REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE

OFFICE OF THE CITY

CITY OF OAKLAND

AGENDA REPORT

2009 MAR 1:1 PM 5: 50

TO:

Office of the Agency Administrator

ATTN: Dan Lindheim

FROM: Community and Economic Development Agency

DATE: March 24, 2009

RE: Agency Resolution Authorizing a Two-Year Agreement with Pacific Park

Management, Inc. for Management of the Franklin 88 Public Parking Garage at

9th and Franklin Streets in Downtown Oakland

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to request that the Redevelopment Agency approve a resolution authorizing the Agency Administrator to negotiate and execute a two-year agreement with Pacific Park Management, Inc. for management of the Agency's 136-space public parking garage located within the Franklin 88 garage mixed-use condominium development at the northwest corner of Franklin and 9th Streets. The Franklin 88 garage is unique in that it requires residents of the development to share space and operating costs with a public parking garage owned by the Agency.

The proposed agreement includes a unique guaranteed-payment/ revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement wherein the new manager would pay the Agency a fixed monthly amount of \$3,300 per month plus a tiered percentage of gross profit. In exchange, the new manager would be entitled to retain all remaining net profit, but would likewise be responsible for all operating expenses regardless of gross revenues generated. Also, the contribution of the Arioso Homeowners Association (HOA) for its share of garage operating expenses would be capped at \$1,500 per month. The HOA represents the 88 condominium owners who also own 88 parking spaces on the second level of the garage.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Franklin 88 garage lost \$9,618 in the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 (FY08) and \$6,043 during the first six months of the current fiscal year that will end June 30, 2009 (FY09) under a traditional fee-for-service agreement with the current management company. The garage did generate a \$39,567 profit for the Agency in the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007 (FY07) on gross revenue of \$236,948, after essentially breaking even, \$634 loss, in the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006 (FY06) and losing \$43,541 during the first eight months of operation during the last eight months of the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005 (FY05). Gross revenue fell to \$204,637 in FY08 and totaled only \$92,877 through the first six months of FY09.

The proposed new management agreement would guarantee the Agency a monthly payment virtually equivalent to the \$39,567 annual profit earned in its only profitable period. The Agency would also receive 10 percent of gross revenue between \$236,948 and \$275,000, and 20 percent

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

of gross revenue above \$275,000. The Agency and the HOA would remain responsible for capital improvements and major capital repairs to the garage facility.

Changing from the traditional fee-for-service compensation arrangement the Franklin 88 garage has been operating under to the proposed guaranteed-payment/revenue-sharing arrangement, will eliminate the \$800-1,000 per month losses the Agency has suffered over the last year and a half, and instead generate a guaranteed monthly payment to the Agency of \$3,300. Based on the proposed new garage manager's projection of first-year gross revenue, the Agency would receive a revenue-sharing payment of \$2,228 after the first year. The guaranteed and possible percentage of gross revenue payments to the Agency would be appropriated to the Chinatown Parking Lot Fund (9515), Capital Improvement Project – Economic Development Organization (94800), and 9th & Franklin Block Project (P126410).

BACKGROUND

History

In November 2002, the Agency sold a parking lot at the northwest corner of Franklin and 9th Streets to SNK 9th & Franklin LLC (SNK) for development of a 6-story 88-unit luxury condominium development and ground floor commercial condominium units. Under the terms of the Disposition and Development Agreement, SNK was required to construct a 224-space garage in the basement, a portion of the ground floor, and the second level of the building. SNK was also obligated to sell the Agency condominium interests in the basement and ground levels, and a portion of the second level of the garage for \$2.8 million. Upon completion of the overall development in October 2004, the Agency purchased its condominium interest in the garage, which contained 135 total parking spaces. The Agency's public garage was intended to replace the surface parking lot located on the site before the Agency sold the site to SNK for development. The remainder of the garage's second level, containing unreserved parking spaces, was sold by SNK to purchasers of the residential condominiums.

The Agency and SNK executed a declaration of reciprocal easements, covenants and restrictions agreement (REA) in October 2004 setting forth the rights and obligations of the Agency and the eventual owners of the commercial and residential condominiums. Among other things, the REA specifies how common area expenses of the building and the garage shall be allocated among the parcel owners. Based upon the common area expense sharing formula, the Agency has been paying the HOA \$2,300 per month since the development opened. On the other hand, the HOA, on behalf of the residential owners, pays a share of various garage operating expenses based on allocation percentages in the REA. The HOA's share of operating expenses has averaged \$5,000 monthly. The REA also provides that the Agency and HOA shall work together to maintain a single manager of the garage, though they are to maintain separate contracts with that manager. Since it opened, the garage has been managed by CMA Asset Managers, Inc., which subcontracts with Parking Concepts Inc. (PCI) to provide valet attendants and direct operation of the garage.

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

CEDA: Agreement for Management of Franklin 88 Garage

The REA also provides that Monday through Friday, between the hours of 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., the Agency will be permitted to use the 89 spaces belonging to the HOA on the second level for public parking to the extent those spaces are not being used by Franklin 88 residents. From inception it was intended that the garage, both the public and residential portions, would be operated on a 24/7 valet assist basis. This is because the garage was designed with almost all tandem or back-to-back spaces and 38 Klaus car lifts to minimize development costs and still maximize the total number of parking spaces. The intent was to use valet attendants to safely and efficiently move cars in and around the tandem spaces and lifts to optimize the use of those spaces.

The adjacent Courtyard Hotel by Marriott also has a license for the use of up to 66 parking spaces in the Agency portion of the garage at any given time at prevailing market rates. Since the garage opened however, the Courtyard Hotel has not exercised this license to park any of its customers' cars in the garage. In the event that the Courtyard Hotel does need to utilize spaces in the garage, the actual number of spaces will be determined by the management staff of the Courtyard Hotel and the new garage manager.

Though the garage was designed to be a 24/7 valet operation, the Agency has accommodated the strong preference of Franklin 88 residents to self-park their cars. This accommodation began shortly after the garage opened and has continued up until now. The Agency made this accommodation because many Franklin 88 residents did not have, and still do not have cars, and there have not been enough public parkers during the day to require parking them on the second floor.

Current Conditions and Issues

The current management agreement the Agency has with CMA Asset Managers, and indirectly PCI, requires the Agency to pay a monthly fee of \$1,200, \$900 of which flows through to PCI under CMA's subcontract with PCI to operate the garage. The agreement also provides for CMA to receive 10 percent of gross revenue each fiscal year in excess of \$200,000 after deduction of the City's parking tax. CMA has come close to receiving this bonus payment only for FY07 when it generated gross revenue of \$199,992 after deduction of parking tax. The current management agreement began in October 2004 and provided for a one-year initial term with a series of one-year automatically renewing terms until terminated by either party.

SNK entered into a similar agreement with CMA (and indirectly PCI) in late 2004. SNK subsequently assigned its agreement with CMA to the HOA as part of the sale of the Franklin 88's residential units. The HOA's total share of operating expenses has averaged \$4,500 during the past year and a half. The Agency and the HOA are responsible for the cost of capital improvements to their respective parcels within the garage

	Item:
Finance and	Management Committee
	March 24, 2009

Financial Performance

During the first eight months of its operation from November 2004 through June 2005, the garage lost \$43,541 on \$64,027 of gross revenue. In FY06, its first full fiscal year of operation, the garage essentially broke even, losing \$634 on gross revenue of \$188,068.

During its second fiscal year FY07, the garage generated its only net profit to date of \$39,567 or 17 percent of the highest-ever \$236,948 in gross revenue it generated that year. During FY08, the garage lost \$9,618 on gross revenue of \$204,637, and through the first six months of the current FY09, the garage had already lost \$6,243 on gross revenue of only \$92,877. The decline in profitability from FY07 to FY08 was caused by a 12 percent decline in transient parking revenue, a 15 percent decline in monthly parking revenue, and a 9 percent increase in payroll expenses. The increase in payroll expenses resulted mainly from the addition of a part-time valet attendant during the day in response to resident complaints about public cars creating bottlenecks trying to enter and exit the garage during busy periods. The secondary cause of the payroll increase was the annual increase in the Living Wage rate paid to valet attendants. Detailed summaries of monthly garage income and expenses for each fiscal year since the garage opened are contained in **Attachment A**.

Recent Trends

The number of monthly and transient parkers patronizing the Franklin 88 garage has gradually declined since peaking during FY07. This has occurred even though the garage has been charging rates that are consistently lower than those charged by most garages and parking lots in the immediate area. A recent survey of surrounding garage parking rates (Attachment B) conducted by the current operator in June 2008, and cross-checked against data compiled by the City's Transportation Division of Public Works illustrates this fact. One reason offered for the Franklin 88 garage's relatively poor performance is that almost all transient customers must have their cars valet parked to maximize the use of the tandem and lift spaces on the first level of the garage. It is believed that many people do not like to have an attendant drive and park their cars, so this requirement for valet parking makes the garage less attractive. The 578-space, and only slightly more expensive, Pacific Renaissance garage located directly across the street gives public parkers a convenient alternative to the Franklin 88 Garage. Another problem for the Franklin 88 garage is that it is less visible and recognizable as a public garage than the Pacific Renaissance garage. A box sign was installed just above the garage entrance in late 2007 to better advertise the presence of the garage.

Staff has encouraged the current management company to experiment with adjusting rates to try and increase usage and revenue. But none of these measures have improved the financial performance of the garage. In an attempt to reverse the negative performance of the garage in a win-win fashion for both the Agency and the HOA, Agency and HOA staff began considering the idea of soliciting a manager for the garage under a unique revenue sharing arrangement. The plan was to incentivize a manager to use all of its skill and energy to optimize the performance of the garage while 1) protecting the Agency from operating losses, 2) providing the Agency a reliable income stream from the garage and some of the potential increase in revenue generated

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

by the new manager, 3) provide the HOA a reduction in its share of operating expenses, and 4) permit residents as much flexibility as possible to continue to enjoy their self-parking accommodation.

Request for Proposals

In November 2008, the Agency, in cooperation with the HOA, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the management and operation of the Franklin 88 garage. The RFP encouraged potential garage managers to respond under a guaranteed-payment/gross-revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement. Under this arrangement, the selected manager would be responsible for paying all operating expenses of the garage, with the exception of a maximum \$2,500 monthly contribution by the HOA. The selected manager would also be required to pay the Agency a \$3,300 per month guaranteed payment regardless of the garage's financial performance, and 10 percent of gross revenues above \$237,000. In exchange for making these guaranteed payments and assuming the risk for all operating losses, the selected manager would be permitted to retain all profit generated by the garage after making the guaranteed and percentage payments to the Agency.

The \$3,300 guaranteed payment to the Agency was calculated to be equivalent on an annual basis to the \$39,567 (and only) net profit generated by the garage in FY07. The \$237,000 threshold for the Agency to begin receiving a percentage of gross revenue was similarly based upon the highest gross revenue generated to date, also in FY07. The intent of these financial terms was to give a new garage manager the incentive to operate the garage at its optimal level while allowing the Agency to enjoy a reasonable share of the "upside" if the garage were to exceed its highest performance to date. The HOA's intent was to reduce and cap its payment of operating expenses and preserve as reasonably as possible the self-parking accommodation its members have been enjoying.

The RFP also permitted potential managers to submit proposals under the traditional fee-for-service arrangement. They were advised, however, that all things being relatively equal, the Agency and the HOA would give preference to those proposers who submitted under the guaranteed-payment fiscal arrangement. The RFP stated that the Agency and the HOA were interested in entering into a two-year agreement with options for renewal.

Five companies submitted proposals in response to the RFP by the extended December 12, 2008 deadline: Pacific Park Management, Inc. (PPM), Douglas Parking, LLC, Imperial Parking, Inc. (Impark), Unipark, LLC, and Parking Concepts, Inc. (PCI), current manager of the garage. Unipark is not a certified small local business and submitted an incomplete proposal that did not provide the required company financial information, a marketing and operations plan, pro forma operating budget for the garage, or contract compliance information. PCI recently lost its small local business certification due to closure of its previous Oakland office, and only submitted a last-minute proposal under its current fee-for-service fiscal arrangement at staff's urging, to provide a back-up proposal in the event no other acceptable proposals were received.

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

A compliance evaluation (Attachment C) completed by the City's Department of Contracting and Purchasing determined that the proposals PCI and Unipark submitted in response to the RFP were non-responsive in terms of compliance with the City's Local Business Enterprise (LBE), Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE), and Equal Benefits Ordinance (EBO) requirements. This compliance did determine that PPM scored highest based on percentage of total LBE and SLBE participation, earning extra points because of its 100 percent SLBE compliance. Douglas Parking ranked second with 100 percent total LBE/SLBE compliance, but only10 percent SLBE compliance. Impark ranked third with 40 percent total LBE/SLBE and 40 percent SLBE participation. PPM, Douglas Parking, and Impark all were determined to be EBO compliant.

After Agency staff and HOA representatives reviewed the five proposals, they agreed to interview the three top-rated firms, PPM, Douglas Parking, and Impark. The interviews took place on January 9, 2009.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

Evaluation of Three RFP Finalists

A review of the three finalists' written proposals and interview performances resulted in the following ranking - according to their experience, proposed operational and marketing plans, financial capacity, references, and pro forma operating statements for the Franklin 88 garage under their management.

Ranking of Finalists Ba	sed upon Writte	n Proposals and	l Interview P	erformance
	by Selecte	d Criteria		

Ranking Criteria	Max Score	Douglas Parking	Imperial Parking (Impark)	Pacific Park Management (PPM)
Experience	14.0	13.0	14.0	12.0
Operational Plan	12.0	10.0	10.0	8.5
Marketing Plan	10.0	9.0	8.5	7.5
Financial Capacity	6.0	0.0	6.0	5.5
References	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Pro Forma	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5
Total Points	50.0	39.5	45.5	41.0

A. Experience

Impark scored highest in the category of experience given its 46 years in business and management of 1,900 facilities in 37 North American cities. Impark manages numerous lots in San Francisco, a 175-stall surface lot at the Montclair Albertson's in Oakland, and a 627-stall

Item:	
Finance and Management Comm	nittee
March 24	2009

garage on Hollis Street in Emeryville. Approximately 70 percent of the properties Impark manages, however, are metered or non-attendant except during special events.

Douglas Parking has been in business for 78 years and currently manages eight City and Agency-owned garages and parking lots, as well as the 1,350-stall Kaiser Center garage, and other garages in Sacramento, Las Vegas, and Denver.

PPM has been in business for 13 years and manages a number of facilities in San Francisco and two lots in Oakland. One Oakland lot is near the West Oakland BART station and the other is the 8,000-space Oakland Airport lot. PPM's contract for the Oakland Airport lot just began this past January. A number of the garages that PPM manages in San Francisco have a combination of valet-assisted parking and self-parking similar to that at the Franklin 88 Garage.

B. Operational Plans

Impark's operational plan highlighted a number of technological enhancements to improve efficiency and performance. These included the provision of an internet portal for clients to view real-time operations data, and for customers to view parking availability and make daily reservations for parking spaces using cell phones and PDAs. Impark also recommended closing down the garage from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. to save valet attendant expense when virtually no revenue is generated.

Douglas Parking proposed making a number of operational improvements to the garage including better management of monthly parkers assigned to the basement so that tandem spaces there are better utilized, simplification and rationalization of the current rate structure, adding credit card payment capabilities to the garage, and consideration of closing the garage from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. Douglas also proposed the use of on-line billing for monthly customers, and referring persons on its wait list for monthly parking at the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) and $420 - 13^{th}$ Street garages to the Franklin 88 garage.

PPM proposed conducting a number of pre-meetings with Agency and HOA representatives to review and fine tune existing policies and procedures before beginning its management of the garage. PPM emphasized the importance of maintaining exceptional customer service, high cleanliness standards, accounting and cash controls, and regular communication and collaboration with the Agency and HOA. PPM also cited its capability to accept internet and cell phone parking reservations.

C. Marketing

All three firms proposed a number of ideas and strategies to increase awareness and use of the Franklin 88 garage. The common theme was that despite its inherent operational challenges, the Franklin 88 garage should be performing much better, given its location and its competitive parking rates. Many ideas and strategies were proposed by more than one firm. They include 1)

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

expanding and emphasizing the garage's validation program with nearby restaurants and retail businesses, 2) marketing monthly parking to Trans Pacific Center and other nearby office buildings, 3) soliciting and accommodating the parking of Zip Cars that typically pay up to three times the market rate for monthly parking, 4) using valet attendants or street actors to draw attention to the garage and wave in customers, 5) creating cross-promotions with nearby businesses and 6) improving the sidewalk signs advertising the garage.

All the firms also suggested ideas for adding ancillary activities and services in the garage to generate additional revenue. Some of these ancillary services include dry cleaning drop-off and pick-up, VIP concierge service for off-site gas fill-ups, oil changes and car washes.

D. Financial Capacity

Douglas Parking declined to submit financial information for confidentiality reasons, but indicated that it would be happy to submit such information if selected to manage the Franklin 88. PPM submitted compiled financial statements for 2006 and 2007 demonstrating reasonable financial capacity and stability. Impark submitted condensed and unaudited financial statements for 2005 through 2007 demonstrating, as might be expected from a company its size, substantial financial capacity and stability.

E. References

Staff in the Redevelopment Agency has been satisfied with the management that Douglas Parking has provided for the Agency's 145-space garage in the UCOP Building since its opening in 1998. The UCOP garage is the only Agency-owned garage managed by Douglas Parking. Staff in the City's Transportation Division of Public Works Agency was also consulted about Douglas' performance over the past several years managing a number of City-owned garages and parking lots. Transportation Division staff reported that Douglas' performance has been acceptable according to recent financial and operations audits. Agency staff also checked references for two garages that Douglas Parking manages in Las Vegas and Sacramento. The property manager of the 781-stall 101 Convention Center Drive Garage in Las Vegas confirmed that Douglas had provided professional and courteous service and accurate reporting for the past two years. This busy garage is located just off the Las Vegas strip adjacent to the Las Vegas Convention Center and office complex. The director of operations for Macy's in Sacramento's Downtown Plaza Mall reported that Douglas Parking has positively impacted revenue and service quality at the 180-space garage it has managed since last September.

Staff checked the two references Impark provided for valet-assisted garages it operates in San Francisco. One was the 210-stall Fulton Market Garage and the 164-stall Aurora Garage. It was confirmed that Impark had competently managed both of these garages for at least three years. The Aurora Garage is located in a 160-unit apartment complex with a Whole Foods grocery on the ground floor and several levels of parking above. It was reported that since only about 80 residents park in the garage, Impark is charged with "over-parking" the residential spaces as

	Item: _		
Finance and	Management	Comr	nittee
	Mar	ch 24,	2009

available with Whole Food customers. The property manager reported that Impark had been doing a good job and their local management staff was always available and responsive.

Staff checked three of the references provided by PPM for a number of garages it manages in San Francisco and a parking lot near the West Oakland BART station. An official with the S.F. Metro Transit Authority verified that PPM is doing a good job managing six garages and surface lots owned by the Authority. It was pointed out that PPM provides valet service for the 1,200-stall St. Mary's Square Garage in downtown San Francisco and has been able to turn over the 900 transient spaces up to twice daily Monday through Friday. A representative for the 509-space Soma Grand Garage at Mission & 7th Streets in San Francisco reported that since November 2007, PPM has been successful managing this mixed-use garage that is somewhat similar to the Franklin 88 garage. The garage is shared by public parkers and residents of 228 condominiums in the building above. PPM valet parks residents' cars while coordinating the self-parking of approximately 500 daily transient parkers. The owner of the 600-stall unattended West Oakland BART surface lot PPM has managed since July 2007 reported that PPM has done a good job managing the lot and cleaning up the overall operation.

F. Pro Forma Analysis

Impark submitted the most detailed and foot-noted pro forma operating statement for the Franklin 88 garage. The pro forma statements submitted by Douglas and PPM were less detailed and did not provide nearly as much detail on assumptions behind the projected income and expenses.

G. Fee Proposals

Douglas Parking and PPM were the only two companies to initially submit proposals under the preferred guaranteed-payment/revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement. Both of their original proposals offered to pay the Agency the \$3,300 monthly minimum specified in the RFP and 10 percent of gross revenue above \$237,000. Douglas Parking, however, requested the option to renegotiate a traditional fee-for-service agreement if its projected revenue and profit was not achieved in the first year. Impark initially declined to propose under the preferred guaranteed-payment/gross revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement, but instead proposed that the Agency pay Impark a \$1,250 per month management fee plus 25 percent of profits. All three firms' original proposals included a \$2,500 per month cap on the HOA's contribution to garage operating expenses.

Subsequent to the proposer interviews, the three finalists were given an opportunity to improve their fee proposals. Impark agreed to consider managing the garage under a guaranteed-payment/revenue-sharing arrangement for the specified \$3,330 per month payment plus 20 percent of gross revenue above \$200,000. Though Impark's revenue sharing offer was a distinct improvement over the requirement set forth in the RFP, Impark required as a condition for its revised proposal that it be allowed to shut down the garage from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. While this

	Item:		
Finance and Mar	nagement	Com	mittee
	Mai	rch 24	, 2009

closure would save overnight valet attendant costs of approximately \$4,000 per month, it would violate the provisions of the REA and pose security risks for the garage and residents.

Douglas Parking and PPM also improved their financial terms. Besides the \$3,300 guaranteed monthly payment Douglas Parking offered to increase the percentage of gross revenue payable to the Agency to 20 percent for revenue over \$275,000. It also offered to reduce the HOA's monthly expense contribution to \$1,800. Douglas, however, wanted the right to begin renegotiating the agreement as soon as 9 months after it began if it was not earning the amount of revenue and profit it expected. PPM matched Douglas' financial terms, and slightly improved them by lowering the cap on the HOA's monthly expense contributions to \$1,500. Unlike Douglas Parking, PPM did not require a 9-month right to renegotiate if projected revenue and profits were not being achieved. In fact, PPM requested a longer term (5 years) agreement, though it was still agreeable to the 2-year term with an option to extend up to one year.

EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE

Neither the City of Oakland nor the Agency has ever contracted with PPM, the recommended new manager of the Franklin 88 garage, for goods or services.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Negotiation and execution of a management agreement with PPM as proposed is expected to create the following sustainable opportunities:

Economic: It is expected that usage of the Franklin 88 garage will increase under PPM's management, thereby providing increased parking services for employees, customers and clients of local businesses, while generating positive revenues for the Agency and increasing parking tax revenue to the City if garage revenues increase as expected.

Environmental: It is expected that PPM will work with Agency and City staff to investigate and implement energy saving measures at the Franklin 88 garage, such as the energy efficient lighting installed in the garage last year.

Social Equity: PPM intends to hire Oakland residents at Living Wage rates to fill the four to five valet attendant positions PPM estimates it will initially need in the Franklin 88 garage.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

PPM management will comply with all applicable local, state and federal regulations including those pertaining to disabled and senior citizen access, including American with Disabilities Act and Title 24 regulations.

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

It is recommended that the Agency authorize the Agency Administrator or his designee(s) to negotiate and execute a management agreement with PPM for a 2-year period, with an option to extend the term up to one year at the Agency Administrator's discretion, to manage the Agency's public parking in the Franklin 88 garage under a guaranteed-payment/gross-revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement wherein PPM will 1) pay all operating expenses of the Franklin 88 garage remaining after a maximum \$1,500 monthly contribution from the HOA, 2) pay the Agency a guaranteed minimum of \$3,300 per month, plus 10 percent of gross revenue between \$237,000 and \$275,000, and 20 percent of gross revenue over \$275,000, and 3) retain all net profit from the pubic parking operation in the Franklin 88 garage remaining after payments to the Agency described immediately above. The Agency and the HOA will remain responsible for paying the cost of capital improvements and major repairs to capital equipment in the garage.

It is recommended that the Agency negotiate and execute an agreement as described above for the following reasons:

- PPM is as equally qualified and experienced as the other two finalists, Douglas Parking and Impark.
- PPM has specific experience managing a larger garage with some of the same challenges presented by residential and public parking being carried out in the same shared space.
- Similar to the other two finalists, PPM has the financial stability and capacity to successfully manage the Franklin 88 garage under the preferred fiscal arrangement.
- Similar to the other two finalists, PPM has suggested a number of interesting marketing ideas and strategies to increase usage and revenue from the Franklin 88 garage.
- Similar to the other two finalists, PPM has proposed to maintain the HOA's self-park accommodation to the extent possible.
- PPM is enthusiastic and confident about meeting the challenge of turning around the performance of the Franklin 88 garage, as evidenced by its willingness to accept the 2-year term of the agreement without any renegotiation conditions.
- PPM's latest financial terms are slightly superior to those of Douglas Parking and clearly superior to those of Impark.
- The Agency will receive a guaranteed monthly payment of \$3,300 regardless of the performance of the Franklin 88 garage.
- The Agency will be relieved of the obligation to pay for losses if operating expenses exceed gross revenue for the Franklin 88 garage.
- The parking tax that the City receives from the Franklin 88 garage will increase if gross revenue increases as expected under PPM's management.

Item:
Finance and Management Committee
March 24, 2009

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

The Agency is requested to approve the attached resolution authorizing the Agency Administrator to negotiate and execute a 2-year agreement, extendable up to one year by the Agency Administrator, with Pacific Park Management to manage the Agency's public parking operation in the Franklin 88 Garage under a guaranteed-payment/gross-revenue-sharing fiscal arrangement.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter S. Cohen, Director

Community and Economic Development Agency

Reviewed by:

Gregory Hunter, Deputy Director

Economic Development and Redevelopment

Jens Hillmer, Economic Development Coordinator Downtown Redevelopment,

Prepared by:

John Quintal

Economic Development Analyst

Attachment A: Franklin 88 Operating Statement Summary

Attachment B: Area Parking Rate Survey

Attachment C: Contract Compliance Evaluation

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE

FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE:

Office of the City/Agency Administrator

Item: ______ Finance and Management Committee March 24, 2009

FISCAL YEAR 2009 JULY 1, 2008 THROUGH JUNE 2009

	** **		005										
	JUL 2008	AUG 2008	SEP 2008	OCT 2008	NOV 2008	DEC 2008	JAN 2009	FEB 2009	MAR 2009	APR 2009	MAY 2009	JUN 2009	TOTAL
ARKING REVENUE													
Transient Revenue	9,079	9,127	9,000	9,670	8,931	7,395	0	0	0	0	0	0	53,20
Monthly Parking Revenue	6,218	6,335	7,453	8,015	5,970	5,598	0	0	0	0	0	0	39,5
Validation Revenue	0	0	0	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Over/Short Hosted Valet	0	0	3 0	(3)	<u>5</u> 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Revenue	<u>-</u>	- 0	0	0			- 0	0	0		- 0	0	
Keycard Deposit	<u> </u>	0	0	<u> </u>	54	27	0	0	0	ŏ	0	0	
TOTAL GROSS PARKING REVENUE	15,297	15,462	16,456	17,682	14,960	13,020	0	Ö	0	0	0	ő	92,8
Less Parking Tax	2,388	2,414	2,569	2,760	2,327	2,028	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,4
TOTAL NET REVENUE	12,909	13,048	13,887	14,922	12,633	10,992	0	0	0	0	0	0	78,3
PERATING EXPENSES			,			,				*	-		
	44.004	40.779	40 505	40.005	40.050	40.040							
Parking Operations Salaries	11,801 1,847	10,773 1,686	10,505 1,644	10,695 1,674	10,950 1,714	12,940 2,025	0	0	0	0	0	0	67,6 10,5
Payroll Taxes & Benefits Workers Compensation	1,847	1,256	1,225	1,874	1,277	1,509	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,8
General Insurance	1,171	1,171	1,171	1,171	1.171	1,171	- 6	0	0	0	0	0	7,0
Licenses	0	1,777	1,111	7,777	7,177	1,777	0	0	0	0	ŏ	ŏ	
Repair & Maint - Lot	0	0	. <u> </u>	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>ö</u>	0	
Repair & Maint - Equip	192	0	480	1,001	ō	2,628	0	0	0	Ö	Ō	Ö	4,3
Maint - Sweeping	107	107	107	107	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Steam Cleaning - Stalls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Exhaust Fan Maintenance	0	175	0	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	3
Maint. Supplies	. 0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Trash Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Equipment	0	0	0	0	00	0	0	0	00	0	0	. 0	
Subcontract Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
General Supplies	0	70	0	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0	00	0	00	0	
Tickets	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Signs	1,679 0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,6
Uniforms Purchase Postage & Shipping	11	11	13	14	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Supplies - Office	0	- 11	0	- 14		46	0	0	0	0	0	- 0	
Supplies - Water	51	45	45	51	51	57	- 0	ŏ	0	0	ő	0	
Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ō	
Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bank Charges	57	60	50	60	55	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Audit Expense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Telephone	34	34	34	68	68	76	0	0	0	0	O	<u> </u>	
Utilities	426	407	436	402	375	327	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,3
Credit Card Charges	0	1 500	4 500	4 500	0 1 500	1 500	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Management Fee	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,0
TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES	20,252	17,295	17,210	18,183	17,282	22,451	U	0	0	0	0	0	112,6
NET OPERATING INCOME	(7,343)	(4,247)	(3,323)	(3,261)	(4,649)	(11,459)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(34,2
ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB	4,465	4,202	4,288	4,824	4,447	5,812	0	0	0	0	0	0	28,0
OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	(2,878)	(45)	965	1,563	(202)	(5,647)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6,2

	PER MONTH	PER YEAR
GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX)	\$96.78	\$1,161.36
AVERAGE EXPENSE PER STALL (NET OF REIMBURSEMENT)	<u>\$104,49</u>	\$1,253.85
TOTAL NET OPERATING SURPLUS / (LOSS) PER STALL	-\$7,71	-\$92,50

FISCAL YEAR 2008 JULY 1, 2007 TO JUNE 30, 2008

Monthly Parking Revenue 7,273 7,775 5,868 8,955 5,760 6,325 5,700 5,200 5,425 5,063 5,703 5,668 77				10	LT 1, 2007	IO JUNE .	30, 2000							
Common C														
Common C	,		4110		007	NOV	pro.	1451				84.637	41.41	7070
Transent Revenue 12.27 11.126 10.289 11.258 10.685 10.485 10.08														TOTAL
Monthiry Parking Remanys	ARKING REVENUE													
Monthly Parting Revenue 7,272 7,775 5,886 5,985 5,780 5,325 5,720 6,320 6,425 6,053 5,720 5,886 77,	Transient Revenue	12,871	11,126	10,289	11,258	10,066	10,405	9,968	10,069	9,578	10,646	10,796 ·	9,745	126,8
CheesShort 0 68 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Monthly Parking Revenue						6,325	5,370	6,320		6,053		5,868	77,7
							-			0				
Other Revenue														
Repear Pepeer P														
TOTAL RECROSS PARKING REVENUE 20.144 18,885 16,77 20,243 15,590 16,787 15,338 16,288 15,588 15,689 16,489 15,512 24,145 12,514														
TOTAL NET REVENUE 17,000 15,945 13,468 17,083 13,360 14,145 12,944 13,831 13,560 14,092 13,924 13,175 172,														204,0
Parling Operations Salenies 12,753 8,979 11,713 11,320 11,991 14,383 12,320 10,905 10,916 11,532 12,231 11,185 141, Payroll Jaxes & Berreitis 1,996 1,562 1,633 1,772 1,877 2,251 1,926 1,707 1,706 1,805 1,914 1,751 22, Violente Compensation 1,405 1,104 1,365 1,500 1,500 1,500 1,005 1,007 1,700 1,00 1,005 1,914 1,751 22, Violente Compensation 1,405 1,104 1,305 1,500 1,500 1,500 1,005 1,007 1,005	Less Parking Tax	3,144	2,950	2,525	3,160	2,470	2,612	2,394	2,558	2,498	2,607	2,575	2,437	31,9
Parling Operations Salenies 12,753 8,979 11,713 11,320 11,991 14,383 12,320 10,905 10,916 11,532 12,231 11,185 141, Payroll Jaxes & Berreitis 1,996 1,562 1,633 1,772 1,877 2,251 1,926 1,707 1,706 1,805 1,914 1,751 22, Violente Compensation 1,405 1,104 1,365 1,500 1,500 1,500 1,005 1,007 1,700 1,00 1,005 1,914 1,751 22, Violente Compensation 1,405 1,104 1,305 1,500 1,500 1,500 1,005 1,007 1,005	TOTAL NET REVENUE	17,000	15,945	13,648	17,083	13,360	14,145	12,944	13,831	13,560	14,092	13,924	13,175	172,7
Payroll Javes & Bernefits 1,999 1,592 1,893 1,772 1,877 2,251 1,928 1,707 1,708 1,805 1,914 1,755 22, Workers Compensation 1,487 1,164 1,366 1,325 1,398 1,170 1,170 1,070	PERATING EXPENSES				·							•		
Payroll Jases & Benefits 1,996 1,592 1,893 1,772 1,877 2,251 1,928 1,707 1,708 1,805 1,914 1,755 22,	Parking Operations Salaries	12 752	9 979	11 713	11 320	11 991	14 383	12 320	10 905	10.916	11 532	12 231	11 185	141 3
Wickess Compensation														
General Insurance														
Repair & Maint - Lot														
Regark Allamit - Equip 1,295 342 472 2874 0 0 2,471 1,938 510 175 0 371 10. Maint - Sweeping 143 143 143 143 143 144 147	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	358	0	0	0	0	0	
Maint Sweeping														
Steam Cleaning - Steam Steam Cleaning - Steam Cleanin														
Exhaust Fan Maintenance 0 0 0 173 0 0 0 526 0 0 Maint Supplies 0 0 93 0														1,
Maint, Supplies 0					~~~									
Trash Removal								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Equipment 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·											
Subcontract Services 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					0		0	0						
Tickets		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Signs 198 366 0 774 111 0 218 0 0 0 0 1,009 2,														
Uniforms Purchase 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0														
Postage & Shipping 32														2
Supplies - Office 0 83 0 0 344 0 60 0 0 0 0 0 0 0														
Supplies - Water 50 56 56 32 40 48 0 40 70 57 55 51 Promotions 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				<u> </u>										
Professional Services 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		50	56	56										
Miscellaneous 0 0 0 0 0 129 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								·						
Bank Charges 50 55 55 48 60 53 53 55 50 57 53 50 Audit Expense 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0														
Audit Expense 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			~											
Telephone 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34														
Credit Card Charges 0		34	34		34	34	34	34	34	34	34		34	
Management Fee 1,500			13	13				88		318		363	461	1,
TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES 20,610 16,456 18,519 21,135 19,531 21,308 22,060 19,649 17,748 20,166 18,793 19,052 235, NET OPERATING INCOME (3,610) (511) (4,871) (4,052) (6,171) (7,163) (9,116) (5,818) (4,188) (6,074) (4,869) (5,877) (62, ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB 4,965 4,426 4,829 2,619 4,509 3,702 4,613 4,839 4,036 4,956 4,437 7 4,772 52, OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) 1,355 3,915 (42) (1,433) (1,662) (3,461) (4,503) (979) (152) (1,118) (432) (1,105) (9,000) (1														
NET OPERATING INCOME (3,610) (511) (4,871) (4,052) (6,171) (7,163) (9,116) (5,818) (4,188) (6,074) (4,869) (5,877) (62, ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB 4,965 4,426 4,829 2,619 4,509 3,702 4,613 4,839 4,036 4,956 4,437 4,772 52, OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) 1,355 3,915 (42) (1,433) (1,662) (3,461) (4,503) (979) (152) (1,118) (432) (1,105) (9, PER MONTH PER YEAR GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX) \$106.61 \$1,279.31														
ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB 4,965 4,426 4,829 2,619 4,509 3,702 4,613 4,839 4,036 4,956 4,437 7 4,772 52, OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) 1,355 3,915 (42) (1,433) (1,662) (3,461) (4,503) (979) (152) (1,118) (432) (1,105) (9, PER MONTH PER YEAR GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX) \$106.61 \$1,279.31	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·													
OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) 1,355 3,915 (42) (1,433) (1,662) (3,461) (4,503) (979) (152) (1,118) (432) (1,105) (9,000) PER MONTH PER YEAR GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX) \$106.61 \$1,279.31	NET OPERATING INCOME	(3,610)	(511)	(4,871)	(4,052)	(6,171)	(7,163)	(9,116)	(5,818)	(4,188)	(6,074)	(4,869)	(5,877)	(62,
PER MONTH PER YEAR GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX) \$106.61 \$1,279.31	ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB	4,965	4,426	4,829	2,619	4,509	3,702	4,613	4,839	4,036	4,956	4,437	7 4,772	52,
GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX) \$106.61 \$1,279.31	OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	1,355	3,915	(42)	(1,433)	(1,662)	(3,461)	{4,503}	(979)	(152)	(1,118)	(432)	(1,105)	(9,
							PE	R MONTH	I	PER YEAR				
AVERAGE EXPENSE PER STALL (NET OF REIMBURSEMENT) \$112.55 \$1,350.55		GROSS REVE	NUE PER ST	ALL (NET OF	PARKING TA	AX)		\$106.61		\$1,279.31				
		AVERAGE EX	PENSE PER :	STALL (NET	OF REIMBUR	SEMENT)	_	\$112.55	_	\$1,350.55				

-\$5.94

\$71.24

Prepared from information prepared by: CMA Asset Managers Parking Concepts, Inc.

TOTAL NET OPERATING SURPLUS / (LOSS) PER STALL

FISCAL YEAR 2007 JULY 1, 2006 TO JUNE 30, 2007

	JUL 2006	AUG 2006	SEP 2006	OCT 2006	NOV 2006	DEC 2006	JAN 2007	FEB 2007	MAR 2007	APR 2007	MAY 2007	JUN 2007	TOTAL
ARKING REVENUE													
Transient Revenue	9,980	10,784	11,998	12,612	10,960	11,596	12,011	12,128	12,562	12,512	13,329	14,224	144,6
Monthly Parking Revenue	6,830	8,200	7,990	8,580	5,175	7,280	8,415	9,055	7,855	8,085	7,115	7,095	91,6
Validation Revenue	100	0	0	0	300	0	0			0		0	
Over/Short Hosted Valet	0	00	4	1 0	0	-22 0	<u>0</u>	0	4	8 0	- <u>11</u> 0	4 0	
Other Revenue	0	0	9	. 0	0	22	12	0		0	0	0	
Keycard Deposit	0	Ö	0	27	54		0	0		- ŏ	81	0	
TOTAL GROSS PARKING REVENUE	16,910	18,984	19,993	21,220	16,489	18,876	20,438	21,183	20,421	20,605	20,514	21,315	236,
Less Parking Tax	2,640	2,963	3,120	3,308	2,566	2,943	3,188	3,307	3,188	3,216	3,190	3,327	36
TOTAL NET REVENUE	14,270	16,021	16,873	17,912	13,923	15,933	17,250	17,876	17,233	17,389	17,324	17,988	199
PERATING EXPENSES									·				
Parking Operations Salaries	10,914	9,569	8,754	13,094	10,167	11,704	11,631	10,208	11,391	10,213	10,358	11,440	129.
Payroll Taxes & Benefits	1,708	1,498	1,370	2,049	1,591	1,832	1,820	1,598	1,783	1,598	1,621	1,790	20.
Workers Compensation	1,273	1,116	1,021	1,527	1,185	1,365	1,356	1,190	1,328	1,191	1,207	1,334	15.
General Insurance	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	12
Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	328	0	0	0	0	0	
Repair & Maint - Lot	0	859	0	0	2,194	0	0	0	0	5,808	1,080	0	9.
Repair & Maint - Equip	726	2,635	Ō	0	0	0	160	454	2,521	209	0	513	7.
Maint - Sweeping	143	143	143	143	143	286	143	143	143	143	143	143	1.
Steam Cleaning - Stalls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700	0	0	
Exhaust Fan Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	0	0	
Maint, Supplies	0	107	. 78	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	
Trash Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Subcontract Services	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
General Supplies	57	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	
Tickets	1,122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	1
Signs	0 0	- 0	381	00	104 0	0	0	0	750	(750)	0	0	
Uniforms Purchase	0	0	0	<u>U</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0 47	0	0	
Postage & Shipping Supplies - Office	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	15	0	87	0	
Supplies - Water	86	46	78	46	42	84	49	34	40	46	54	50	
Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Professional Services	0	ō	0	ō	0	0	ō	0	0	0	Ů.	ŏ	
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0	
Bank Charges	55	55	55	50	55	52	52	60	50	50	57	57	
Audit Expense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	
Telephone	47	57	37	39	34	34	35	35	35	34	34	34	
Utilities Cond Charges	0 36	0 	0	25	<u>D</u>	28	13 5	14 6	12	12 6	14	13	
Credit Card Charges Management Fee	1,500	1,500	5 1,500	1,500	5 1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	18,
Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES	18,737	18,660	14,492	19,574	18,090	17,986	18,193	16,353	20,644	22,099	17,225	1,500 17,944	219,
IET OPERATING INCOME	(4,467)	(2,639)	2,381	(1,662)	(4,167)	(2,053)	(943)	1,523	(3,411)	(4,710)	99	44	(20,
ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB	. 4,220	8,211	3,848	4,173	4,984	4,551	4,271	4,183	5,552	6,734	4,553	4,292	59,
	•												
OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	(247)	5,572	6,229	2,511	817	2,498	3,328	5,706	2,141	2,024	4,652	4,336	39

 PER MONTH
 PER YEAR

 GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX)
 \$123.45
 \$1,481.43

 AVERAGE EXPENSE PER STALL (NET OF REIMBURSEMENT)
 \$99.03
 \$1,188.33

 TOTAL NET OPERATING SURPLUS / (LOSS) PER STALL
 \$24.42
 \$293.09

FISCAL YEAR 2006 JULY 1, 2005 TO JUNE 30, 2006

_	JUL	AUG	SEP	ост	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	TOTAL
	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2006	2006	2008	2006	2008	2006	
PARKING REVENUE													
Transient Revenue	9,230	9,516	8.644	8,536	9,567	8,656	10,489	8,782	9,454	8.597	9,847	9,652	110,970
Monthly Parking Revenue	2,805	1,680	4,620	6,180	4,550	4,800	9,460	5,540	6,085	7.165	7.785	8,105	68,775
Validation Revenue	1,200	2,325	1,700	0	1,250	400	450	300	0	0	0	0	7,625
Over/Short	0	0	3	0	230	0	-18	75	30	27	0	(22)	325
Hosted Valet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Other Revenue	0	σ	đ	σ	O O	0	0	σ		σ	21	Ū	21
Keycard Deposit	0	0	0	0	0	108		135	57	27	25	0	352
TOTAL GROSS PARKING REVENUE	13,235	13,521	14,967	14,716	15,597	13,964	20,381	14,832	15,626	15,816	17,678	17,735	188,068
Less Parking Tax	2,066	2,111	2,336	2,297	2,435	2,163	3,181	2,294	2,430	2,465	2,752	2,768	29,299
TOTAL NET REVENUE	11,169	11,410	12,631	12,419	13,162	11,801	17,200	12,538	13,196	13,351	14,926	14,967	158,769
OPERATING EXPENSES									<u>—</u>			·	
Parking Operations Salaries	11,121	9,932	10,415	8,692	10,845	11,434	11,094	9,788	10,216	9,811	10,725	9,854	123,927
Payroll Taxes & Benefits	1,740	1,554	1,630	1,360	1.697	1,789	1,736	1,532	1,599	1,535	1.678	1,542	19,392
Workers Compensation	1,481	1,323	1,387	1,158	1.445	1,523	1,478	1.304	1,361	1,307	1,429	1,313	16,509
General Insurance	1,020	1,020	1.020	1.020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,070	12,290
Licenses	0	0	0	0	7,020	0	0	0	285	0	0	0	285
Repair & Maint - Lot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,182	0	0	0	1,182
Repair & Maint - Equip	185	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	531	0	0	1,681	2,412
Maint - Sweeping	140	140	140	140	140	140	0	143	143	493	143	143	1,905
Steam Cleaning - Stalls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	0	0	143
Maint, Supplies	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		27	0		27
Trash Removal	0	25	49	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	74
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0		0
Subcontract Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		D	0	0	0
General Supplies	803	20	0	218	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	243	1,380
Tickets	0	0	934	0	0	0	0	0	0	933	0	0	1,867
Signs	0	0	0	0	538	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Uniforms Purchase	0	0	0	_ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	D	0
Postage & Shipping	0	8	4	51	49	0	112	20	0	0	00	0	244
Supplies - Office	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	. 0	232	0	199	0	20	451
Supplies - Water	224	136	82	81	0	91	97	98	42	. 46	44	46	987
Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296	0	0	0	296
Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bank Charges	52	50	52	53	55	57	52	60	53	52	55	59	650
Audit Expense	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telephone	34	138	87	73	88	67	0	53	80	58	62	50	790
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	. 0	0	0	0	0	79
Credit Card Charges	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	26	0	0	5	279
Management Fee	1,000	1.000	1,000	1.000	1,000	1,000	5,500	1.500	5,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	23.000
TOTAL ĞARAGE EXPENSES	17,831	15,377	16,831	13,892	16,908	17,248	21,199	15,781	22,334	17,124	16,656	17,526	208,707
NET OPERATING INCOME	(6,662)	(3,967)	(4,200)	(1,473)	(3,746)	(5,447)	(3,999)	(3,243)	(9,138)	(3,773)	(1,730)	(2,559)	(49,938
ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMB	4,255	3,793	4,046	3,911	3,987	3,910	5,220	3,473	5,033	3,897	3,712	4,067	49,304

	PER MONTH	PER YEAR
GROSS REVENUE PER STALL (NET OF PARKING TAX)	\$98.01	\$1,176.07
AVERAGE EXPENSE PER STALL (NET OF REIMBURSEMENT)	\$98.40	<u>\$1,180.76</u>
TOTAL NET OPERATING SURPLUS / (LOSS) PER STALL	(\$0.39)	(\$4.70)

FISCAL YEAR 2005 JULY 1, 2004 TO JUNE 30, 2005

	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	TOTAL
	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	
PARKING REVENUE													
Transient Revenue	0	0	0	0	1,590	4,555	4,579	5,507	6.183	6.965	. 8,382	8,507	46.26
Monthly Parking Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	300	450	1,160	1,535	1.910	3.160	2,580	11,09
Validation Revenue	0	0	0	0	ō	0	300	300	1,600	750	2,400	1,300	6,65
Over/Short	0	0	. 0	0	1	7	1	16	1	0	-10	-2	14
Hosted Valet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Hotel Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	ō	Ō	0	0	0	Ö	0	
TOTAL GROSS PARKING REVENUE	0	0	0	0	1,591	4,862	5,330	6,983	9,319	9,625	13,932	12,385	64,02
Less Parking Tax	0	0	0	0	145	442	938	1,090	1,455	1,502	2,175	1,933	9,680
TOTAL NET REVENUE	0	0	0	0	1.446	4,420	4,392	5,893	7,864	8.123	11,757	10,452	54,34
OPERATING EXPENSES							·		·	•			•
Parking Operations Salaries	0	0	0	0	6,025	11,203	10,212	9,061	9,700	9,146	9,740	8,696	73,78
Payroll Taxes & Benefits	0	0	0	0	943	1,753	1,598	1,418	1,518	1,431	1,524	1,361	11,54
Workers Compensation	0	0	0	0	803	1,492	1,360	1,207	1,292	1,431	1,324	1,158	9,82
General Insurance	0	0	0	0	510	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	7,65
Licenses	0	Ö	Ö	0	0	0	0	. 0	102	0	0	0	10
Maintenance-Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398	0	0	0	39
Sweeping	0	0	0	0	200	210	140	140	140	140	140	140	1,25
Exhaust Fan Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. ,,25
Trash Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	49	74	0	0	15
Equipment	0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0	381	0	0	0	0	38
General Supplies	0	0	Ō	0	1.849	91	183	1,511	2,884	115	60	49	6,74
Tickets	0	0	0	0	931	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Signs	0	0	0	0	254	5,737	0	174	0	0	0	0	6,16
Uniforms Purchase	0	0.	0	0	1,917	0	712	0	0	0	0	0	2,62
Postage & Shipping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	
Supplies - Water	0	0	0	0	0	110	. 0	99	100	62	123	83	57
Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	0	0	0	7
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	. 0	175	0	0	0	83	0	0	0	25
Bank Charges	. 0	0	0	0	. 0	26	52	48	48	60	48	57	33
Telephone	0	0	0	0	320	-25	. 0	0	0	0	00	62	35
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	
Utilities					0		26	26	26	26	26	31	24
Credit Card Charges	0	0	00	0		86					1 000	1,000	7,50
	0	0	0	0	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	., .,
Credit Card Charges	0								1,000 18,436	1,000 - 14,292	14,987	13,657	
Credit Card Charges Management Fee	0	0	0	0	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	-				130,92 (76,5 75
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES	0 0	0	0	0	500 14,427	1,000 22,703	1,000 16,310	1,000 16,110	18,436	14,292	14,987	13,657	130,92 (76,5 7
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	500 14,427 (12,981)	1,000 22,703 (18,283)	1,000 16,310 (11,918)	1,000 16,110 (10,217)	18,436 (10,572)	14,292 (6,169)	14,987 (3,230)	13,657 (3,205)	130,92 (76,575 33,03
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	500 14,427 (12,981) 3,202	1,000 22,703 (18,283) 4,919	1,000 16,310 (11,918) 4,056	1,000 16,110 (10,217) 3,849	18,436 (10,572) 6,312	14,292 (6,169) 3,687	14,987 (3,230) 2,872	13,657 (3,205) 4,137	130,92
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	500 14,427 (12,981) 3,202 (9,779)	1,000 22,703 (18,283) 4,919 (13,364) 17,784	1,000 16,310 (11,918) 4,056 (7,862)	1,000 16,110 (10,217) 3,849 (6,368) 12,261	18,436 (10,572) 6,312 (4,260)	14,292 (6,169) 3,687 (2,482)	14,987 (3,230) 2,872 (358)	13,657 (3,205) 4,137 932	130,92 (76,57: 33,03 (43,54
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	500 14,427 (12,981) 3,202 (9,779)	1,000 22,703 (18,283) 4,919 (13,364) 17,784	1,000 16,310 (11,918) 4,056 (7,862) 12,254	1,000 16,110 (10,217) 3,849 (6,368) 12,261	18,436 (10,572) 6,312 (4,260) 12,124	14,292 (6,169) 3,687 (2,482)	14,987 (3,230) 2,872 (358)	13,657 (3,205) 4,137 932	130,92 (76,57: 33,03 (43,54
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 GROSS REVEN	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	500 14,427 (12,981) 3,202 (9,779) 11,225	1,000 22,703 (18,283) 4,919 (13,364) 17,784	1,000 16,310 (11,918) 4,056 (7,862) 12,254 ER MONTH \$50.32	1,000 16,110 (10,217) 3,849 (6,368) 12,261	18,436 (10,572) 6,312 (4,260) 12,124 PER YEAR \$402.57	14,292 (6,169) 3,687 (2,482)	14,987 (3,230) 2,872 (358)	13,657 (3,205) 4,137 932	130,92 (76,57) 33,03 (43,54)
Credit Card Charges Management Fee TOTAL GARAGE EXPENSES NET OPERATING INCOME ASSOC. EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 TALL (NET C	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PF REIMBU	500 14,427 (12,981) 3,202 (9,779) 11,225	1,000 22,703 (18,283) 4,919 (13,364) 17,784	1,000 16,310 (11,918) 4,056 (7,862) 12,254 R MONTH	1,000 16,110 (10,217) 3,849 (6,368) 12,261	18,436 (10,572) 6,312 (4,260) 12,124 PER YEAR	14,292 (6,169) 3,687 (2,482) 10,605	14,987 (3,230) 2,872 (358) 12,115	13,657 (3,205) 4,137 932 9,520	130,92 (76,57 33,03 (43,54 97,88

Franklin 88 Garage Area Parking Rate Survey

DATE: 06/01/08 Transient Parking Rates No. of **Monthly Parking Rates** *Facility Parking Parking Facility Address **Building Name** Parking Operator Early Night Туре Daily Reserved Other Other Spaces Unreserved \$ Weekend (time) Max. Bird Rate 40.0 1 1 1.62 \$1 1st & 2nd brs 3rd 8.00 \$5.00 A \$10 4 4 Franklin 88 43. SIPCT. N 11 G: A 225 \$165.00 \$145 (M-F) (10AM) (5PM) F1/ 989 Franklin Street . 8th hrst. \$14.00 \$5.00 (overnight) \$20 2 988 Franklin Street G 578 \$180.00 \$1.25 Pacific Renaissance Plaza In-house \$160(M-F) 1 hr. \$14.00 (overnight) 1000 Broadway Trans Pacific Center AMPCO 354 \$1.25 3 (enter on 12th St..) G \$175.00 20 min. \$14.00 340 11th Street \$5 4 (11th & Harrison) Star Park G 80 \$140.00 \$7.00 Flat \$7.00 (4PM) \$5.00 City of Oakland, 12th & \$4 5 1200 Harrison Street Harrison Garage Douglas 207 \$90.00 \$75.00 \$1.25 1hr. \$10.00 (overnight) \$5 6 Franklin & 13th & Webster & 12th Downtown Merchant Parking In-house 520 \$210.00 \$185.00 \$1.25 1/2 hr. \$12.00 \$6.00 (overnight) \$5 PCI \$8.00 (3PM) 7 13th & Webster SL \$150.00 \$3.00 hr \$10.00 \$5.00 726 Harrison Street \$3.00 8 (8th & Harrison) East Bay (7PM) 5L \$135.00 \$2.00 1hr. \$6.00 \$3.00 \$2.00 9 7th & Harrison Central \$120.00 \$1.50 20 min. \$6.00 (4PM **\$**3 \$3.00 (4PM) 10 325 7th Street Central \$120.00 \$7.00 1hr. 2hr free with In-house 28 purchase of \$20 11 410 7th Street G N/A \$2.00 \$18.00 Orient Market 1hr. (4PM) 12 Broadway & 8th Central N/A \$5.00 2hr \$9.00 Old Oakland G = 44 G = \$175 13 (Washington & 7th) Central G & \$L SL= 108 SL=\$160 \$1.00 20 min. \$12.00 \$1.50 14 11th & Clav Convention Center Garage In-house 585 \$190.00 20 min. \$22.00 \$12.00 525 14th Street

\$220.00

City Center Garage

AMPCO

1.157

Franklin 88 Multiple Hours Fee Summar

20 min.

\$25.00

\$2.00

rrankili	n 88 Multiple Ac	ours ree Summa	ir			
\$1.00	1st hr.	\$14.00	\$8.00 (10AM)	\$5.00 (5PM)	\$5.00	\$10.00
\$2.00	2-3 hrs		flat	flat	flat	
\$4.00	3-4 hrs	_				
\$6.00	4-5 hrs		ļ			
\$8.00	5-6 hrs					
\$10.00	6-7 hrs					
\$12.00	7-8 hrs			,		
\$14.00	8 hr			l		

^{15 (}also enter on 11 th & Clay)

* G = Garage; SL = Surface Lot

Memo



Department of Contracting and Purchasing Social Equity Division

To:

John Quintal, UEA III

From:

Vivian Inma, Contract Compliance Officer

Through:

Deborah Barnes, Director, DC&P

Shelley Darensburg, Sr. Contract Compliance Officer &, Quenaburg

Date:

March 10, 2009

Re:

P126410 - Franklin 88 Garage Management

The Department of Contracting and Purchasing (DCP), Division of Social Equity, reviewed five (5) bids in response to the above referenced project. Below is the outcome of the compliance evaluation for the minimum 20% Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation requirement, and a preliminary review for compliance with the Equal Benefits Ordinance (EBO).

Below are the results of our findings:

Respons	sive	Proposed Participation			F	Carned Credits and I	discounts			
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/ SLBE	LBE	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Points	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant?
Douglas Parking, LLC	. NA	100%	90%	10%	NA	20%	2 points	NA	0 points	Y
Imperial Parking (US) Inc.	NA	40%	0%	40%	NA	40%	4 points	NA	0 points	Y
Pacific Park Management	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	NA	2points	Y

Comments: As noted above, all firms met and/or exceeded the minimum 20% L/SLBE requirement. Firms that are not EBO compliant will have to come into compliance prior to contract award.

Non-Resp	onsive	Pro	posed	Partic	ipation		Earned Credits and	Discounts		~
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/	1 1	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Points	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant?
Pacific Parking Concepts	NA	0%	0%	0%	NA	0%	0 points	NA	0 points	N
Unipark, LLC.	NA	0%	0%	0%	NA	0%	0 points	NA	0 points	N

As noted, Pacific Parking Concepts failed to meet the minimum 20% L/SLBE participation requirement and our L/SLBE database and other proposals shows that there are local firms that can participate in this contract. Unipark, LLC failed to submit a Schedule E, Project Consultant Team Listing, and therefore compliance cannot be determined. Both firms are deemed non-responsive at this point in the process. As this is a negotiated agreement, the firms could revise its team and meet L/SLBE participation requirements. Neither firm is EBO compliant.

Should you have any questions you may contact Vivian Inman at (510) 238-3970.



DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

	IPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR: Professional Services	•
Project No.: P12	6410	
RE:	Franklin 88 Garage Management	
CONSULTANT/	CONTRACTOR: Douglas Parking, LLC	:
	Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount NA NA	Over/Under Engineer's Estimate NA
Tanto Medicani Marijama ny Chiles ao	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Point N/A 2	8:
	Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	YES
	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE participation	YES
	b) % of SLBE . <u>10%</u> . participation	'
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? YES	-
	(If yes, list the points received) 2	points
	5. Additional Comments.	
•	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initia	ating Dept:
•	3/10/2009	
Reviewing Officer: Approved By:	Date: 3 Shelley Darensburg Date: 3	10/09

LBE/SLBE Participation Douglas Parking, LLC

Project Name: Franklin 88 Garage Management

Project No.	Project No.: P126410 Engineer's Estimate		NA		Under/Over Engineers Estimate:					
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages	Ethn	For Tracking C MBE	nly WBE
PRIME Janitorial	Douglas Parking, LLC First Building Management	Oakland Oakland	CB CB	90%	10%	90% 10%	90% 10%	С	10%	
Project Totals				90%	10%	100%	100%		10%	0%
Requirements: The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.				*LBE 10%	SUBE(10%	### Ethnicity AA = African American A = Asian C = Caucasian				
LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified Busine CB = Certified Busines MBE = Minority Bu WBE = Women Bu	s Islness Enterprise		H = Hispa NA = Nal O = Othe NL = Not	tive American r		



DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

PROJECT COM	PLIANCE EVALUATION FOR: Professional Services
Project No.: P12	410
RE:	Franklin 88 garage Management
Day San	
CONSULTANT/	CONTRACTOR: Imperial Parking (US) Inc.
	Over/Under Engineer's
	Ingineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount Estimate NA NA NA NA
	Pid discounted amount. Discount/Droference Balates
Cathalan Barran and an teach	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points: N/A 4
Manage Company of the	I. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply: YES
	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement YES a) % of LBE participation
	b) % of SLBE 40% participation
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? YES
	(If yes, list the points received) 4 points
	5. Additional Comments.
•	
	5. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.
	3/10/2009
•	Date
	Visit Inn
Reviewing Officer:	Date: 3/10/09.
Approved By:	Shelley Darenstrung, Date: 3/10/09

LBE/SLBE Participation Imperial Parking (US) Inc.

Project Name: Franklin 88 Garage Management

Project No.	.: P126410	Engineer's Estimate NA				Under/Over Engineers Estimate:					
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE		Total	Total		For Tracking C	nly
			Status		<u> </u>		LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Imperial Parking (US) Inc.	San Francisco	UB					60%	С		
Janitorial	System Masters Comm Cleaning	Oakland	CB	,	. 40)%	40%	40%	AA	40%	
					· .			•			
Project Totals				0%	, 40)%	40%	100%		40%	0%
Requirements: The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.			LBE 10%	10% SLBE 10% TOTAL LEBESLEE					Ethnicity AA = African American A = Asian C = Caucasian		
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise			UB = Uncertified Business CB = Certified Business					H = Hispanic NA = Native American O = Other			
			MBE = Minority Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise			NL = Not	-				



DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

PROJECT CO	MPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR: Professional Services
Project No.: P1	26410
RE:	Franklin 88 Garage Management
CONSULTANT	T/CONTRACTOR: Pacific Park Management
	Over/Under Engineer's
	Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount Estimate NA NA NA NA
and To September 19 September 18 Phillips	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points: N/A 5
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply: YES
	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE participation YES 0%
	b) % of SLBE 100% participation
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? YES
	(If yes, list the points received) 5 points
•	5. Additional Comments.
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.
	3/10/2009
Reviewing ¹ Officer:	Villa Jun - Date: 3/10/05
Approved By:	Shellow Darenstrung Date: 3/10/09

LBE/SLBE Participation Pacific Park Management

Project Name: Franklin 88 Garage Management

Project No.:	P126410	Engineer's Estimate			NA	Under/Over Engineers Estimate:				
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages	Ethn	r Tracking MBE	Only WBE
PRIME	Pacific Park Management		CB*		.100%	100%	100%		100%	
Project Totals					100%	% 100% 100		·	100%	0%
•	nts: nents is a combination of 10% L SLBE firm can be counted 1009			理(李核) 批[四]	SEBE-10%	TRUCKING 20%		A = Asiar C = Cauc	can American I asian	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified Busine CB = Certified Busines MBE = Minority Bu WBE = Women Bu	ss Isiness Enterprise		H = Hispa NA = Nat O = Othe NL = Not	ive American r	



DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

PROJECT COI	MPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR: Professional Services 26410	
RE:	Franklin 88 Garage Management	
CONSULTANT	CONTRACTOR: Pacific Parking Concepts	
·	Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount NA NA	Over/Under Engineer's Estimate NA
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Point N/A 0	S;
	Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	YES
. ·	Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE participation	NO .
	b) % of SLBE <u>0%</u> participation	
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? NO	
	(If yes, list the points received)	points
	5. Additional Comments.	
	Firm failed to meet the minimum 20% L/SLBE particiaption requirements responsive.	nent. Therefore, the firm is deemed non-
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initia	iting Dept.
	3/10/2009	·
Reviewing Office	Date Date Date: 3	3/10/69

Approved By:

Date: 3/10/09



LBE/SLBE Participation Pacific Parking Concepts

Project Name: Franklin 88 Garage Management

Project No.:	Project No.: P126410 Engineer's Estimate		NA		Under/Over Eng	gineers Estimate:			
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages	For Tracking C	Only WBE
PRIME	Pacific Parking Concepts	San Fransico	UB				100%		
Project Totals			0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	
Requirements: The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		FRUCKING 20% AA = African American A = Asian C = Caucasian			
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified Busin CB = Certified Business MBE = Minority Business WBE = Women Business	ess s siness Enterprise		H = Hispanic NA = Native American O = Other NL = Not Listed		



DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

Project No.: P12	26410
RE:	Franklin 88 Garage Management
CONSULTANT	CONTRACTOR: Unipark LLC Over/Under Engineer's Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount NA NA NA NA NA
The state of the s	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points: N/A 0
	Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply: YES
	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement NO a) % of LBE 0% participation
	b) % of SLBE <u>0%</u> participation
· ·	Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? <u>NO</u>
	(If yes, list the points received) 0 points
. ,	5. Additional Comments.
	Firm failed to submit a Schedule E, therefore compliance cannot be determined.
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.
-	3/10/2009
Reviewing Officer: Approved By:	Shelley Darenslrung Date: 3/10/09.



LBE/SLBE Participation Unipark LLC

Project Name: Franklin 88 Garage Management

Project No.: P126410 Engineer's Estimate				NA	Under/Over Engineers Estimate:					
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages	For Tra	icking (BE	niy WBE
PRIME	Unipark LLC	Hercules	UB				100%	С		
	Proje	ct Totals		0%	. 0%	0%	100%		0%	0%
	ents: ements is a combination of 10 SLBE firm can be counted to			EBE 10%	SUBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African Americ A = Asian C = Caucasian	zan	
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified Busine CB = Certified Busine MBE = Minority Busine			H ≃ Hispanic NA ≈ Native America · O ≃ Other NL = Not Listed	an		

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERA OAKLAND 2009 MAR 11 PM 5: 50

APPROVED AS TO	FORMANE	LEGALITY:
		m-
	ORA AGE	NCY COUNSEL

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND

RESOLUTION NO.	C.M.S

AGENCY RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A TWO-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH PACIFIC PARK MANAGEMENT, INC., FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE FRANKLIN 88 PUBLIC PARKING GARAGE AT 9TH & FRANKLIN STREETS IN DOWNTOWN OAKLAND

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency owns a condominium interest in portions of the basement, first and second levels of the Franklin 88 development at the northwest corner of Franklin and 9th Streets containing 135 public parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, in November 2008, the Agency and the Arioso Homeowners Association ("HOA") jointly issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP") to 20 parking management firms soliciting a potential new manager for the Agency public parking garage and the residential parking garage who might improve the financial performance of the parking operations for the benefit of the Agency and the HOA; and

WHEREAS, five parking management firms responded to the RFP, three of which were determined to have submitted responsive proposals; and

WHEREAS, Pacific Park Management, Inc. ("PPM") submitted the compensation arrangement that was most favorable to the Agency and the HOA; and

WHEREAS, the Agency wishes to enter into an agreement with PPM to operate the public parking garage at the Franklin 88 project; and

WHEREAS, the Agency finds that this contract shall not result in the loss of employment or salary by any person having permanent status in the competitive service; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Agency Administrator is hereby authorized to negotiate and enter into an extendable two-year agreement ("Agreement") with PPM for management of the public parking garage at the Franklin 88 project under the following minimum terms:

- 1. PPM will pay the Agency \$3,300 per month plus 10 percent of annual gross revenue from the public parking operations between \$237,000 and \$275,000, and 20 percent of annual gross revenue from the Parking Operation in excess of \$275,000.
- 2. PPM will be responsible for paying all expenses of the parking operations that exceed gross revenue from the parking operations and a \$1,500 monthly maximum contribution from the HOA.
- 3. The Agency and HOA will be responsible for paying for capital improvements and repairs to their respective parking parcels in the project according to the terms of the Reciprocal Easement Agreement.
- 4. PPM will retain all net profit from the public parking operation after all payments described in term number one above have been remitted to the Agency.
- 5. PPM will hire Oakland residents to provide all valet attendant services in the public parking operation of the Franklin 88 Garage that cannot be provided by PPM's current workforce. If PPM chooses to transfer staff members to the Franklin 88 garage from other parking facilities that it manages, then PPM will hire Oakland residents to replace staff members who are transferred from any of those other facilities to the Franklin 88.

and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That all payments received by the Agency under the Agreement shall be deposited into the Chinatown Parking Lot Fund (9515), Capital Improvement Projects – Economic Development Organization (94800), 9th and Franklin Block Project (P126410), and shall be used to fund a capital improvement and repair reserve for the Agency public parking garage; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Agency Administrator or his designee is authorized to take whatever action is necessary with respect to the Agreement consistent with this Resolution and its basic purposes, including extension of the Agreement after its initial term for up to one additional year; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Agency Administrator will return to the Agency for authorization to execute an agreement with any other company to manage the Franklin 88 Garage in the event that the Agency Administrator is not able to execute the Agreement with PPM, or it is terminated by either the Agency or PPM prior to the end of its term including any extension as provided above; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Agreement authorized hereunder, including amendments, modifications, or extensions, shall be approved as to form and legality by Agency Counsel and filed with the Agency Secretary.

IN AGENCY, OAKL	AND, CALIFORNIA,, 2009
PASSED BY THE	FOLLOWING VOTE:
AYES-	BROOKS, DE LA FUENTE, KAPLAN, KERNIGHAN, NADEL, QUAN, REID, AND CHAIRPERSON BRUNNER
NOES-	
ABSENT-	
ABSTENTION-	
	A TITE OT.
	ATTEST:LATONDA SIMMONS
	Secretary of the Redevelopment Agency
,	of the City of Oakland