COUNCILOR BENTON: I call the meeting to order. Thanks for being here. Thanks for making the time today. Turn it over to facilitator, Tim Karpoff.

TIM KARPOFF: This is the final meeting of the Selection Committee. Tonight, we are going to score the proposals and determine if there is a recommendation that is going to be made. Let's briefly recollect the two remaining proposals and the interviews that we conducted a month ago. This is a MAJOR project, and we should proceed with a deliberative process.

General Discussion about Proposals:

- JAY REMBE: Samitaur’s ability to get the project financed and their financial strength from both the primary partners and their relationships with banks. Being able to foot the upfront costs. With City View, it wasn’t certain where they were going to get financing from.
RON ROMERO: Samitaur – comment that housing might not be appropriate on the site but could be accommodated in the surrounding neighborhoods. City View – said there is a great need for infill housing and that the project may not be as successful without housing on the site. The City View proposal is stronger, in my mind, in that regard.

SEN. GRIEGO: Question about that. If we look at some of the preferences that we put on the table – e.g., housing be a key part. My reading of the RFP says that we can talk to these guys and express that these are important issues to us. I have a couple concerns about things one of the team says, even though I feel that they’ll be able to pull the project off the best. E.g., the whole issue of the roundhouse doesn’t seem very realistic or well thought out.

TIM KARPOFF: The RFP allows for great flexibility. At-the-beginning-of-the-project preference. Metaphor of marriage. The decision is which team do you want to work with to come up with the design?

JAY REMBE: You have two very different development teams. One is very housing focused – that’s their strength. The other team is focused on office and some mixed-use, but residential is not their expertise, which is not to say that they can’t do the housing. They would probably need to bring in another group to do the housing.

DIANA DORN-JONES: I didn’t hear them say that housing isn’t something they won’t do. They talked about their experience of placing housing on the site and options to place housing elsewhere. They have housing experience, even if it’s limited. Smith has both, but they talked about being careful about how to place housing on the site to make sure it agrees with other uses on the site.

LEBA FREED: Samitaur-Smith seems to have a lot of experience with the kinds of uses and projects that are similar to us. I did not see that from Paradigm. Paradigm never discussed what to do in the historic buildings. I don’t think they’re ready to take on something like this.

SEN. ORTIZ Y PINO: To follow up on the housing issue, John Molloy has extensive housing experience for the Samitaur-Smith team. What impressed me about S-S is their ability to finance. He’s going to be able to finance and own this. Paradigm was asking the City to buy the turntable easement upfront, which is a non-starter. Paradigm seemed too dependent on public financing to get things started.

REP. MIERA: Back to Sen. Griego’s original statement, are we under the impression that since the RFP is somewhat open that we can accept a proposal with conditions?

JOE RAEL: There are things that could be handled in contract negotiations that could be addressed as performance measures.

REP. MIERA: That makes me feel a little bit better.

RON ROMERO: I just want to say that we (Daniel and myself) have scored Samitaur quite a bit higher, but I feel responsible to raise some of the issues I heard, one of them being housing. One thing I was uncomfortable with was Samitaur’s proposal to “buffer” the community, where Paradigm talked about connecting with the community. Connection is very important in the RFP and in our SDP.

DIANA DORN-JONES: On the other hand, Paradigm didn’t talk about connecting to South Broadway at all.

COUNCILOR BENTON: We don’t even know the mix of uses yet. We not only don’t know the design, that will all unfold with the planning process that we, the Advisory Board, will be deeply involved in. There’s no denying that the City View team seems housing focused, but they did talk about some mixed use. I saw the City View/Paradigm team as being weaker because they didn’t talk about bringing uses other than housing to the site.

SEN. GRIEGO: Is it appropriate just to ask – someone raised the issue – one of Samitaur’s strength seems to be attracting office users. But given the occupancy rates downtown…if they don’t fill their entire space with outside occupants, it’s pretty competitive. Seemed to be how they approached the Culver City project – attracting tenants, which would be great, but will that work and be compatible with downtown?
• DIANA DORN-JONES: Bottom line for me is do they have the capacity and the financial capacity to carry out this project? Samitaur has been able to prove to me that they have the capacity and won’t leave the City holding the bags.
• DAVID CAMPBELL: I couldn’t have said it better myself.

TIM KARPOFF: Let’s move on to scoring. Fill out score sheets for everyone.

Next Steps:
TIM KARPOFF: It’s an assumption of mine that the RYAB will continue to convene and work on this project. This selection is just one chapter in the work of the Board.

JOE RAEL: On the procurement end – we’ll total up the score and determine the presumed awardee. We’ll develop the Recommendation of Award, send it to the CAO’s office, and the results will be posted to Sicomnet, including composite scores. There will be a 10 working-day protest period.

JOE RAEL: Have completed totaling the scores. The final composite scores are:
   Samitaur Constructs: 9308
   City View/Paradigm: 6135
   Albuquerque Station Consortium: 2945

Meeting adjourned.