ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2010, 3:00 P.M
PLAZA DEL SOL, BASEMENT HEAR ROOM

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT
Alex Romero, Chair
Archie Garcia
James Strozier

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT
Paul Silverman

CITY STAFF PRESENT

Russell Brito, Long Range Planning, Planning Department
Richard Asenap, Metropolitan Redevelopment, Planning Dept
Maryellen Hennessy, Historic Preservation, Planning Department

---

1. **Call to Order:** 3:03 p.m.

2. **Changes and/or Additions to the Agenda**
   No changes.

3. **Approval of Minutes**

   NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Albuquerque Development Commission voted to approve the minutes for August 18, 2010 as presented.

   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER GARCIA
   SECONDED BY CHAIR ROMERO

4. Announcements

Jim Strozier introduces himself as one of the principals of a planning firm called Consensus Planning. He is very interested in the redevelopment opportunities for the community. This is his first ADC hearing and he's happy to be on the Commission and looking forward with working with the City.

5. Public Comments

No public comment.

6. De Anza Motor Lodge RFP

CHAIR ROMERO: So, we'll move on to Item 6 on the agenda which is the De Anza Project.

MR ASENAP: For the Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency. Before I go through the request, I'd like to introduce Russell Brito. Russell is the Manager for the Long Range Planning Division. He's also the acting manager for the Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency and Maryellen Hennessy is a staff member in advance planning, as well, with emphasis on historic properties. She helped me and Russell with the RFP that we're presenting today. So, I wanted to introduce them to you because they pretty much are going to be the MRA Agency for the near future. I think you'll have plenty of interaction with them as this thing proceeds. And with that, let me tell you a little bit of what were asking you to do today.

CHAIR ROMERO: Richard since we have a new Commissioner, do you want to expand upon that a little bit in terms of their role moving forward?

MR ASENAP: Yes. We're very limited in staff. I'm their last remaining member of their staff and because of that we've had to take some of the duties and responsibilities of the agency and spread around a little bit and the long range planning division essentially is going to be the MR agency for the near future. They will be staffing a lot of the work that we're doing now. We have an announcement out for a Manager for the division. I think it closed last Friday and they'll be interviewing, I think, over the next month or so. We also have other plans for the Fiscal Officer, the Administrative Assistant, the other planner positions that are open. So we want to eventually move to get the agency fully staff again and operating, but we've had a number of retirements. We've had a number of people that have left for other opportunities. So I think it's a good time for you to coming on because we're going need some new vision for the agency, if you will.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank You.

MR ASENAP: Sure. Well this particular piece of properties that we'll be talking about today.
There's one of our remaining staff members now. And the new addition, newest staff member, Gabriel Riveria. Gabriel is a staff member of the MRA Agency. He's on extended leave. You can see why he's on extended leave but he'll be returning soon.
Back to the property, we're asking you to approve the issuance of a request for proposal. This RFP will be advertised for redevelopment. It's going to have restrictions on it and I'll run through those restrictions with you. We're going to re-engage the neighborhood in the release of this RFP so the draft that you received, we'll be sticking pretty much close to that but there maybe changes. Once we start

talking to the business community and the neighborhoods they may ask for some changes in the RFP, but I don't they're going to be major. I think we covered pretty much what's been our history with the neighborhood and but we want to get it out.

The reason that we're issuing the RFP is that we actually had a development agreement. We had a developer. We put out an RFP in 2003, the developer and the City entered into a developer agreement which was signed in January of 2007. Through a variety of problems, a lot of it I think was economy, the developer just felt that he could not fulfill his end of the bargain, and as a result, in July, we met with the Legal Department and Administration and we met with the developer and we mutually agreed to terminate the agreement. So that developer is out of the picture at this point. He certainly can re-bid on the new RFP if he chooses to, but we feel that we need to get on with selecting a developer.

This particular piece of property has been empty for a number of years, almost seven years. We've tried to keep the deterioration of the building to a minimum. When people don't live in a building you get people breaking into it, you get windows broken, you get water damage, and really we need to protect it by developing redeveloping it as quickly as possible. So we feel we put together an RFP that will generate interest from the development community. It's our hope that will advertise it regionally and nationally because it is a prime piece of property.

The changes that we've made to the original RFP are that the property is now listed on the New Mexico State Registrar Culture Properties and the National Register of Historic Places which will require the developer to reflect the historic preservation goals of the property. Additionally, the Federal and State Governments have agreed to create a museum and visitors center on the property. We think that this will be a destination point that will be a marketing tool for the developer and incidentally is what the neighborhood and business community wanted and then trying to redevelop the property is to have some arm of the museum or visitors center as part of the development. And ironically, this will actually happen before the development will actually be privately developed, but the new RFP will have to reflect these changes and we think that it'll be a real draw.

The other changes that were made that were not in the original RFP is that we have a new sector plan for the area. A sector plan changes the zoning and the design standards of the property so the new developer will have to build to those new design standards, that zoning criteria, but once again, we think that strengthens the RFP on the property. So, I think it's a good time to issue the RFP. We think that there are a lot of good positive aspects to the changes that I noted but I wanted to take you very quickly through the process of what we're going to be following. If you choose to approve the issuance of the RFP this afternoon, we're going immediately start meeting with Citizens Advisory Committee of the area because in the MR plan that was developed, we promised that we would consult with the neighborhoods and we plan to do that. We plan to issue the RFP sometime in November and we hope to have a pre-proposal conference sometime in November as a result to that. The proposal target date is January 14, 2011 for bids to be received. We feel that's adequate time; however, we feel that if through the pre-proposal conference and through consultations with developers as a City RFP, if they feel they need more time, we certainly we'll reconsider that date, but we feel it is reasonable at this point. Like I said, we want to advertise the proposal as wide as we can and cast a big net to get a quality developer in.

I'm suggesting that we have a mandatory pre-proposal conference on November 30. You're probably asking 'why mandatory'. Well it's been our experience with these RFP's that unless it is mandatory, what we're constantly getting request at the last minute that the, to change the dates because they weren't at the conference they're a little confused, or don't understand the criteria that we're asking for in the RFP. And even though some bidders maybe out of state, they typically can find a local representative, a real estate agent, or other developer to represent them at the conference. So we feel that's important having it mandatory because of financial requirements and the MR code can be very cumbersome for developers.

In the MR plan, we promise that we would review with the Citizen Advisory Committee of the RFP. In the MR plan it says that they will make recommendations to you. So we'll work with them both of the issuance of the RFP and the bids that we receive on the RFP with these Advisory Committees of the neighborhoods and they will recommend to you probably at the February meeting they're short list of proposals, but the actually selection of the bidder will be up to the Development Commission. We feel that's in line with the ordinance that created this commission and certainly you have that responsibility and have that authority. We hope that you have redevelopment agreement in place after you make a selection by around May 2011 with construction start as soon as practical with reconstruct redevelop the property.

In the RFP, if you go to page 8 of the RFP, you'll see under the section evaluation and selection process pretty much what I laid out for you, however, we have some criteria how the property bids will be ranked. I won't go through the whole criteria with you but they're roughly with are six criteria. There's a total 105 points but as we go through the evaluation process with the neighborhoods I'm sure that these are going to be massaged a little bit especially the points that we've were suggesting here.

CHAIR ROMERO: So Richard.

MR ASENAP: Yes

CHAIR ROMERO: Well that's interesting that, I mean a little bit risky to have the Neighborhood Association being involved in this process. I think you've assigned the criteria allocated points which I thought were pretty good. What will be the purpose in allowing the neighborhood or the Committee to be involved in that process? I mean, I can see. I really like their involvement early on but once you get to this point.

MR ASENAP: I think there are two things that are influencing this. We had several meeting over the RFP in house and the points that were assigned were debated, quite frankly, among this staff and some felt that we need to have more emphasis on finance, some on experience etc. So even I think even the Planning Department a little unsure or willing to let the neighborhoods at this point weigh in on it and more importantly in the MR plan, when we developed the MR plan, we said that the neighborhood citizen what we call the citizen action group would be involved in the release of the RFP and in selection of the recommendations. So we really promised a lot to them in the RFP, the MR plan.

CHAIR ROMERO: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: I guess my question is this similar, similar (inaudible). I'll disclose that I live at Nob Hill and I've been a board member for the Neighborhood Association. I know that a lot of players in the area and we're also going have to get Main street involved for the phase coming up in (inaudible due to technical difficulties). Is this committee, basically does it exist or do we have to form this committee and I wonder if you thought about maybe just having a representative from the Neighborhood Association and a representative from main street to participate as members of the selection committee as opposed to… I do this a lot so pulling a committee together - and that could take a lot of time and effort - and I totally support the idea behind whoever's involved on the part of the community and I know that the folks on both sides that the neighborhoods and the business communities are going to have opinions about it and have a lot to say (inaudible). I also think it's important to keep this concept as efficient as possible in terms of getting to the end result which I think we all agree is really important.

MR ASENAP: Exactly. I'm going to turn it over to Maryellen at this point. Maryellen is going to be working with the advisory group that going to be formed. She has ideas that of how she wants to approach that but before I do that I just want to say that these things are always a fine line of community involvement. It's been our experience with the agency that the, that's something we've pride ourselves on is engaging in neighborhoods.

CHAIR ROMERO: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good question before we get into the discussion and that's the (inaudible) selection process that you've developed here. Was that the same when you had the original RFP position back in 2007?

MR ASENAP: It, it isn't for two reasons. Number 1, the MR plan was really not developed in entirety yet. The groups that actually were involved in the designation report were not as strong but to come stronger. So it's changed a little. It's not; it's not exactly the way we had in the original RFP. It does give more power to the neighborhood groups because that's what was in the MR plan, which came later.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I was just wondering if you could identify that this selection process (inaudible) criteria that may have lead to the termination of the agreement, so far as where it was weak or where it was strong or…

MR ASENAP: No. We were pretty involved in the first RFP making it more in line with traditional RFP's with the City with full authority. I don't think the fault in selecting the developer was the RFP. I think it was economic conditions at the time but the financial requirements have tightened up a lot and that's hamstrung a lot of development. I think it was combination of things.

COMMISSIONER: Do you think is such that this has changed. Has the climate changed?

MR ASENAP: If I knew that I wouldn't be here, I would be on Wall Street sir. From what I read, we are coming out of this bottom of this thing. We are starting to see more permits issued from the Planning Department so from that perspective I think we are seeing some changes, positive changes.

CHAIR ROMERO: Richard, why don't you proceed with your presentation and then we can come back visit on this.

MR ASENAP: I only have a couple of more things to say. The RFP will be issued under the terms and conditions of the State Metropolitan Redevelopment code which allows for this commission to make the final selection. I just want to make sure you understand that. The Metropolitan Redevelopment code has certain criteria that for the new commissioners especially I think it would be prudent to have maybe small retreat, half a day or so, to get the City Legal Department to make a presentation on the MR code because there were amendments in 2007 that changed some things but basically still the same but I think you need to have a new understanding of that.

CHAIR ROMERO: And to that point Richard, as soon as we understand who the players are and who the leadership within Albuquerque Development Services happens to be we will certainly reschedule that. We, as you know, had one scheduled and then the Administration had a different view of what was going to happen here so we postponed it. So we would bring it back to life once we know like who the players are.

MR ASENAP: Once again, we're asking for your approval for the issuance of the RFP and that pretty much concludes my part of the presentation. I'll stand for questions later.

CHAIR ROMERO: And for the record, normally the staff report would have that recommendation in writing which is not here but that's your recommendation.

MR ASENAP: Yes.

CHAIR ROMERO: Commissioners comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: Mr. Chairman, I like to, if we could since you had that initial question about the citizen's role. Maryellen might kind of go through her thoughts on how that process would work and that kind of feeds into other questions that I had.

COMMISSIONER: Perfect.

MS HENNESSY: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Strozier. There are basically three citizens group that are very active in Nob Hill. The Nob Hill mainstreet, which is kind of an evolution of the Nob Hill Highland Renaissance Corporation, is my understanding. There is the neighborhood association and there is also a special interest organization, the Route 66 De Anza Association, which was instrumental in getting some initial federal money for the artwork involved in this project. So, it was our thinking that two representatives from each of those organizations would constitute, the stakeholders, if you will, and with several people, other people from probably the department and basically they are being asked to comment on the RFP. There maybe some topics of interest to be brought up, but we can give them a deadline of, you know, give us your comments by two weeks. I've actually been in contact with each of those associations and will be meeting with the main street board tonight as well as the representative from the Route 66 De Anza.

COMMISSIONER: So Maryellen, you're talking about asking them to respond once to the respondents to the RFP, right once we get back or are you saying. Let's look at the RFP and give us comments on this. Is that what you're saying?

MS HENNESSY: Well, there's some… it's pretty well articulated in MR plan how the RFP process is supposed to work and that's on page 6 towards the end. I'm not sure about the numbering of this.

CHAIR ROMERO: But your.

MS HENNESSY: But the plan spells out what the process is and it says that a Citizens Advisory Committee will be formed and that they will, the RFP will issued, after the members of the Advisory Committee review it at their first meeting.

CHAIR ROMERO: So wouldn't we have done that before it came to this commission?

MS HENNESSY: Well, that's not the order in which this happened.

CHAIR ROMERO: No I'm just curious because what happens now is that I mean we are being asked to approve something that's not a final product in the fact.

MS HENNESSY: I understand your a your question Mr. Chairman. I brought the same thing up to Mr. Brito a little earlier.

CHAIR ROMERO: So I wonder if a, because I'm very much in favor of, I mean, I've done this long enough to know that you have to have the neighborhood involvement otherwise you got issues and so I think that needs to happen. I mean if you follow this process, we're going to be looking at another RFP that could look somewhat different from what we are approving today.

MS HENNESSY: Mr. Chair as I discussed with Mr. Brito and I don't want to speak for him but I would imagine that if there was a substantive change. You know people are probably going to have opinions about this or that but the Planning Department doesn't have to accept those. Ultimately, it will be the Planning Department that makes the, puts the RFP together. I would think that if there was a substantive change that it would come back to this Commission.

CHAIR ROMERO: So, to what, to what extent has the neighborhood been involved? Or has this Council or whatever were calling this group this advisory group have they met and have they discussed any of this at all to this point, on this new RFP? Do we know who the players are? The two from each group? Are they aware that this is coming I guess is my question?

MS HENNESSY: Mr. Chairman, the organizations are aware that this is coming. We notified them and the next step is for them to identify two people.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay. I don't want (inaudible) this is an important project and I certainly don't want to slow it down in anyway. I think something needs to happen pretty quick. My only concern is that

A. all the players have an opportunity to provide input and secondly, we're not taking up the commissions time on something that needs to be actually needs to run through another process before we actually have to vote on it.

CHAIR GARCIA: I like to make a motion that we defer this action until we get public comment and approvals and if necessary call this special meeting so that we consider the RFP.

CHAIR ROMERO: Let's hang on to that. Richard, again genuinely I don't want to slow this process down so, is there some risks in doing that?

MR ASENAP: There's always a risk but I think Maryellen has a good feel of the various people involved in it and quite frankly, the Planning Dept wants to get this thing moving and that's what's really behind us submitting the RFP to you today. I think if she can meet with them tonight and get the ball rolling get the comments done in a week or two and then reconvene an emergency meeting. We could probably get this done in about two or three weeks.

CHAIR ROMERO: Maryellen is that, do you have a problem with that?

MS HENNESSY: Mr. Chairman, I think that time line sounds adequate.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay and I think really this does something more. I think what this does is that it demonstrates a commitment on our part, the City's part to get them involved and to for them to feel they're playing a bigger role. I really have a problem with going through the process and then having to go through another process. Now were dictating what something to them because to them your saying the Development Commission already approved this, I mean I've been, we've been in this situation before where the City Council takes action then were expected to action and it doesn't feel very good. So, if it ok with you we have a motion here that we allow you to go through this process and we're ok with calling an emergency meeting to be able to assist you in expediting this request. I feel pretty good about that I just don't want to derail your process.

CHAIR ROMERO: Mr. Brito

MR BRITO: Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Reviewing the languages for the request for proposals process, it's my read that the Advisory Committee is intended to advise you about what the proposals are. They're view of the proposals not so much inform you of what they think of the RFP because the language states that the RFP will be issued after members of the Advisory Committee review it at their first meeting and the very next item is when issuing the RFP. So in the way that it is written it appears that the issuance of the RFP happens soon after the Advisory Committee reviews it so I think you might want to consider that and maybe not defer it. It's definitely up to you whether you want to or not but I believe that the intention of the Advisory Committee is to actually advise on the proposals themselves.

CHAIR ROMERO: Yeah, I know but even the process that you read to us really if I heard it correctly that they need an opportunity to look at it and then it comes to us.

MR BRITO: This is from the MR plan for the Central Highland Upper Nob Hill MRA and its on page 6 but it's in the second half of the plan. The section does begin on page 5 under De Anza Motor Lodge Redevelopment subsection B is request for proposals process.

CHAIR ROMERO: I see, but we're not the Advisory Committee.

MR BRITO: That's correct. Yes. You discussed later on, under 6 when the Advisory Committee members review the proposals and will make a recommendation to you and then add another hearing is when you will decide who to grant the project to.

CHAIR ROMERO: See that's not the way that I understand that. What that says is that they're looking at the RFP not the responses to the RFP, not what's coming back to the potential developer. They're looking at the, what we are approving today, is what that step, that very first step, is what that's referring to.

MR BRITO: Yes. The review of the RFP by the Advisory Committee is number 2 and then number 5 states once the proposals are submitted there will be a second meeting of the Advisory Committee to review the proposals and then 6 is details of how their recommendations to you on the proposals will come to you at a public hearing.

CHAIR ROMERO: I understand that part.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: (INAUDIBLE) is different from what you're stating in the RFP.

CHAIR ROMERO: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: One problem is the process in the MRA plan is, leaves this commission out of those early steps and so I think that's part of what we're stuck on with. It certainly seems that my point would be that if the commission agrees, sounds like we are one to have an emergency meeting in order to make sure this thing keeps moving. It sounds like you all are determined to your knowledge of the neighborhood in the community which are out there which will be beneficial to get their input on the RFP and I completely agree with the Chairman that never seems like when your asked to review or give your input on something that's already been approved. And so, it seems to me that if we, if we defer this, let this committee gets formed, get their input on the RFP. Once you have that meeting scheduled, it seems like we could been (inaudible) you have a pretty good idea of when you would have their comments and be able to address them. We can schedule our next meeting so that we do it very timely and not, not in a (inaudible) project that certainly seems like it makes sense to me and doesn't put either us either in the position of approving something we know is going to change, which doesn't seem like the right thing to do it or asking them to review and comment on something this we've already approved.

CHAIR ROMERO: Yeah, hang on a second. I want to make sure that that I don't mess you guys up because I know that you're going through a process and I know it takes a lot work for you to get here. I

think this is important enough personally I've, I mean, I went through the initial process and I rather go through the steps involve the group and they know their players up front and I think it can move a lot more smoothly if we follow that process and I promise you we will be at your disposal to take the next step when you deem that to be appropriate. So if you'll restate your motion Commissioner

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I move that we defer action on the RFP to a subsequent meeting. Let there be a regular meeting or emergency meeting. We'll take consideration after public input and meeting of the citizens (inaudible).

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay. So is there a second on that.

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: I second that.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay. Is there any discussion? Additional discussion? Ok. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA AND STROZIER: aye.

CHAIR ROMERO: All opposed. None heard.

All right so that motion carries. Let's do that and again you have our commitment to move quickly with the next process. As you go through that exercise though, again, its up to but you whatever, what the plan calls for but I think if you look at page 8 there and you look at the evaluation criteria in the point assignment. I personally, I looked at that very, very carefully and I think that's a very solid process that you have there and if you allow the group to start messing too much with that I think you'll have a set of whole different set of issues to deal with. So I don't know how you'll address that but whatever it's worth. I mean you've done this enough Richard certainly you've been involved in, I think as you look at that, actually the point assignment is probably pretty consistent with what use within IRB's themselves right? You're close enough. So, that's where we stand. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: I decided that one observation that I have maybe before you take this to Citizen Advisory Committee; I just noticed maybe some inconsistency between some of the language earlier on in the RFP and the evaluation criteria. So probably give it another reads for consistency, in terms of things that are stated earlier on in the RFP and the evaluation criteria of (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER: Do you have an example of that Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER STROZIER: An example I believe is the museum. It talks about, oh, it's really that the Development Proposal section on page 7, what your asking the proponents to provide you. It doesn't have anything in here about how you would coordinate your museum and that process even though it's stated earlier on and its one of the evaluation criteria. So just of couple of those little things like that I'm

noticing in here where just make sure that matches the description to what you're asking the developer to submit for the evaluation.

CHAIR ROMERO: Thank you. One other question and it doesn't have anything to do with this, but do we have potential candidates in mind? Has there been some interests that that?

MR ASENAP: There has been some interest. It's been pretty informal, just asking information. I received some telephone calls and there's been one person that wanted to go out and look at the property. So I think there's definitely interest in it.

COMMISSIONER: One other question that I had, I don't know if it means anything, but the fact that the previous developer actually created an LLC called the De Anza LLC. Would that pose an issue or a problem for?

MR ASENAP: It may. I don't think that it's an insurmountable problem but certainly by calling it the De Anza LLC that exclusive from other uses and like I say he could come back and bid on it again.

CHAIR ROMERO: Well, Commissioners anything else on this particular topic?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I have a question? On the RFP process it self, does it go through the same type of exposure as the RFP did for the railroad yards and the development there?

MR ASENAP: When you say the same type of exposure, you mean the advertisement of it?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The same process or is this process different?

MR ASENAP: It's probably going to be a little different. The Rail Yard RFP was put out by a different department than this agency. I'm not really clear as to what was different about it but that was handled by Family and Community Services. Am I correct?

CHAIR ROMERO: Anything else Commissioners? Alright. Yes.

MS HENNESSY: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Garcia, I was wondering what you meant in terms of process when you asked about similar process?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The one went for the Railroad (inaudible) went through the electronic bid process with an established data base that (inaudible).

MS HENNESSY: In terms of getting it out there to a larger audience, I hope that were going to make every effort to tap into those same resources.

CHAIR ROMERO: Alright. Let's move on to.

MR BRITO: Mr. Chair. One question. Thank you. I want to know if the Commission had any specific direction that you wanted to us take to the Advisory Committee. Do you have any special input that you wanted to hear back from them about the RFP or just you wanted general comments from them?

CHAIR ROMERO: No. I think if I understand the process correctly they will review and provide us a recommendation, right? So, so really were looking for, I mean, I don't know, if I were, if this was my neighborhood, I probably would, I may want certain things in there that I want to fight for. So I don't, we don't know what those answers are but we do know that those groups those three groups that you mentioned that been very active and asked and there very knowledgeable and very passionate about what they like to see so I think they deserve the opportunity to hash it out. It would be interesting to see what they come up with. I'm not sure if that answers the question. I wouldn't know because I'm not there but, but I do know that this Commission over the years has seen a lot of action from community organizations I mean we've been in meetings where the rooms are packed. So it becomes very passionate and as Richard knows if we can give folks an opportunity to provide input up front it just solves all kinds of problems as you move through, so that's the spirit of the action here today. Anything else from this? Alright, we don't have any old business that I'm aware of and certainly I don't think that we don't have any new business. One of the things we didn't ask and I didn't know. Anybody signed in back there to comment on?

MS PORTNOY: I had one question. (Inaudible)

CHAIR ROMERO: Would you identify yourself please?

MS PORTNOY: I'm sorry. My name is Tamara Portnoy. I've had great deal of interest in this property. I've been out to the property with a contractor.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay. Thank you. And again state your name.

MS PORTNOY: Okay. My name is Tamara Portnoy. I'm a local resident and I've had an interest in this property for several years. When I found out it was going to become available again, I jumped right in. I've got architecture contractors. I've been out to visit the property. I've been in touch with the De Anza Route 66 Association and been to couple of their board meetings. I would like to meet with the Main Street people and kind of get a feel for what the neighborhood expects but I think I have a plan that would be workable, the neighborhood will embrace and that will be terrific for the area.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay will good. This provides you an opportunity to get you with the right people.

MS PORTNOY: Yes, but the museum area. I agree with the placement. The square footage, I have some concerns over and the relationship. How will that work? The City will cover relationship with the museum entity and that relationship will transfer to the new developer, but there's some questions I have about the square footage the nature of that agreement. When can I see that agreement because that will impact how I respond to the RFP?

CHAIR ROMERO: See already interesting. So that's good. So please you'll need to sign in if you haven't done so and thank you for your comments and all well taking in good timing and on we go. So having said that have any new business for the commission, and if not….

MR ASENAP: Mr. Chairman

CHAIR ROMERO: Yes.

MR ASENAP: I like to make a brief statement if I could.

CHAIR ROMERO: Okay.

MR ASENAP: I think most of you know, I certainly know that I been looking to retire for sometime now and I think it's a good opportunity to do that to open up agency to new faces and new blood so I decided that this meeting will be my last meeting with ADC. I'll be leaving city government at the end of this month. I have some new opportunities that I want to pursue and I hope to be meeting with you and individually and getting your ideas about some of the new work that I'll be doing. I'm not ready to announce it yet but I just hope that you'll continue to assist these blighted neighborhoods that we've been working in for many years. I think we've done some good things together I'm certainly proud of the work that we've done and that you've done with me. You only have to look at some of the neighborhoods that we worked in and see how we've changed them and I hope that you continue with that creativity and that passion of helping people in these neighborhoods that need it and with that I appreciate the work that I've done with you and I certainly have benefited it from it, so thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO: Richard, we, I personally have worked with you for many, many years and you've done a tremendous job and tremendous service to this City and so we wish you well in your decision and your new path and we are confident that you'll do a good job and we're very, very grateful. I speak for certainly for myself, for the Commission, and former commissioners. You've always done a great job, extremely knowledgeable and we appreciate that very much. In fact, the facility that we have at the chamber, and that process we went through early on back in the late 90's, 2000, 2001, a lot of success we had really came as a result of your efforts and knowledge and knowing how to make things happen and so today we have an eight million dollar facility that is doing tremendous work for our community and our City and so you deserve a lot of that credit so Thank you very much.

MR ASENAP: Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO: I was going to be funny and say something that Commissioner Garcia said you know but…

MR ASENAP: No, nothing like that.

CHAIR ROMERO: Well, you'll do well so congratulations. We stand adjourned.

5. **Old Business**
   There was none.

6. **New Business**
   There was none.

7. **Adjourn**
   The meeting was adjourned at 3:58