

November 4, 2019
Dear Members of the City Council,

A few weeks ago, the City Council held a secret meeting to discuss, and perhaps select, a developer for the restoration/rehabilitation/adaptive re-use of Pasadena's Julia Morgan YWCA building in the Pasadena Civic Center. As an incentive to subsidize the cost of returning the dilapidated YWCA building to active use, the City has offered for development the parking lot east of the YWCA and the L-shaped parcel of parkland along Holly and Garfield, as well as the similarly-shaped parcel south and east of the YMCA building.

Despite public input demanding an open process to determine the future of these key parcels in the Civic Center, the City has chosen to hide the facts from us, the citizens who paid for and own these two parcels as well as the blocks on which they stand, and the surrounding nationally-significant Civic Center, including City Hall, the Public Library, the Civic Auditorium and the U. S. Post Office.

Now the Council is opening a public hearing, having pre-selected 5 of the 10 proposals received, with no public input in that process. The selection criteria are vague: 1) the proposals most advantageous to the City, and 2) most responsive to the goals established by the City. Who is the City here? The Council, the officials, the people?

The Civic Center Task Force recommended that the City commission a Cultural Landscape Report for the Civic Center National Register District. The City failed to do so, perhaps because they assumed that the CLR would interfere with their plan to monetize this civic open space. These parcels on the YM and YW blocks were purchased through a citizen-approved bond issue, and described in the adopted Ordinance as "the grounds, approaches and appurtenances" for City Hall. For almost a century they have played an important role in providing the setting for City Hall, as well as views of the Post Office, the Hale Building, and the County Courts building. They are also the setting for the Mack and Jackie Robinson Memorial, a public art work that pays tribute to Pasadena brothers Mack and Jackie Robinson, whose athletic prowess and civil rights struggles are of national significance. The sculptures of the Robinson brothers are by John Outterbridge, a nationally and internationally known Los Angeles-based African-American artist, who was not even recognized in the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Kimpton project.

Now we are being presented with Kimpton 2. One project proposes a hotel of 125-150 rooms. Another project proposes 167 rooms, yet another 164 rooms, another with 179 rooms, and the last, 142 rooms. We all remember how Kimpton morphed into 192 rooms and demanded a ground-lease subsidy of 50 years. No drawings are presented in the Agenda Report.

The importance of the decision arrived at by the City Council cannot be over-emphasized. How can we ensure that the open space remains open and that whatever happens to the YWCA is in keeping with the high architectural standards of the surrounding civic buildings? Why are we, the citizens shut out of this process? This is our Civic Center!

Sincerely yours,

Ann Scheid
500 South Arroyo Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91105

RECEIVED
2019 NOV -4 PM 5: 03
CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

11/04/2019
Item 7

Jomsky, Mark

From: Marsha Rood <marsharood@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2019 3:27 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark; Tornek, Terry; Morales, Margo; Kennedy, John; Hampton, Tyron; Masuda, Gene; Andy Wilson; Madison, Steve; Gordo, Victor
Cc: Mermell, Steve; Klug, David; Reyes, David; Duyshart, Eric
Subject: FW: YWCA PROPOSALS ON CITY COUNCIL 11-4-2019 AGENDA TONIGHT - ITEM 7 MV ROOD'S ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Tornek, Vice Mayor Hampton, Council Members, Mark Jomsky, City Clerk, Steve Mermell, City Manager, Eric Duyshart and David Klug,

I respectfully ask that my comments on Item #7 (shown below) be entered into the public record. Thank you, Marsha V. Rood.

**YWCA PROPOSAL ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS
ITEM #7; CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF 11-4-2019**

SUBMITTED BY MARSHA V. ROOD, FAICP

RESIDENT OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT. CITY'S DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR FOR 20 YEARS.

1. CRITERIA

- **RFP STATES THAT THERE ARE FOUR EVALUATION CRITERIA. WHICH ONES WERE MORE IMPORTANT?**
- **THE RFP SAID THAT PANEL MEMBERS WILL SCORE EACH RESPONSE IN THEIR "OWN PREFERRED ORDER" BASED ON THEIR "REASONABLE JUDGEMENTS." THIS A HIGHLY UNUSUAL PROCESS BASED UPON CITY ESTABLISHED PROCESSES.**
- **HAVE THE INDIVIDUAL PANEL MEMBERS REVEALED THEIR REASONS FOR THEIR SCORING?**
- **ON THIS BASIS ALONE, THE PUBLIC DESERVES TO KNOW WHO THE PANELIST ARE AND THEIR SCORING.**
- **DID POLITICS ENTER INTO THE SCORING PROCESS? HOW WOULD THE PUBLIC KNOW ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?**

- WAS ANY WEIGHT GIVEN TO MINORITY AND WOMEN-OWNED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS?
- RFP SAID THAT IF THE LAND WERE SOLD OR LEASING, ADDITIONAL CRITERIA WOULD BE APPLIED. HOW WOULD YOU KNOW AHEAD OF TIME WHETHER TO APPLY THEM OR NOT?

ALL OF THIS SHOULD BE PUBLIC INFORMATION.

2. PROCESS:

- WERE THE 10 ALTERNATIVE COMPARED USING A SCORING SHEET?
- WERE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ADDED TO THE CRITERIA? GIVEN ANY WEIGHT BASED ON PUBLIC INPUT DURING THE CITY CONCIL'S RFP PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 28, 2019?
- WHAT IS THE *GOING FORWARD PROCESS* TO DECIDE AMONG THE TOP PROJECTS?
- ARE YOU PLANNING TO DO AN *EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT* WITH THE SELECTED PROPOSER? IF SO, THAT APPROVAL MUST BE DONE IN A PUBLIC SESSION.
- WILL THE FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SALE OR LEASE AGREEMENT BE THE NEXT TIME THE PUBLIC WILL SEE THIS?

ALL OF THIS SHOULD BE PUBLIC INFORMATION.

3. LAWSUIT

- THE RFP SAID THAT THE LAWSUIT ON THE YWCA PROCESS WOULD BE RESOLVED BY THE END OF THE YEAR - THE PENDING LAWSUIT WAS NOT MENTIONED IN THE STAFF REPORT. WHAT IS THE STATUS?
- IF NOT RESOLVED, IT WILL BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT FOR THE CITY TO SELL OR LEASE THE PROPERTY.

ALL OF THIS SHOULD BE PUBLIC INFORMATION.

4. OPEN SPACE/GREEN SPACE

- OPEN SPACE AND GREEN SPACE PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION IS A CITY COUNCIL- ESTABLISHED *GENERAL PLAN* GOAL FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT. WAS THIS INCLUDED IN ANY ADDITIONAL CRITERIA?
- THE RFP REQUIRED BUILDING ON OVER HALF OF THE EXISTING OPEN SPACE CIVIC GARDENS. YET STAFF SAYS THAT IT WAS "NOT SURPRISING" THAT THE PROPOSERS SAID THAT SPACE WAS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO MAKE PROPOSALS ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE, SPECIFICALLY HOTELS. BECAUSE THE CITY ACTUALLY

REQUIRED THE LAND AREA OF THE CIVIC GARDENS TO BE PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT, HOW COULD STAFF KNOW THAT IT MADE A DIFFERENCE?

5. CIVIC CENTER GOALS

- HOW DID EACH PROPOSAL ACCOMPLISH THIS OR NOT? WERE SOME BETTER THAN OTHERS?
- WILL THE CIVIC CENTER *VISION* BE CHANGED BASED ON THE SELECTED PROJECT? IF SO, WILL THIS CHANGE OF *VISION* BE AN OPEN PUBLIC PROCESS?

6. PROPOSAL TEAMS

NO MENTION WAS MADE IN THE STAFF REPORT REGARDING TEAM MEMBERS LIKE ARCHITECTS - STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS? OTHER DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS? THIS IS OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE.

7. CLOSED SESSION

- WERE THE TOP FOUR PROPOSERS SELECTED DURING THE CLOSED SESSION MEETING ON OCTOBER 14TH?
- WERE "PRICE AND TERMS" NEGOTIATED DURING THIS CLOSED SESSION MEETING? IF SO, HOW WAS THAT ACCOMPLISHED WITH TEN PROPOSERS?

8. PROJECT SUBSIDIES

ANY AND ALL PUBLIC SUBSIDIES MUST ONLY BE GIVEN TO PUBLIC/CIVIC/NON-PROFIT USES, NOT TO PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

9. PROPOSALS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

ALL TEN PROPOSALS SHOULD BE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW. ALL PROPRIETY INFORMATION MUST BE TAKEN OUT TO PROTECT THE PROPOSERS. THIS COULD BE READILY DONE.

THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS SHOULD BE DONE IN PUBLIC!