[MS-0398.039.010.010]
RECEIVED
JAN - 3 1992
Ans'd. DIA

There is presented to the Board a letter, Board of Supervisors Document No. 746724, from the Chief Administrative Officer, concerning Downtown Court/Office Building, making the following recommendations:

1. Plan for sixteen courtrooms in the Downtown Court/Office Building;

2. Direct the Chief Administrative Officer to return to the Board with a comprehensive financing plan after considering responses to the Request for Proposals;

3. Direct that the Request for Proposals include a courtroom module desired by the Superior Court;

4. Direct that the evaluation of the Request for Proposals include block diagrams showing a general space plan, but do not consider proposed schematic design and renderings of the Downtown Court/Office Building;

5. Approve in principle the Memorandum of Understanding with the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency regarding the funding for sixteen additional courtrooms in Downtown San Diego;

6. Direct that the financing of the Downtown Court/Office Building be provided through the San Diego Regional Building Authority;

7. Approve the issuance of the attached Request for Proposals for the Downtown Court/Office Building;

8. Limit the search area for the Downtown Court/Office Building to three blocks from the Courthouse;

9. Remove the County-owned property bounded by Front Street, B Street, First Street, and C Street from consideration for accommodating the Downtown Court/Office Building.

A representative of the Chief Administrative Officer orally reviews the staff report.

The following persons orally address the Board:
John Hartley, District 3, San Diego City Council, urges support for the Memorandum of Understanding; and states that a strong downtown court presence in San Diego is needed.

Nos. 59, 60
11/5/91
mdb

[11-15-91, Agenda 57]

Foto

Judge Judith McConnell, San Diego Superior Court, supports the Chief Administrative Officer's recommendations; commends the staff for its collaboration with the courts on this proposal; and comments that this structure will be County-owned, and will take into consideration public transportation.

Pamela Hamilton, Centre City Development Corporation, comments on the importance of keeping the Request for Proposals process free of ambiguity; and urges the Board to maintain a three-block radius.

Paul A. Peterson, Bentall Development Corporation, states that Bentall believes this structure should be an architectural statement of the County's commitment to downtown; and suggests that a design element should be included in the Request for Proposals. He submits a a copy of a letter, Board of Supervisors Document No. 747055, to Bentall Development Corporation from Ellerbe Becket Architecture, responding to issues regarding the County Request for Proposals.

Jerry Saunders, Vice President, Continental Development Corporation, El Sugundo, California, requests that Continental Development be given the right to select a privately owned site and respond to the Request for Proposals on that site.

Brad Saunders, Starboard Development, points out that the three-block radius limits parking, which in turn will limit a source of income; and comments that the County should ask for architectural renderings in order to know what it is buying.

Bill Evans suggests that the Request for Proposals is so specific that it removes competition, and that the Board should look at the cost benefit of different proposals.

Brian Seltzer, attorney, Evans/Ledford Family Trusts, urges the Board to open up the competition; and states that present criteria do not address the traffic burden and number of persons going to the facility; and comments that the Board should consider the ability of the development team to obtain financing.

Robert Kevane, Starboard Group/Property Owners, states that the Request for Proposals limits this project to one competitor; and urges the Board to determine exactly what it wants, and then give everyone the opportunity to compete.

Chuck Berling requests that all developers who were qualified be given the chance, subject to an acceptable site, to continue in the competition.

During discussion, staff indicates that it is appropriate that developers who have a site that could accommodate the building be given an opportunity to respond. Questions are raised on the issues of: the three-block radius; adequate parking for the facility; cost of construction; the need for architectural renderings; and criteria for the Request for Proposals. It is noted that a preference for the three-block radius was expressed by the Board, and that there was more competition for buildings within the three-block limit. It is suggested that a decision on the radius and other operational efficiencies be made now, before competition begins.

No. 59

ON MOTION of Supervisor Golding, seconded by Supervisor MacDonald, the Board of Supervisors, relative to the Request for Proposals on the Downtown Court/Office Building, directs the County's real estate consultant to:

1) make recommendations to the Board on ways to reduce the project's costs and space requirements before issuance of a Request for Proposals;
2) consider the major materials and design element, if possible;
3) retain the five-block radius; and
4) not remove the County-owned property on Front and B Streets.

Roll call on the foregoing motion results in the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Bilbray, Bailey, Golding, Williams, MacDonald
NOES: Supervisors None
ABSENT: Supervisors None

- - -

No. 60

ON MOTION of Supervisor Golding, seconded by Supervisor MacDonald, the Board of Supervisors directs the Chief Administrative Officer to examine the proportional requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding with Centre City Development Corporation; and seek assurance that tax-exempt financing will not cause a leasing problem in the future.

Roll call on the foregoing motion results in the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Bilbray, Bailey, Golding, Williams, MacDonald
NOES: Supervisors None
ABSENT: Supervisors None

- - -

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
County of San Diego)

I, THOMAS J. PASTUSZKA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego, State of California, hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy with the original order adopted by said Board at a regular meeting held November 5, 1991 (59-60), by the vote herein stated, which original order is now on file in my office; that the same contains a full, true and correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and the seal of said Board of Supervisors, this 18th day of December, 1991.

THOMAS J. PASTUSZKA
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By Esther C. Ryan
Esther C. Ryan, Deputy

Nos. 59, 60
11/5/91
mdb