, but...

UM4: Well the ruling was...

Miss Eisenberg: It seems like that...

UM4: ...by Craig Fuller is that open meetings did not apply, the Brown Act did not apply so, therefore, I don't understand what the unreadiness is...

Miss Eisenberg: And I think that's why because why he said that and I think it's correct is because it has this is land negotiations. You, the city owns the land so then that does not have to fall under the open, you don't have to provide everything.

UM4: Well then...

Miss Eisenberg: But I...

UM4: Chris, I recognize you and then I would like offer some discussion that I would hope that someone would move as a motion and receive a second so we can get over this and get out of here. Chris, go ahead.

Chris: My suggestion was that instead of delivering the paperwork, perhaps what we could do is, it could be on the verbal record that we have delivered our scores verbally and then there could be a motion passed that says that we recognize that the commission has voted and these

are the totals, blah, blah, blah, so that the total ends up in a motion but the paperwork remains in our hands.

UM4: I'm not supportive of that because I think you have to retain the record and we should be able to stand by our record.

Miss Eisenberg: Can I just correct the record. I'm not opposed to turning it in. I never said I was. I was just letting people know what the impact is of turning it in.

UM4: Okay, here's my recommendation and see if I can get someone to move it, is that we rank individually. We will go around the horseshoe and each committee member will say who their one, who their two, who their three and who their four. The developer team with the most ones is our recommendation for the project. That's one piece of my recommendation. Secondly is that the scoring sheets will actually have the name of the reviewer and a total and that will be provided to staff only if staff can commit to us that they will go back to the city attorney, obtain a ruling if this can remain confidential, it's not subject to, we don't have freedom and information it only relates to federal but we do have a state law that's similar to freedom of information [UI] where the question is, is it applicable. That's my recommendation.

[UI – background voices]

UM13: What was the question?

[UI – background voice]

UM4: Why don't we just go around the room real quick. Hugo.

Hugo: [UI]

UM4: Terry.

Terry: You know what, I'm [UI]

UM4: I'll come back to you. Sean.

Sean: [UI]

UM4: Dora.

Dora: [UI]

UM4: Maria.

Maria: I prefer not to give [UI] all the points. I wouldn't mind giving my name with the total points.

UM4: Okay. [Porten]

Porten: [UI]

UM4: Harden Carter.

Harden Carter: [UI]

UM4: Mike Bailey.

Mike Bailey: [UI]

UM4: No preference, meaning it's fine to release it. Ishmael.

Ishmael: [UI]

UM4: Abe.

Abe: [UI]

UM4: No I said [UI] Abe. Chris.

Chris: I agree with the previous person. I didn't catch who it was that said I like the report total.

UM4: Mr. [UI]

Mr. [UI]: [UI]

UM4: Okay, then how we will proceed is that we will provide to city staff at the end of our tallying these documents and city staff will tell us, we'll go back to the city attorney and get a ruling for us that he would share before he would be able to release any information about the actual totals. So, first I'd like to start with Mr. Suarez. Tell [UI] who your one is, who your two is, who your three is and who your four is.

Dora: John, I know you're gonna kill me but I don't, once we give it to Jim, we can't take it back.

UM4: Correct.

Dora: So it's probably better that we...

UM4: You want to give it to me?

Dora: Yeah, we give it to you and once he knows the answers, then you can either hold onto them or you can give it to Jim because...

UM4: Okay.

Dora: ...once Jim has it, he gets an answer, we don't [UI]

UM4: Make that a motion.

[UI – background voice]

UM4: Well make the motion first.

[UI – background voice]

Dora: Right, I mean no one can compel John. I move that we give the scoring sheets to John at the end of this meeting.

UM4: It's been moved and properly seconded that the chair of this committee be empowered to retain the actual scoring sheets and not release them to the public. Is that the motion? Clarify it then Dora.

Dora: Now the chair will retain the scoring sheets until he hears from staff whether or not the scoring sheets are subject to public Freedom of Information Act.

UM4: Okay. What I would invite all of you to do now, even though you're giving who your one and your two and your three and your four is, for those of you, we haven't voted on the motion but I invite you right now to mark down your totals and your ranking for your own edification, so you cannot accuse me later of changing our ranking or you can accuse me of changing your numbers you will not be able to accuse me of changing your ranking.

UM14: Mr. Chairman if I may, Joel Ryan turned in his evaluation sheets to [UI simultaneous conversation].

UM4: Is there any more discussion on the motion? All those in favor, please signify by recording, let's record this act somehow.

[UI – background voices]

UM4: Okay. All right, it's being recorded, good. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple: Aye.

UM4: Opposed. Abstentions. One abstention, Ishmael [UI]. Okay, now we would like to go around the horseshoe and do our ranking. Please provide me, Joel Ryan..

[UI –background voice]

UM4: Okay [UI]. Hugo Suarez.

Hugo Suarez: I have [UI – voice in background]

UM4: Use another color please, blue or black or any other color. But you just can't see that one too well [UI].

[UI – background voices]

UM4: [UI] Roth. Do we need to come back to you?

[00:35:16 to 00:36:55 blank]

[From this point is repeat of prior text]

UM4: Sean. Dora. Maria.

Maria: I prefer not to give [UI] all the points. I wouldn't mind giving my name with the total points.

UM4: Okay. Porten.

[UI] [UI]

UM4: Harden Carter.

[UI]

UM4: Mike Bailey.

[UI]

UM4: No preference, meaning it's fine to release it. Ishmael.

[UI]

UM4: Abe. No I said Abe, Abe. Chris.

Chris: I agree with the previous person. I didn't catch who it was that said I like to report the total.

UM4: Mr. [UI] Okay, then how we will proceed is that we will provide to city staff at the end of our tallying these documents and city staff will tell us, we'll go back to the city attorney and get a ruling for us that he would share before he would be able to release any information about the actual totals. So first I'd like to start with Mr. Suarez. Tell me who your one is, who your two is, who your three is and who your four is.

Dora: John, I know you're gonna kill me but I don't, once we give it to Jim, we can't take it back.

UM4: Correct.

Dora: So it's probably better that we...

UM4: You want to give it to me?

Dora: Yeah, we give it to you and once he knows the answers, then you can either hold onto them or you can give it to Jim because...

UM4: Okay.

Dora: ...once Jim has it, he gets an answer, we don't want to...

UM4: Make that a motion.

[UI – background voice]

UM4: Well make the motion first.

[UI – background voice]

Dora: Right, I mean no one can compel John. I move that we give the scoring sheets to John at the end of this meeting.

UM4: It's been moved and properly seconded that the chair of this committee be empowered to retain the actual scoring sheets and not release them to the public. Is that the motion? Clarify it then Dora.

Dora: The chair will retain the scoring sheets until he hears from staff whether or not the scoring sheets are subject to public Freedom of Information Act.

UM4: Okay. What I would invite all of you to do now, even though you're giving who your one and your two and your three and your four is, for those of you, we haven't voted on the motion but I invite you right now to mark down your totals and your ranking for your own edification so you cannot accuse me later of changing your ranking or, you can accuse me of changing your numbers but you will not be able to accuse me of changing your rankings.

UM14: Mr. Chairman, if I may, Joel Ryan turned in his evaluation sheets to [UI simultaneous conversation].

UM4: Is there any more discussion on the motion? All those in favor, please signify by recording, let's record this act somehow.

[UI – background voice]

UM4: Okay, all right, it's being recorded, good. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple: Aye.

UM4: Opposed. Abstentions. One abstention, Ishmael [UI]. Okay, now we would like to go around the horseshoe and do our ranking. Please provide me, Joel Ryan...

[UI – background voice]

UM4: Okay, do that [UI] Hugo Suarez.

[UI]

UM4: Use another color please, blue or black or any other color. You just can't see that one too well [UI]

[UI – background voices]

UM4: [UI] Roth. Do we need to come back to you?

[End of recording]