

UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**AUGUST 11, 2003**

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in a regular meeting on August 11, 2003, in the Neighborhood Community Center, 1845 Park Avenue, Costa Mesa. The meeting was called to order at 6:45 P.M. by Chairperson Steel, who led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL CALL** Agency Members Present: Chairperson Steel  
Vice Chairperson Mansoor  
Agency Member Cowan  
Agency Member Monahan  
Agency Member Scheafer

Officials Present: City Manager Roeder  
Executive Director Lamm  
Planning & Redevelopment Mgr. Robinson  
Agency Attorney Wood  
Management Analyst Penalosa  
Executive Secretary Thompson

**POSTING** The Redevelopment Agency meeting agenda was posted at the Council Chambers and Police Department on August 7, 2003.

**MINUTES** On a motion by Agency Member Cowan, seconded by Agency Member Mansoor, and carried 5-0, the minutes of June 9, 2003, were approved as written.

**OLD BUSINESS** None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Housing Mediation Update** Management Analyst Penalosa reported the Housing Mediation pilot program was approved by the Redevelopment Agency at its April 2003 meeting, to be reviewed after twelve weeks. The Fair Housing Council of Orange County (FHCOC) was to provide a staff person to be based at the Costa Mesa Neighborhood Community Center in order to provide fair housing services for Costa Mesa residents. The program was budgeted out of the low-mod, aside-funds for an eight hour per week position at \$24 per hour. At the time the proposal was presented, the FHCOC had a staff person to fulfill the position; however, that person is currently on disability. FHCOC is optimistic that the position will be filled in the near future. In the meantime, staff has explored alternatives, and contacted housing advocacy groups, legal services agencies and independent contractors in an effort to fill this position. Responses received were prohibitive in cost.

Staff was seeking direction as to how to proceed with the program, i.e., to extend the pilot program for an additional sixty days to give the FHCOC an opportunity to fill the position; pursue another staffing option with a significant increase in the budget; or, cancel the program and reallocate the funds within the low-mod set-aside funds.

Agency Member Cowan asked if, by continuing the item for another sixty day, the FHCOC would have a definitive answer regarding staffing. David Levy, representing the FHCOC, responded the Council was still interested in trying to fill the position; he requested a sixty day extension be provided. Mr. Levy explained the staff person designated for the pilot program had health problems and could not perform the position duties;

however, a new landlord tenant counselor had been hired and this would ease current staffing constraints. He had also contacted someone with mediation certification and paralegal training, who may be able to participate.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

None.

Chairperson Steel voiced support for a sixty day extension.

Vice Chairperson Mansoor also supported the extension. He referred to the statement made in the staff report that the FHCOC does not meet with clients "face-to-face" but contact is through telephone calls. He questioned why the City program was being pursued if the FHCOC's Santa Ana office could handle things via the telephone.

**MOTION  
Approved  
Carried**

A motion by Agency Member Cowan to continue this item for sixty days and have staff return with an update at that time, was seconded by Agency Member Monahan. The motion carried 5-0.

**Presentation of  
Final Redevelop-  
ment Action  
Committee  
(CRAC) Report**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported the Redevelopment Agency retained Civic Solutions, Inc. (CSI) in May, 2002, to provide facilitator services to the Community Redevelopment Action Committee (CRAC). The Committee's work is completed and its report has been provided to the Redevelopment Agency. The first twelve pages of the report provide recommendations and background information; specific recommendations are included on pages 6-9.

At the request of the CRAC, John Douglas, CSI, made the presentation of the report which offers suggestions for improvement of the Westside and adjacent areas. The CRAC membership included a broad range of interests: homeowners, renters, landlords, business owners, public institutions and community associations/organizations. Over the course of thirteen meetings, the CRAC explored a variety of problems, and ideas to solve them. The process was unconventional as there was no chairperson, no majority rule, and no consultant advice or direction on substantive matters. Instead, the facilitators provided a framework within which the CRAC could explore issues and develop its own recommendations. After the first few months, a few of the members felt the meetings were a waste of time, but few believed that such a diverse group could find common ground..

Mr. Douglas announced the report was written almost entirely by the CRAC and contains 24 recommendations centered around six general topics, plus two recommendations for follow-up studies. At its July meeting, all 25 CRAC members in attendance supported the report.

A short transmittal letter from the CRAC was read by Mr. Douglas, thanking the Redevelopment Agency for the forum to examine the revitalization of the Westside, and expressing pride in its work to provide the report which expressed its vision for the future of the Westside. The strongest recommendation consisted of revitalizing the West 19<sup>th</sup> Street Commercial Corridor. The City is asked to pursue two professional studies of issues that could have significant impact on revitalization efforts. While the CRAC achieved consensus on the entirety of the report, unanimous agreement was not reached on each recommendation presented but the process allowed a broad consensus to be developed. The report is not a set of recommendations with specific actions; rather, the report identified priorities for revitalization activities with essential

community participation. The major benefit of meetings has been to open channels of communications between stakeholders of divergent views.

Building on this work, the CRAC earnestly requests the Redevelopment Agency charter its continuation under a new name and acronym “Westside Revitalization Oversight Committee (WROC)”. The WROC would consist of the current CRAC members who are now used to working together, and would not require further facilitator services. The letter was signed by 27 members of the CRAC.

Mr. Douglas concluded by thanking the Redevelopment Agency for allowing the study to occur, the CRAC members for their hard work and participation, and staff – particularly Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson and Management Analyst Veturis.

Chairperson Steel thanked Mr. Douglas and CSI staff for the report, which provides a foundation on which to move forward on.

Agency Member Cowan said the CRAC has done a tremendous job. She referred to different headings under the consensus action recommendation and, again, under the items that are identified as actions which did not reach consensus, and wondered how they relate in terms of moving forward..

Mr. Douglas replied that the main body of the report was drafted by the members of the committee, not the consultants. A six or eight member sub-committee was formed which drafted the report, and they developed the six major headings. The appendix listing items which did not reach consensus were developed during the workshop process.

Agency Member Cowan commented the report had come a long way in providing the “vision” for the Westside but she noticed it does not identify the tools to get there. She wondered if the WROC had the skills necessary to do that if staff provided the technical support it would need.

Mr. Douglas responded the CRAC was told to focus on the “what” and not the “how”. It is a policy group – not a technical group. He recommended if the WROC continue, it should focus on policy issues and rely on City staff to technically implement its suggestions.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

None

Agency Member Cowan stated that she felt it important to receive the report, but she felt the continuation of the Committee is something that would affect how the Redevelopment Agency received the report.

Agency Attorney Wood advised the Redevelopment Agency could proceed to the next item on the agenda and then refer back to the report by citing different objectives spelled out in the report.

**MOTION  
Approved  
Carried**

Chairperson Steel motioned to receive the report and move on to the next item. The motion was seconded by Agency Member Monahan, and carried 5-0.

**Continuation  
of the CRAC**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported that in May 2003, the Redevelopment Agency received a status report on the progress of the CRAC. A survey was mailed to current members asking various questions including if they were interested in the continuation of the Committee following the formation of its report. The result was affirmative. Should the CRAC continue, staff was seeking direction as to what specific tasks or responsibilities the committee should have, and what level of technical support it should be provided. Should the Committee operate as an ad hoc committee with a specific date to complete its work or a standing ongoing committee with no designated "end"?

Chairperson Steel said he believes the CRAC should be continued and its name should be changed to Westside Revitalization Oversight Committee (WROC) as its members had requested. City staff should monitor the meetings. At its first meeting, perhaps members should elect officers and divide some of the issues into subcommittees. He hoped specific recommendations would be presented in the very near future, after analysis of the problems. There was no sense putting out a vision if the problems are not dealt with.

Agency Member Cowan stated she was interested in hearing from the CRAC members as to how they felt the Committee should continue and what kind of support they would like from staff.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

Mary Fewel, 2000 Republic, Costa Mesa, said she believed Chairperson Steel had the basic structure as discussed within the CRAC, which is to continue with present membership, meet monthly or more, with a staff member, likely Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson, present. She suggested other staff members attend as invited, such as Peter Nagavi, Allan Roeder and other department heads in order to share some of their knowledge. She stated that it might be a good idea to have an executive committee with representation from the various groups, and agreed with the subcommittee idea. From the 24 recommendations, it should be decided which is number one, and perhaps pick 3 or 4 items at a time to be investigated and then make specific recommendations on those. She would like to see the first WROC meeting scheduled for September.

Judy Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, felt if the committee was ad hoc with current members and a designated sunset date, it would be all right; however, if a standing ongoing committee, she did not think it could be limited to the current members. Some people might drop out and there should be an opportunity to add people as needed.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, said that if the Committee is to be continued, it wanted more communication with staff. If the RDA valued the input of the committee, then it should be at least aware when new streetlights, or bus stops, or other improvements are to be added. The Committee should be communicated with on a current basis, not after the fact. The fact that half of the Committee resigned during its lifetime cannot be ignored.

In response to Agency Member Cowan's question concerning what was the best method to do accomplish what he suggested, Mr. Berry replied the thrust of the organization would be perhaps 1) architectural, 2) policy, 3) process and 4) history, with each group chaired independently. As the City encounters these issues, staff should notify the appropriate group within the Committee so it can work around it as necessary.

Mr. Berry responded to Chairperson Steels question relating to membership by stating existing members are committed to the process and are focused on the many issues on the Westside. Issues relating to other parts of the City could perhaps have other groups.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, wanted to provide positive feedback on the CRAC. The ability to question experts and staff, and spend time to educate is really important. He felt people who have a stake in the Westside have a different level of commitment. The decision to expand should be a decision of the Committee. At Chairperson Steel's request, he identified the two subcommittees formed by the CRAC; one that prepared the introductory materials to the report; the second worked on the cover letter.

Agency Member Cowan asked what the current standing of the CRAC is, and had it been held to the Brown Act requirements. Agency Attorney Wood replied he believed the CRAC had been an ad hoc committee; however, the longer the Committee operates, it transmutes into a standing committee. If it continues as WROC, it should be referred to as a standing committee, reporting back under any guidelines the Redevelopment Agency establishes. In either case, both types of committees are subject to the Brown Act.

Agency Member Cowan said she had a certain definition of "stakeholders" when the CRAC was first established. That definition has likely changed, and questioned if the Redevelopment Agency should define this or the WROC would wish to have that responsibility.

Mary Fewel, 2000 Republic, Costa Mesa, said she thought the WROC should define "stakeholders". The idea of inviting new members had been well supported, realizing there are people on the Westside who have not been a part of this process however, no one is comfortable with opening it up to the "herds". The members worked well together; therefore, making it easy to appoint an executive committee. Every effort would be made to ensure it represented every interest. Ms. Fewel said she would also like a closer relationship with the Redevelopment Agency, but was unsure how to achieve that. The Redevelopment Agency/staff liaison should be discussed at the first WROC meeting.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, reported this issue came up in conversation with Urban Futures, Inc. and a "planning area committee" (PAC) with certain statutory requirements. A "community advisory committee" was referenced which does not fit in the definition of PAC but which operates in the same manner. Perhaps a discussion with UFI would be indicated, as the consultant understood a less formal organization would serve that kind of purpose, with a direct relationship with the Redevelopment Agency.

Agency Member Monahan suggested the PAC would be a formal committee with certain requirements; he did not feel the committee could legally serve in such a way. Regardless, the Brown Act would apply which means there needs to be a quorum for official business, open meeting notices posted 72 hours in advance, etc. Typically, a staff member is assigned. He supported having a council liaison, not only to attend meetings but to be a "go to" person with whom the Committee could discuss actions, etc. . If there was a need for money, it would go through the normal budget process. He did feel as Committee vacancies occurred, it should be the responsibility of the Redevelopment Agency to fill.

Vice Chairperson Mansoor thanked everyone who has been involved with the CRAC; it has been a frustrating experience and he appreciated their time. There were many good things in the report; however, some of what it contains is already known. He wanted to emphasize asking staff to identify in the report what could be accomplished now. It had been stated that an implementation strategy be clearly identified. With a standing committee the objectives may not get accomplished in a timely manner. An ad hoc committee with a deadline and clear recommendations might be an incentive to get clear answers. The Committee could be extended with a goal or timeline established to work toward.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadow View Lane, Costa Mesa, asked if the City already has a revitalization committee, and wondered if the Redevelopment and Residential Rehabilitation (3R) Committee was supposed to bring forward suggestions for the revitalizing the City to the City Council and Redevelopment Agency. Although he has not heard any revitalization recommendations, perhaps there should be some linkage between the 3R Committee and the WROC.

Chairperson Steel suggested a joint meeting of the 3R and WROC Committees.

Mr. Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, said a group of the CRAC had tried to figure out how to go forward with "ad hoc versus standing" and the consensus seemed to be ad hoc fitted more closely in that it focused, and did not continue forever.

Vice Chairperson Mansoor referred to Mr. Berry's statement concerning the 3R Committee. One of the aspects of the 3R Committee is revitalization and it seems to have drifted into simply how to spend HUD funds. He asked staff to provide what the 3R Committee had been charged with to see if there was overlapping in duties with the WROC. He wondered if the 3R Committee had focused on the wrong things and what it would take to reinvigorate that Committee with what it is supposed to be doing. He did not want to duplicate effort.

Executive Director Lamm synthesized the 3R Committee duties which primarily relate to the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area. Its jurisdiction relates to the Project Area and the monies that come out of the housing funds from there, and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. He did not believe the purpose of the Committee was to initiate new renovation/revitalization projects, but to oversee the CDBG funding and housing side of redevelopment. The new WROC is perhaps more focused on revitalization and may not be related to a Project Area. He did not think they completely overlap, but in a small way. He suggested bringing back the Committee Formation Form which explains what that Committee is to do; staff could make a brief presentation of current membership, staff and Committee roles/responsibilities to better define the new WROC and if it is wished to separate further or overlap and advise each other. The 3R Committee has been in service to the City for perhaps fifteen years.

Vice Chairperson Mansoor again asked for reassurance that the two Committees would not overlap in responsibilities. Executive Director Lamm responded the 3R Committee has done very well in housing issues in redevelopment; it could have been used more for new Redevelopment Project Areas consideration but the CRAC fulfilled that role. Staff will return with a report explaining responsibilities of both Committees.

Agency Member Schaefer asked for the differences between “standing” vs. “ad hoc” committees. Agency Attorney Wood responded if it is a Council appointed committee, generally the Council appoints the members, and could be a standing or ad hoc committee.

**MOTION**

Agency Member Cowan moved that the CRAC be continued but under the new name of Westside Revitalization Oversight Committee (WROC), it be initiated with the current membership; the Committee makes the decision on how to handle new members or empty stakeholder positions in terms of membership; that it be an ad hoc committee of the Redevelopment Agency and, within one year, the Committee is to more fully develop the recommendations and oversee the implementation of the recommendations from the CRAC, as outlined in the report it submitted; to have an executive committee, as requested, with representatives from each of the stakeholder groups; that the Committee define those stakeholder groups; that the Committee be given the ability to invite staff or other technical support that it would need for communication or presentations; and that it makes a request back to the Redevelopment Agency regarding a Council or a Redevelopment Agency liaison, and that staff is appointed to support the Committee, and that it comes back minimally with quarterly updates.

Agency Member Monahan seconded the motion with discussion. He asked for clarification of the number of current membership. Agency Member Cowan said the current membership is believed to be around forty. Since it will be a quorum driven organization, the Committee needs to come back with its number.

Agency Member Monahan said he would like to also reword the Motion concerning replacing members. As it is a Council Committee, the Committee would make recommendations and any member would be appointed through the Redevelopment Agency. The maker of the motion agreed to amend her motion.

Agency Member Monahan said that there were some items in the report that were easy to do, and some that would need major budget amendments. He cautioned with the current State budget crisis and with the City Manager implementing a “no new program budget” this year, some tough decisions are ahead. Some things may get approved; however, they may not be funded or built immediately. He asked staff to direct the Redevelopment Agency as to what items can be implemented immediately so there is a sense of accomplishment.

Chairperson Steel said it did not matter what is decided; things are not going to happen overnight. Patience and tolerance will be required.

Vice Chairperson Mansoon offered a “silver lining” to what Agency Member Monahan previously said. He had asked staff to direct to the Redevelopment Agency what can be implemented right now. He would ask the same of the WROC: what exactly did it want to see enacted now with existing resources in code enforcement and police. Then there will be a sense of some accomplishment on some items.

**Approved  
Carried**

The Motion passed 5-0.

Agency Member Cowan suggested the WROC get together as soon as possible and identify the things the Redevelopment Agency has charged it

with, and perhaps return to the October meeting with an update on where it is.

**Request from  
Westside  
Revitalization  
Association  
to Remove  
Industrial  
Properties from  
Proposed  
Downtown  
Redevelopment  
Project Area  
“Added  
Territory”**

Vice Chairperson Mansoor recused himself from this item as his own property is within 500 yards of the proposed area.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported in January 2003, the Planning Commission approved the Preliminary Plan for a Proposed Amendment to the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area including “Added Territory” to the Project Area. In March 2003, the Redevelopment Agency continued action on these items until its September 2003 meeting. Since that time, industrial property/business owners who opposed the Preliminary Plan formed the Westside Revitalization Association (WRA) and formally requested all the industrial properties be removed from the proposed “Added Territory”. Redevelopment Law gives the Planning Commission the authority to approve a Preliminary Plan and set the boundaries of the “Added Territory”. Any action by the Redevelopment Agency would be sent back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration of its action.

Agency Member Monahan reported he was approached by members of the WRA and had requested this item be agendaized

Chairperson Steel announced a five minute recess in order for the WRA to prepare the equipment for its presentation.

Dan Gribble, Boatswains Locker, 931 West 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Costa Mesa, spoke as President of, and on behalf of, the West Revitalization Association (WRA). He presented its mission statement which supports revitalization of the Westside through positive participation in owner directed activities, while preserving property rights. The organization wants to collaborate with the City and maintain the industrial zoning, overall employment and economics of the area. The WRA has 97 members, over 1.4 million square feet of buildings on over one hundred acres of property, and 1,260 employees with \$51 million in payroll. He emphasized twenty-five percent of its employees/owners live in west Coast Mesa.

Mr. Gribble gave commentary to a power-point presentation. The various photographs displayed showed improvements to landscaping and buildings. Since the March Redevelopment Agency meeting, at least a quarter million dollars has been spent on various improvements. The WRA wants to find sources of funding, cooperate in cleaning the area, and work closely with the City to revitalize the Westside through cooperative initiatives without redevelopment action. The major role of the WRA is to act as a business and property owners association to self monitor members to comply with laws and regulations. It is in their best interest to make it a better place to live and work. Many WRA members were members of the CRAC. The CRAC report recommendations are supported, particularly with respect to infrastructure improvements, incentives for private improvement, and code and law enforcement; however, there is no mention of using redevelopment and eminent domain as tools to accomplish these recommendations.

Mr. Gribble formally requested all industrial zoned properties be removed from the proposed Costa Mesa Downtown Redevelopment Project Area “Added Territory”, and such action be taken by the Redevelopment Agency this evening. The WRA is gathering funds to improve the



industrial area and welcomed input from the City. He concluded WRA board member John Hawley has been designated liaison to the City. The WRA calls for the City to demonstrate its commitment to revitalize the Westside by prompt action in the areas where it has control, particularly, in street improvements and infrastructure. Mr. Gribble thanked the Redevelopment Agency for the opportunity to make the presentation.

Chairperson Steel said that there has been many complaints regarding pollution produced by Westside businesses and asked what action the WRA was taking. Mr. Gribble answered that the accusations were unfounded as all companies on the Westside were subject to regulation and enforcement by a number of agencies. Three different permits and audits are involved. The appropriate agency would contact the offender if there was a violation. There are also complaints about crime; however, crime is within the residential areas, not the industrial area.

Agency Member Cowan asked Mr. Gribble if the industrial area was removed from the "Added Territory" would half the WROC membership leave because of their membership in WRA. She pointed out the word "Revitalization" being within the WRA and WROC, compared to the CRAC's emphasis on the commercial zone. Mr. Gribble responded, personally, he would remain on the WROC.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

David Salcida, 954 West 17th Street, Costa Mesa, wanted to address the area of west 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Streets, Whittier and Monrovia, the area where his property is located. One of the blight indicators is "mix use". That is true of this area but the majority of properties are well maintained and not blighted. Residential properties are gradually being converted to industrial. At this time, it should not be held against the area because it is mixed. Viable families live in the area they enjoy. If the residents are removed, good housing stock is being lost.

Judy Berry, 2064 Meadowview Lane, Costa Mesa, said most of the WRA businesses had been operating on the Westside for a long time. She feels they formed their own organization and improved their properties because of the fear of eminent domain. She understood from one of the Roundtable meetings, redevelopment can offer help with funding for street repairs, sewers, utilities, etc., and questioned how the WRA could accomplish this without a major amount of money. If the industrial properties are excluded, she wondered what guarantees the City has to ensure the WRA continues to remove blight from the area. This is the organization that sent letters voicing opposition to redevelopment; now it wants to only exclude its own properties. A lot of people have been fixing up their homes. Why would the industrial areas be excluded from redevelopment and not the homeowners?

Fred Bockmiller, 1872 Monrovia Avenue, Costa Mesa, speaking as a private person and not as a member of the Water Board, asked for the definition of "blighted" property, and said that although certain areas were defined as blighted, there were no specifics as to why. He suggested, in many cases, properties that do not fit into the definition, were included to simply to draw a straight line on the map. He has consistently requested from consultants Urban Futures, Inc. (UFI) and others to indicate the specifics of blight found in the Coral Bay Homeowners Association property located at 1872 Monrovia. To date, he has not received this information except that it was included because it is probable it will be included. He asked the Redevelopment Agency to direct its staff to provide him with the information as to specific blight indicators on the Monrovia property so they can be addressed. The Water District property

is included in the Redevelopment Area; however, there is no statutory authority to redevelop this property.

Chairperson Steel assured Mr. Brockmiller he would receive answers to his questions.

Agency Member Cowan reminded everyone that in reality the areas were large, undefined, broad stroke areas and the next task was to go parcel by parcel to further identify those areas. UFI had been hired to do this. When the initial line was originally drawn, it was known it would become more circumspect.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadowview Lane, Costa Mesa, said the group requesting exclusion from redevelopment is probably most commonly referred to as "the cause of blight on the Westside". Mr. Gribble had stated he did not think the CRAC membership would change after this evening yet he voted on all issues in the CRAC report. Without saying anything to the CRAC membership, he now wants to be exempt from redevelopment although the WRA owns most of the property on the Westside. Mr. Berry urged the Redevelopment Agency to think hard about its decision. After years of trying to get business property owners fix up their properties through code enforcement, City encouragement, etc., it is only in the last two months they have made improvements.

Chairperson Steele asked Mr. Gribble for a handout of the WRA presentation. Mr. Gribble agreed to supply a copy.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard #264, Costa Mesa, stated Messrs. Gribble and Hawley did not live in Costa Mesa, and that the WRA presentation was misleading. He opined the industrial area of the Westside is the primary magnet that is causing the problems. The businesses came to the City when there were oil wells and are wrong for the area in 2003. The land would be better used for housing. The Costa Mesa zip code of 92627 is one of the most polluted areas in Orange County according to the web sight [www.scorecard.com](http://www.scorecard.com). Some businesses are inherently polluting because their products cannot be manufactured without using chemicals. He knew of cases of rashes, respiratory problems, lupus, etc., and other sicknesses in the community. He had not done a complete analysis but he did know when one drives down Placentia, one smells "something". Chemicals are being released into the City's air and he believed some of the soil is also contaminated. Laws are not good in dealing with such situations. He felt it was time to make a policy decision as to what type of city Costa Mesa wants to be. The Westside cannot be improved until something is done about the industrial area.

Wendy Leece, 1804 Capetown Circle, Costa Mesa, a resident of the Westside for 30 years, said she liked Agency Member Cowan's idea that each property is looked at independently. She had seen a major effort to clean up the area by the industrial property owners. If the industrial area was removed, there would be no incentive for the property owners to continue to improve the properties. Unless there was a time issue, she cautioned the recommendation not be made to the Planning Commission yet, but requested the Redevelopment Agency observe what actions the WRA continues to take, and then evaluate the situation.

Mr. Gribble, WRA, Boatswains Locker, 931 West 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Costa Mesa, acknowledged changes had been made by the business owners. The eminent domain threat got their attention, and encouraged them to make improvements over the last six months. If the properties were removed from the “Added Territory”, it did not mean owners were going to stop making improvements. He requested specific proof of pollution coming from the businesses. He had no health problems, neither did his workers. He referred to a previous speaker discussing properties on 18<sup>th</sup> and Monrovia Streets. The properties in question are not included in the redevelopment area but are across the street. The absurdity is that the south side of the street is included, the other half is not and he does not know why. The City impound yard is not included in the Redevelopment Area yet it meets blight indicators. In response to the criticism that he did not live in the City, he reported he grew up in Costa Mesa; he now lives in Laguna Nigel because he could not afford to buy a house in the City. He felt he has as much right to have a say in the community as a renter, perhaps more so because that person is not a stakeholder. Although he no longer lives in Costa Mesa, he provides jobs for many residents. He asked the Redevelopment Agency to think in terms of stakeholders and not residency.

Irene Shannon, 1640 Newport Boulevard, Space 17, Costa Mesa, said she had spoken to the City Council for over six months on mobile home parks. There are twenty-two mobile home parts in Costa Mesa, sixteen of which are on the Westside. This is not industrial, condominiums or commercial, etc. but a land use that has different rules. The majority of owners are elderly. Most business employees used to live in the Westside but no longer because they have been priced out of the market. A survey was conducted around 4 years ago, and it showed a high number of Westside employees were no longer able to afford to live in the City. Mobile home parks came into the area in 1959 as an investment land use instead of a vacant lot. It was a “money-machine” until it was time to redevelop.

Bill Modic, 1728 Placentia, Costa Mesa, an industrial property owner and resident on the Westside since 1963, said he did not know why residency should be an issue if businesses are owned in Costa Mesa. He keeps up his property, most owners do. On the pollution issue, he has worked and lived in the industrial area and has no health problems. All the businesses come under the regulatory control of the state, county and City.

Chairperson Steel said a lot of the businesses are in compliance with statutory standards but the City could consider tightening such standards.

Mr. Modic asked why should local businesses be under the scrutiny of more controls when parameters are in place concerning pollution. It would be very difficult to document problems. He has lived in the Westside of the City most of his life and has no health problems; he did not know why anyone else should have problems.

Chris Eric, 1825 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, took exception to what Messrs. Motey and Gribble said earlier. People downwind of the businesses are very often subject to pollution. He admitted to calling the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) many times over many years. Unfortunately, the State says if the pollutant is not identified, it cannot be called a toxic pollutant. There is a plant on 18<sup>th</sup> Street which emits a rubber odor by producing high tech fabrics for the space industry. He told of an incident when a worker at the plant said sometimes the equipment works – sometimes it does not. Unfortunately, the government is not always the final answer to solve problems. There are pollutants on the

Westside; however, it is possible to be desensitized when living in a polluted area for a long time.

Sylvia Branson, Monrovia & 19<sup>th</sup>, Costa Mesa, said there was truth to the pollution; there have been occasions when she could hardly breathe and her eyes water; especially late-late at night and usually during the summer time. She was driving her son in the area and he asked her to close the car windows because of the smell. He said everyday when the school bus goes by the area he gets a headache. Everyone should take heed when a child experiences something like this. The City should find the violators to solve the pollution problem. The community has to come together and fix this and other problems.

Georgette Danciu stated her family owns G&G Auto Collision, 2085 Placentia, Costa Mesa, and has lived in Westside Costa Mesa for over eighteen years. Owner Angela Danciu then spoke about the concern of small business owners having their businesses taken away without getting a chance to clean up the area. She said that everyone should get together, residential and business owners alike, to decide what should be done to improve the City and perhaps make a financial contribution to bring about those changes.

Chairperson Steel reassured Mrs. Danciu that no one seated on the dais or in City Hall has any notion to take away their business or home. He did not want anyone to jump to the wrong conclusion.

Mike Evans, owner of a business at 1720 Whittier Avenue, Costa Mesa for twenty-six years, and which is included in the Redevelopment Area. He no longer lives in the City but moved to Fountain Valley because he could not afford to remain in Costa Mesa. He drives down Ellis Avenue passed the sewer plant each day – it reeks. Smell/pollution has nothing to do with the topic which is redevelopment and whether to exclude the industrial properties.

Chairperson Steel closed the public hearing.

Agency Member Monahan asked staff to define the procedure and what exactly is involved in setting or changing areas.

Agency Attorney Wood explained under Redevelopment Law, the Planning Commission has the responsibility of designating the extent of territory under consideration for adding to the Project Area. The Redevelopment Agency can then pass a motion tonight directing the Planning Commission to amend the border. Technically the Planning Commission is given the responsibility to take action and formalize what the Redevelopment Agency asked it to do. He clarified for Agency Member Cowan that the Planning Commission is the body that designates the territory; however, the Redevelopment Agency is a higher authority to the Planning Commission, and is ultimately responsible for determining what the territory is. Thus, if the motion is made tonight and if the Planning Commission is directed to delete the industrial properties from the “Added Territories”, then ultimately, that is what will happen.

Agency Member Cowan asked when UFI would be returning with its reports. Executive Director Lamm stated that it planned to make its presentation in September. In light of the League of Cities, it is questionable if that meeting will take place. Therefore, it may be October. Staff and UFI are gearing towards that date.

Jon Huffman, consultant with UFI, supported what Agency Attorney Wood stated. The language under the specific code section that deals with the Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency setting boundaries. The two bodies are to collaborate in the preparing of the Preliminary Plan and establishing Preliminary Project Area Boundaries. The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance will control all land use issues. That being the case, the Planning Commission has less of a role in land use/zoning issues. The Redevelopment Agency is not really dealing with land use issues.

Agency Member Monahan asked if the Redevelopment Agency was able to send direction to the Planning Commission on just the industrial areas, and exactly what can or cannot be done tonight. Agency Attorney Wood responded as the item was agendaized, the industrial area is being dealt with, and the motion to direct Planning Commission to adjust the boundaries and delete certain industrial properties could be made.

Agency Member Monahan said that regardless of whether industrial areas are included or not in the Redevelopment Area, is not going to help with the odors, etc. Redevelopment law is very strict in what can and cannot be done. In some people's minds, redevelopment is a fix-all for what is wrong in an area; that is not true. He believed many improvements had been done in the Downtown Area and yet there are still complaints. He did not want people to think that an area designated a Redevelopment Area was going to be bulldozed and made beautiful. The economics are not there. He still felt the financial area is the only area that can be changed. The money is just not there for residential. If a Redevelopment Area is eventually designated, it will not bring in money to fix the sewers, roads and sidewalks, etc. He did not want expectations to be too high or people afraid of what may or may not happen. Eminent domain is possible, but 20 City blocks are not going to be taken and million dollar homes built.

## **MOTION**

Agency Member Cowan motioned this item be return in October 2003, with the rest of the report from the last discussion on the Redevelopment Area, and within that to ask the new WROC take a look at the request from the industrial property owners and have the WROC give their opinion on that. Chairperson Steel seconded the motion.

Agency Member Cowan voiced appreciation for the industrial properties owners pulling together and forming an association. The WRA made a lot of good points in terms of being removed from the Redevelopment Area. To take action this evening outside the return of some of the reports, is premature. It is regrettable it appears there will not be a meeting in September. It does show there is a difference between redevelopment and Redevelopment or as both are now referred to as "revitalization". She asked the industrial property owners to be patient, to continue to work with WROC and be patient until October.

Agency Member Schaefer supported Member Cowan in terms of the difference between revitalization and redevelopment, and tagged on to what Agency Member Monahan said in that Redevelopment was not a quick fix. One of the first items cut from the State budget was Redevelopment (\$250 million). He supported the motion to continue the item. He agreed the WRA needs to be patient. There are regulatory agencies to take care of pollution, etc. He lives near Ellis; if the wrong wind blows, it is "tough" but compassion is needed for both sides. The

report did not give enough information about the industrial area and he requested more information before making a decision.

**Approved  
Carried**

The Motion carried, 4-0, Vice Chairperson Mansoor recused.

**REPORTS**

**Executive  
Director**

Executive Director Lamm suggested, as two Council Members will be attending the League of Cities Annual Conference in September, and Vice Chairperson Mansoor is recused from participating in the Redevelopment Agency discussion, perhaps the Redevelopment Agency should consider continuing its September meeting to October 2003. This change would be announced to the public by every means possible.

**MOTION  
Approved  
Carried**

On a motion by Agency Member Cowan, seconded by Agency Member Monahan, and carried 4-0 (Vice Chairperson Mansoor recused) the next Redevelopment Agency meeting will be continued to October 2003.

**Agency  
Attorney**

None

**WARRANT  
RESOLUTION  
CMRA-313  
and CMRA-314**

On a motion by Agency Member Monahan, seconded by Agency Member Cowan, and carried 5-0, Warrant Resolution CMRA-313 was ratified and Warrant Resolution CMRA-314 was approved.

**ORAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Wendy Leece, 1804 Capetown Circle, Costa Mesa, commended the Redevelopment Agency for being prudent in waiting before making its decision on the WRA. She reiterated the area she sighted on the corner of 18<sup>th</sup> and Monrovia as being blighted is, she believed, within the area that is “shaded” for redevelopment. Mr. Gribble is incorrect in his opinion.

Irene Shannon, 1640 Newport Boulevard, Space 17, Costa Mesa, asked why some of the mobile home parks on the Westside were included in the Redevelopment Area and some were not. Agency Member Monahan replied that the Redevelopment Area has a strict boundary. The mobile home parks not included are just outside of that area.

Martin Mallard, 973 Harbor Boulevard, No. 264, Cost Mesa, said that comparing sewage smells to chemical smells is an absurd comparison. He knows about chemicals, etc. because of owning businesses himself. Redevelopment triggers the Polanco Act affecting chain of title. If anyone doubted the pollution, they could go the website previously mentioned. Some of the industrial owners are incrementally trying to kill off the improvement of the Westside which cannot be done without doing something about the industrial area. He would like to rezone the Westside bluffs as residential.

Executive Director Lamm interjected that, at the September 8, 2003 City Council Study Session, the AQMD intends to report on who are the major pollution offenders and what is the truth about the Westside air quality.

John Hawley, resident of Newport Beach and member of WRA, said that there are major industrial parks on the north side and Harbor Boulevard, but the only complaints involve companies on the Westside. To blame air quality on the Westside industry is unfair. The air quality in the City depends on which way the wind blows from all areas. He looked forward to the AQMD report because none of the industrial members want to be labeled as a polluter and will comply with every possible regulation.

Dave Salcido, 954 West 17th Street, Costa Mesa, said that he does not think the answer to Ms. Shannon question about why some mobile home parks are included in the Redevelopment Area and some are not, made sense. Executive Director Lamm recommended anyone with such questions contact Redevelopment staff and/or Mr. Huffman, UCI. He could not respond personally as the maps, etc. were unavailable at this time.

Mr. Evans, owner of the business at 1720 Whittier Avenue, Costa Mesa, said that the industrial property owners asked UFI specifically for blight criteria for the individual properties. They were told it was work in progress and could not be supplied. Not knowing what the blight indicators are makes it very difficult for property owners. Once they determine the problems, they will begin working toward solutions.

**AGENCY  
MEMBERS  
COMMENTS AND  
SUGGESTIONS**

Agency Member Monahan announced he had several discussions with partners of Triangle Square and they have some exciting things coming forward. More information will be available at the end of the month.

**ADJOURN**

There being no further items for discussion, Chairperson Steel adjourned the meeting at 10:00 P.M.