

Council Meeting of
May 8, 2012

**SUPPLEMENTAL #1 TO
Council Agenda ITEM 12C**

Honorable Mayor and Members
of the City Council
City Hall
Torrance, California

Members of the Council:

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL #1 TO AGENDA ITEM 12C

Since the staff report for Item 12C was published, additional correspondence has been received and is attached herein for your review.

Staff continues to recommend that the Council enter into exclusive negotiations with Meta Housing Corporation for the development of mixed-use workforce housing at 1640 Cabrillo Avenue.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFERY W. GIBSON
Community Development Director

CONCUR:



Jeffery W. Gibson
Community Development Director

By 

Gregg Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager



LeRoy J. Jackson
City Manager

Attachment: A) Letter from Related/Mar Ventures (5/7/12)



May 7th 2012

Mr. Jeffrey W. Gibson
Community Development Director
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

RE: **RFP - 1640 Cabrillo, Torrance: May 8th 2012 Council Meeting**

Dear Mr. Gibson,

On behalf of the Related/Mar Ventures, Inc. team, we have received the Staff Report for the disposition of 1640 Cabrillo Avenue. As an active stakeholder in Downtown Torrance for the past 20 years, we applaud staff for bringing this to a conclusion after 18 difficult months.

We note that the City's consultant concludes that the proposals are financially competitive and equal, and recommends that the City select a developer based on selection criteria from the RFP. We take issue with staff's interpretation of the requirements in the RFP and other statements:

1. Staff report for May 8th 2012 meeting: *"Meta's original design for 45 units over commercial and at-grade parking was rated the highest by the internal selection committee."* The May 10th 2011 staff report stated that: *"With a total of 45 units and an aesthetically designed site, Meta's development program was considered most compatible with the goals of the RFP."* Our concern firstly arises from the fact that the internal selection committee actually rated our proposal highest, and higher than Meta (see attachment; note that scoring criteria include design/aesthetics). Secondly, we were advised that the preference for Meta came from their providing 45 units versus our 39. In this regard, we would note that the original RFQ stated (page 4, bottom) that: *"Ideally, proposals should aim to provide 30 to 40 units"*. Our proposal was responsive to the selection criteria made available; Meta's was not; how can a proposal that exceeds the RFP parameters be most compatible to it?



2. The original RFP stated that: "*Proposals should provide a mix of Low- and Very-Low Income Housing*". According to the April 19th 2012 KMA memo to staff (Attachment A), all units in our project are either Low- or Very-Low; only 14 of the 45 units in the Meta proposal meet this criterion, the balance are moderate income.

We dislike debating a staff recommendation, but when we were the top-scoring original selection, but penalized by staff selecting another team that used project parameters that did not comply with the original RFP requirements, we feel Council should select our proposal based on its consistency and compliance with the RFP requirements, as well as our long track record of quality development in Downtown Torrance and the entire City.

Very truly yours,

Allan W. Mackenzie
President

RELATED/MAR
 ROEM
 LINC
 META
 AMERICAN
 AMCAL
 NAT'L

| | Rater 1 | Rater 2 | Rater 3 | Rater 4 | Rater 5 | Total |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | 81 | 78 | 83 | 81 | 79 | 80.3 |
| | 71 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 66.4 |
| | 69 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 61 | 67.3 |
| | 80 | 83 | 81 | 82 | 68 | 78.7 |
| | 76 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 70 | 72.5 |
| | 70 | 79 | 80 | 74 | 72 | 75.3 |
| | 71 | 66 | 71 | 76 | 62 | 69.2 |