

UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in a regular meeting on September 9, 2002, in Conference Room 1A of City Hall, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa. The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m. by Chairperson Monahan who led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL Agency Members present: Chairperson Monahan
Vice Chairperson Dixon
Agency Member Cowan
Agency Member Robinson
Agency Member Steel

Officials present: City Manager Roeder
Executive Director Lamm
Planning & Redevelopment Mgr. Robinson
Agency Attorney Wood
Executive Secretary Thompson

POSTING The Redevelopment Agency meeting agenda was posted at the Council Chambers and Police Department on Thursday, September 5, 2002.

MINUTES On a motion by Vice Chairperson Dixon, seconded by Agency Member Cowan, and carried 5-0, the Minutes of June 10, 2002, were approved as written.

OLD BUSINESS None.

NEW BUSINESS

Direction to Community Redevelopment Action Committee (CRAC) Public Participation Facilitator Chairperson Monahan referred to a meeting with Executive Director Lamm, Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson and Urban Futures, Inc. (UFI) to discuss what direction the Redevelopment Plan was going, and ways in which the CRAC could participate in order to help that process. The meeting resulted in a memorandum drafted at his request dated September 5, 2002 from UFI, and attached to this evening's staff report. Chairperson Monahan apologized that Jon Huffman (UFI) was not present to answer questions concerning the contents of the memorandum which suggested activities which would result in recommendations, projects and action items that could be folded into the final Redevelopment Area Plan and the Westside. Four activities would include: education; California Redevelopment Law; identification of areas of interest and their impact; and a list of projects. UFI has also offered to provide educational material similar to that already received by the City Council and Planning Commission.

Chairperson Monahan voiced concern that there had not been interaction between the CRAC and the on-going redevelopment process. After meeting with the Facilitators earlier, he understood this was partly due to the process involved. The main agenda item at the next CRAC meeting on September 26, 2002, is to decide on a process to achieve a final conclusion. He suggested the UFI memorandum be added as an item for discussion at that meeting.

Vice Chairperson Dixon said she found the UFI memorandum confusing, and referred to Page 3 “Review of Existing Data” – all data gathered to date on the entire Westside. She asked for the pros and cons of providing such data at this point and questioned if this would confuse CRAC members, as several are familiar with the Westside, while others would need to be educated.

Chairperson Monahan reported while at the CRAC meeting, information was requested. UFI was proposing providing education during a meeting or two to bring the CRAC “up to speed”. He had not posed his question to the facilitator, Civic Solutions, Inc., but to UFI as to how to get this accomplished. There was no discussion between CSI, UFI and himself before the memorandum was written.

John Douglas, Civic Solutions, Inc. (CSI), responded in the affirmative to Vice Chairperson Dixon’s question that, as the CRAC continues to meet, would education not be part of the process. She reported she had attended the last CRAC meeting and was surprised at the time wasted on minor detail. She felt nothing was accomplished and left feeling very frustrated.

Mr. Douglas introduced Rigoberto Rodriquez, a partner on the project, who had participated in a number of these large group activities. Mr. Douglas described his perspective on the process. It is very much what he would have expected given the nature of the process, the history of the community, the size of the CRAC and the relationships that exist within the community. He was not surprised at all by the time taken and the nature of the discussions.

Mr. Rodriquez reported he has been involved in nine/ten projects of this size, and nothing he has experienced so far with the CRAC process has “scared” him. He felt members are very committed to their areas and have diverse perspectives, and explained CSI works from within the energies of the group. By the end of the last meeting, a few things were achieved; one being how issues would be raised within the context of the CRAC by the CRAC itself, plus the development of a process by which items could be agendaized. It was also decided to review models available to accelerate the process at the September 26, 2002, meeting. CSI has not been contacted about UFI’s suggestions until an e-mail was received Friday afternoon, September 6, 2002. Therefore, there was not an opportunity to review how they mesh with the models being prepared by CSI for the CRAC to consider. They are fairly standard elements.

Mr. Douglas referred to when he was asked for a progress report on the CRAC. He and a number of the CRAC members were uncomfortable with such a request because a relationship of trust between them is being built upon. The question is “Who speaks for the CRAC?” He believes it should be the CRAC members, and CSI should not try to characterize their opinions. Mr. Douglas was not comfortable with the present conversation taking place, and felt without adequate notice of this meeting being given to the CRAC, many members may have been prevented from participating.

Chairperson Monahan replied the CRAC was formed by the Redevelopment Agency so its main focus is on the Redevelopment Area; however, he recognized the CRAC can review areas not covered by the Plan. He reiterated his concern that there was no direction for the CRAC.

Agency Member Cowan recognized the Redevelopment Agency's struggle in regard to the "process". As there was not an opportunity for the Redevelopment Agency to interview candidates for the Facilitator contract, she suggested a presentation of the CSI interview that was previously given to the Planning Commission. This would give the Redevelopment Agency an understanding of what CSI has been hired to do. After reading the proposals and contract, she understands things are moving along just fine. Any size group will struggle to communicate.

Agency Member Cowan said UFI has the responsibility to make a legal definition that can withstand the test of law and time. Blight is in the eye of the beholder. She sees the CRAC doing the community work – creating the "vision" of what the Westside can be. UFI's legal framework becomes a tool to create recommendations to bring about that vision. Other tools may become available; "Redevelopment" is only one.

Agency Member Cowan expressed the opinion the process was right on track. The Redevelopment Agency needs to have a better understanding of the process CSI has brought to the CRAC to alleviate fears that progress is not being made. She did agree the CRAC should have an opportunity to review materials provided by UFI. Agency Member Cowan would like CSI to walk the Redevelopment Agency through the process, and present what was done in the interview to win the contract as Facilitator. If a member of the Redevelopment Agency needs to attend the meetings in whatever capacity requested, she was willing to volunteer with one other member.

Agency Member Robinson voiced concern that, according to feedback she had received, many CRAC members are not being heard. She understands there is a process; however, she would like the Facilitator to guarantee these voices are heard.

Agency Member Steel stated he empathized with concerns expressed by Agency Members Cowan and Robinson; however, his own concern was that the CRAC was going to break up. The Redevelopment Agency should have interviewed the applicants for the Facilitator contract. He would like the Facilitator to hold elections for steering and sub-committees. The idea of the CRAC was to get insight into the determined blighted areas, but a lot of discussion is on process and trust. He advocated simplifying the process and focusing on the CRAC objectives which would increase the trust. Although he personally was in favor of rezoning the bluffs, it was not in the purview of the CRAC, and not a part of the study. The zoning of the bluffs should be taken up by the City Council and run through either the Planning Commission or a study session, etc. "Stakeholders" needs to be defined; he understands it to mean legal residents who can be members of the electorate, who own businesses or residential property, or live in a home in the area.

Chairperson Monahan said he did not believe the Redevelopment Agency gave the Facilitator or the CRAC any idea of what is expected at the end, and wondered what exactly CSI had been asked to facilitate.

Vice Chairperson Dixon responded she thought the CRAC was going to study many different issues including zoning, possibly an art village, library, housing, infra structure, etc.. She thought the CRAC would come to a consensus as to what it wanted, and then return to the Redevelopment Agency with recommendations.

Agency Member Robinson concurred with Vice Chairperson Dixon's understanding, and that the CRAC had a broad canvas with the freedom to consider issues in the improvement areas – without the Agency's thumbprint on it.

Mr. Rodriguez said some clear parameters were given, including the Redevelopment Agency did not want to be involved with managing the process. This direction was imbedded in the Request For Proposal of key areas. CSI had asked bluntly if the City was looking for a specific set of recommendations in a specific area? The response was "we do not have a predetermined agenda or outcomes". The Redevelopment Agency was looking for a broad vision with key areas, where there is strong consensus in terms of not only the Westside but a broader area also. Later, CSI was informed there was a parallel redevelopment specific process which is more technical and legal at this juncture, wherein redevelopment tools are going to be utilized. Mr. Rodriguez suggested three months of work for some may seem a lot, but when the future of a community is being considered, it is not that much to even begin to establish common agreements around processes to be used. It is better to move slowly at the beginning in order to establish some solid ground rules that will allow faster movement later.

Mr. Rodriguez said he did not mean disrespect but he felt to determine what is happening by attending one meeting is not doing justice to the breadth of what is taking place. It should be the CRAC that establishes its own process and to move forward in crafting that vision. At the last CRAC meeting, it was decided how to come up with agenda items, and formally agreed to address at the next meeting the model to develop that vision. The timeline is absolutely on track with the RFP. CSI was told there were sixteen to eighteen months to complete this project. At that time, CSI was not informed there was a separate redevelopment specific parallel track that was going to impinge that timeline. Within that broad timeline, the aim is to accelerate that process.

Chairperson Monahan asked what would be presented at the end of the sixteen month period. Mr. Rodriguez responded the CRAC recommendations, and not necessarily at the end of that period, but earlier. What actually is presented will be worked out in the process; the next CRAC meeting was going to focus on the best model to allow all voices to be heard.

Discussion ensued concerning process expectations within certain timeframes, etc. Vice Chairperson Dixon reiterated that, with patience, the process will work out.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
CRAC Members**

Robert Graham, 3260 Dakota, Costa Mesa, said 19th Street to Brookhurst is a major part of the redevelopment discussion. If the road does not go through, the area will remain isolated and stagnant. He suggested a large reference map needs to be provided.

Steve Marks, 1950 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, stated the one monthly CRAC meeting should be increased to perhaps two a month in order to get anything accomplished.

Terry Breer, 956 Magellan Street, Costa Mesa, presented an acronym IRAC: issues, rules, application and conclusion. Based on UFI's previous presentation to the CRAC, she had thought all aspects of redevelopment

and the process would be taught. CSI is a great facilitator but it has been asked to do a lot more than anticipated, certainly not to teach the facts about Costa Mesa. She suggested stepping back to get educated, perhaps within the next two meetings, and then getting on track with the accelerated model.

Janice Davidson, 1982 Arnold, Costa Mesa, complained CSI does not let CRAC members discuss anything. At the third meeting the facilitator talked for the entire meeting. Rezoning was the only item on the last agenda. Although a lot of people had been lost, she felt they could be brought back.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, reported earlier this summer he had an opportunity to see an example of what the CRAC could accomplish. He toured a neighborhood similar to his own in a neighboring city, and described how a new \$7 million community center had been achieved. The process had taken seven years and included a facilitation group. Raising the money was easy - getting the separate groups together was the difficulty. He asked that the Costa Mesa process not be “derailed” ; he saw it as the only way to reach consensus in order to gain great things.

Jim Clough, 1873 Park East Circle, Costa Mesa, said there was a problem with the conception of the CRAC and it will take time to understand what the direction is going to be. He understood the Redevelopment Agency is concerned only in the blighted areas while the CRAC is concerned with the Westside and some areas outside. Most people are used to the way City committees are set up; however, the CRAC is very large and not set up the same way. The Facilitator has tried to lead in a way that it feels will work; however, some CRAC members who are unhappy with that, are still on the “old small” ad hoc committee model. He felt it will take a good deal longer that perhaps it should to get to common ground.

Mary Fewel, 2000 Republic Avenue, Costa Mesa, reported she was pleased the way the CRAC is going, except for the last meeting. Chairperson Monahan is right on; however, the Facilitator should be given a chance and is doing a good job overall. Everyone wants the same thing – to make the Westside better.

John Feeney, 1154 Dorset Lane, Costa Mesa, gave examples of why he felt there was a lack of trust concerning the Facilitator, and questioned when a common ground consensus had been decided upon. He complained factual information was not presented, and the Facilitator is not always objective and should be obligated to present both sides. After being residents of Costa Mesa for 37 years, he and his wife want a decent neighborhood to live in.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, No. 264, Costa Mesa, suggested the CRAC meeting on September 26 may be in conflict with the City Council candidate forum scheduled at the same time. He expressed dissatisfaction with the Facilitator. Although there is talk about process – there are no mechanics in place. CRAC members should be from Costa Mesa so they are informed about the City.

Don Elmore, 2209 Wallace Avenue, Costa Mesa, expressed concern about where the Facilitator is going, what the CRAC is trying to do, and how long it is going to take to get there. He questioned when the CRAC is going to discuss what it thinks is needed in Costa Mesa.

Paul Bunney, 984 Linden, Costa Mesa, reported in February 1999, an all-day meeting took place on upgrading communities; then, in 2002, the Westside Plan was voted on, and that fell through. The City is now going through the same process to get something done, but without any ground rules. He believed approximately two months ago rezoning the Westside bluffs was agendaized for the City Council. Mayor Pro Tem Monahan proposed rezoning the Westside bluffs going back to Monrovia as residential. It appeared the vote was going to be 3-2 in favor; however, Council Member Cowan dissuaded everyone to pass it over to the CRAC.

Agency Member Cowan responded a consultant is currently putting a study together for rezoning from Monrovia West to the bluffs.

Executive Director Lamm clarified that a dual process is occurring. The City Council decided on the boundaries of the study area and directed staff to obtain the scope of work, etc. for presentation to the CRAC for its approval. Staff was to return with an independent study review presenting facts, costs, etc.. This information would then be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council. Although everyone is in favor of rezoning, there are basic legal requirements. Notices go out to property owners who would be directly affected. There are serious ramifications. The consultant cannot be hired without the CRAC's sanction. The CRAC was to decide when to take up the issue, and voted that item would be on a future agenda.

Agency Member Cowan disagreed – she recollected the City Council and Redevelopment Agency directed staff to develop a scope of work, take it to the CRAC to see if anything else was wanted to be included, and then move it on. She said she had confirmed this direction two weeks ago in an e-mail.

Chairperson Monahan asked staff to provide meeting minutes to clarify this direction; he would then bring the item back to agendaize.

Mr. Bunney offered to splice the tapes of both meeting and provide them to staff. He had attended the City Council study session earlier this evening and saw Mayor Dixon “rake staff over the coals” over the duck pond. He wished the Redevelopment Agency would get as worked up over the Westside which includes fourteen areas of blight.

Chris Fewel, 2000 Republic Avenue, Costa Mesa, felt everyone present was saying the same thing; however, a difference may be where people think the CRAC is on the timeline. He felt the consultants had been unfairly demeaned in public for doing a difficult job in trying to get a 73 member committee from point A to point B. All meetings are taped. In the CRAC's lifecycle, everyone will have an opportunity to discuss issues. He felt all members will make the commitment to try to do the best thing for the Westside.

Eric Bever, 1046 Westward Way, Costa Mesa, thanked Chairperson Monahan for bringing this item up, and thanked Vice Chairperson Dixon for attending the last CRAC meeting. He felt the “Delphi technique” is what is going on concerning “process”. The CRAC has not been given any information regarding its task. A meeting in October/November has been discussed; however, he questioned when there be time to do “homework”. The interest seems to be in getting a group consensus rather than education. His idea is similar to going to school; materials are given,

they are read in preparation for each upcoming meeting then, during that meeting, intelligent decisions are made.

Ernie Feeney, 1154 Dorset Lane, Costa Mesa, said she heard the CRAC has 73 members; however, in watching the tapes of the meetings, it looks like 40-45 members show up consistently. She wondered what the actual number is, and if non-attendees will be purged.

Chairperson Monahan responded 70 members were appointed to the CRAC; the rules and regulations state if a member misses three meetings, they are contacted to see if there is still interest in participating. If not, that person's membership would be cancelled. He requested Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson track attendance and, if any member meets that category, he should inform the Redevelopment Agency.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson replied attendance is recorded; however, due to technical problems, it is difficult to work out e-mail responses. An attendance list will be in the next mailing. He agreed to contact anyone who had missed a couple of meetings to confirm their interest in continuing.

Mr. Graham asked if the date of the CRAC September meeting could be changed because of the conflict with the City Council candidate forum scheduled at the same time. Chairperson Monahan responded the date could not be changed for various reasons.

Mr. Davidson, a Westside resident, said he had attended every CRAC meeting. At the last meeting, he discovered he was not a member but would like to be.

As there were no further speakers, Chairperson Monahan closed the Public Comment section at 8:20 p.m.

Chairperson Monahan stated a lot of confusion was heard this evening. Comments that no education/information/materials, etc. have been provided particularly made an impression.

**MOTION
Education of
CRAC**

Chairperson Monahan motioned each member of CRAC be given a copy of the Urban Futures, Inc. (UFI) feasibility study, a large colored area map of the Redevelopment Area, the Westside study and surrounding area; and CRAC members be kept on a mailing list for any staff reports generated in reference to the Redevelopment Area going in the future to the Planning Commission or Redevelopment Agency. He requested that, at least the next two meetings and longer if necessary, UFI be retained to give a presentation of redevelopment actions, laws, etc. as outlined in its report so the CRAC can understand what can/cannot be done in redevelopment and what falls outside, even if in its Scope of Work.

Chairperson Monahan said he was not trying to change the Facilitator's agenda concerning process, but a portion of the agenda could be set aside for education, etc. The CRAC has authority to set its own agendas and can decide to discontinue this in the future.

Agency Member Steel asked if there was anything to add to the Motion. Mr. Rodriguez responded anything that could give an understanding of redevelopment to the CRAC is well taken. He did have some concern, however, with the Redevelopment Agency making a formal decision to formally allocate time within the CRAC agenda for the purposes of

redevelopment, because that steps into the process of the CRAC. Making recommendations for the CRAC's consideration is one thing, but to force the CRAC to take a portion of its time for that purpose might send a message that the Redevelopment Agency is micromanaging.

Planning Commission Chairperson Foley reported the Planning Commission decided this evening to continue the public hearing item to define the redevelopment area to the taped study session of October 7, 2002, in order to ask Urban Futures, Inc. to provide "Redevelopment 101". Staff was asked to invite the entire CRAC, and anyone else who has an interest in this issue. Chairperson Foley thought this might be a solution to the current dilemma. She also requested Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency meetings not be scheduled simultaneously. The Planning Commission continued the public hearing to define the Redevelopment Area to October 28, 2002.

Mr. Rodriguez expressed concern that the Redevelopment Agency was reviewing items that were for the CRAC; however, Chairperson Monahan said he had not seen an avenue provided for the CRAC to discuss what it may want on an agenda. His idea was to do this concurrently with CSI's agendas, which includes process, etc. He was not concerned the decision was made by the Redevelopment Agency rather than the CRAC, because the CRAC needs to be educated and kept current with whatever is happening with redevelopment.

Approved Agency Member Robinson seconded the Motion which carried
Carried unanimously.

REPORTS

Executive Director None

Agency Attorney None.

WARRANT On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Vice
RESOLUTIONS Chairperson Dixon, and carried 5-0, Warrant Resolutions CMRA-301 and
CMRA-301 CMRA-302 were ratified, and Warrant Resolution CMRA-303 was
CMRA-302 approved.
CMRA-303

PUBLIC Eric Bever, 1046 Westward Way, Costa Mesa, stated he attended
COMMENT two CRAC meetings. At one meeting, Agency Member Cowan announced to the CRAC that the Redevelopment Agency did not want to be involved. Then, at a study session, she said the CRAC did not want the Redevelopment Agency involved. To clarify, the CRAC never had that discussion and never made that decision.

Jose Pacheco, 988 El Camino Drive, No. 2, Costa Mesa, representing adult soccer, said he thought soccer field acreage was an item for discussion this evening. Chairperson Monahan offered to direct Mr. Pacheco to the correct agency following the close of the Redevelopment Agency meeting.

AGENCY None.
MEMBER
COMMENTS AND
SUGGESTIONS

ADJOURN There being no further items for discussion, Chairperson Monahan Adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.