

For clarification purposes, Chairperson Monahan requested the appointees be identified for the community organizations. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson confirmed the representatives for each of the following organizations: Citizens for the Improvement of Costa Mesa; Lions Park Association; Canyon Park Homeowners Association; Latino Community Network; Latino Business Council; Auto Repair Shops; Wallace Avenue Improvement Group; Senior Center; Industrial Business Owners Group; Chamber of Commerce; School PTAs; Rental Property Owners and Churches for a total of approximately twenty-eight representatives. No application had been received from the Westside Improvement Association.

Approximately thirty-three applications were received for the "at-large" membership. Deborah Koken stated she intended to represent Lions Park Association but had not completed the application. Chairperson Monahan directed Ms. Koken's name be added.

**PUBLIC
COMMENTS**

Mike Clifford, 666 West 19th Street, Costa Mesa, suggested guidelines concerning eligibility of members of the WRAC.

Eric Bever, 1046 Westward Way, Costa Mesa, requested WRAC membership include one representative from each Homeowner Association on the Westside. Agency Member Cowan said her original report did identify Homeowner Associations in the proposed WRAC membership.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported the current number of applicants was fifty-nine; it will be necessary for fifty percent plus one to be present in order to hold a meeting; however, Agency Attorney Wood stated the Redevelopment Agency could designate a lower number to constitute a quorum, if it so wished.

Chris Eric, 1825 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, expressed concerns about the structure of the WRAC and questioned how to make it more equitable for those who own property and are trying to elevate rather than maintain a status quo.

Terri Breer, 956 Magellan Street, Costa Mesa, wondered if all the applications were going to be accepted. She had not been involved with the Westside before but hoped she would be selected.

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadowview, Costa Mesa, a member of the Westside Improvement Association, reported the Association had rejected the invitation to participate on the WRAC because the City has failed to address issues concerning blight on the Westside. Until action is taken on core problems, redevelopment will not change anything.

Paul Bunney, 984 Linden Place, Costa Mesa, disagreed as to how WRAC groups were defined and requested the Redevelopment Agency revisit the criteria. He saw overlapping and unfairness in giving everyone a chance to participate.

Paul Freck, owner of business located at 2090 Placentia, Costa Mesa, referred to a City letter dated January 28, 2002, indicating guidelines on the structure of the WRAC. He supported the make-up of members which was listed on Page 2 of that letter. He suggested by accepting anyone beyond those guidelines is going to change the whole concept.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard # 264, Costa Mesa, was concerned about the size and dynamics of the WRAC. The formation of the Committee and the lengthy suggested process could stop real change on the Westside. Things need to be done right now.

Hildegard Gonzalez, 1932 Pomona Avenue, Costa Mesa, questioned why she did not receive information about the WRAC in the mail. Chairperson Monahan responded a City-wide mailing was not done; however, there has been advertising and wide press coverage on the subject. There is only so much that can be done to get the word out to the community. Ms. Gonzalez said the police had been very responsive to the gang problems; however, the slum landlords are the core of the problems and need to be dealt with.

Tom Egan, 1893 Parkview Circle, Costa Mesa, supported a broad all-inclusive WRAC membership.

Chris Hayden, 1805 Peninsular Place, Costa Mesa, wants to see more high end properties on the Bluff. He reported the California Sea Breeze Homeowners Association was not asked to participate. Chairperson Monahan responded the at-large category was included to handle any groups that were missed.

Lisa Lawrence, 104 W. 19th Street, Costa Mesa, applicant to the WRAC, reported the subject of the 19th Street bridge keeps coming up; however, people are not maintaining their properties because the area will be destroyed if the bridge is built.

Denise Neptune, 20391 Running Springs Lane, Huntington Beach, owner of property on Placentia Avenue, wondered why she was not contacted about the WRAC. Chairperson Monahan again reiterated there was not a mailing to everyone on the Westside, but advertising in the newspapers and extensive press coverage.

Chairperson Monahan closed the public hearing at 7:13 p.m.

**MOTION
WRAC
Appointments**

A motion by Vice Chairperson Dixon to appoint to the WRAC all those who had already applied and those who had applied this evening, plus appoint one member from each Westside Homeowners Association, was seconded by Agency Member Steel for discussion. Agency Member Steel said he had previously lost 4-1 on the size issue of the WRAC. If a facilitator is able to deal with the size, perhaps the WRAC could be broken up into specific manageable groups. He asked the maker of the motion to open membership to all Homeowner Associations. Applications could be sent to Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson by a deadline.

Vice Chairperson Dixon responded a formal letter should be sent to the registered Westside Homeowner Associations, giving at least a week to respond. She hoped those selected to represent their group take the commitment seriously. A major part of the dialogue needs to come from people who live or have businesses on the Westside. After a brief discussion, Agency Member Steel supported the original motion presented by Vice Chairperson Dixon.

Agency Member Robinson referred to Item 6 of the list of criteria indicating representation of those on the Westside; however, comments and applications have been received from people outside the boundaries of the Westside. Did this mean the criteria no longer applied. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded applications were reviewed and the table included in the staff report indicated Westside

resident or general Costa Mesa resident. A current list of all the legal Homeowner Associations in the City is maintained.

For clarification purposes, Vice Chairperson Dixon repeated the motion proposed earlier: all those individuals who had applied plus all those heard from this evening be appointed to the WRAC, and the City notify and appoint one member from each Westside Homeowners Association.

Agency Member Cowan supported the motion and stated she was very pleased with the response to this Committee. She really wanted to hear from all those on the WRAC. It was the job of the facilitator to pool everyone so there is discussion. Through the facilitator, a consensus plan may be developed or it may be decided to do something different. The efforts of the Redevelopment Agency should continue to address redevelopment issues.

Chairperson Monahan announced he will not be supporting the motion as he tended to agree the WRAC is too wieldy with approximately seventy members. He said he is very happy with the number of people willing to serve; however, having seen the amount of people involved in the Westside Specific Plan and dealing with other committees of various sizes, he felt the number should have been reduced to be more in keeping to where things could get done. He wished the WRAC the best of luck as it moves forward. Chairperson Monahan announced the meetings will be open to the public.

Vice Chairperson Dixon gave credit to all those who applied to the WRAC. Everyone has one purpose in mind – to make the Westside Costa Mesa the place everyone wants it to be. She had confidence that this will be the best, most receptive committee the City has ever had.

**Approved
Carried**

Agency Member Steel agreed to support and seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1 (Chairperson Monahan voting no).

During ORAL COMMUNICATION, Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard #264, Costa Mesa, asked, with the inclusion of north Costa Mesa, if he could apply for membership in the Westside Redevelopment Action Committee.

**MOTION
Additional
WRAC
Membership
Approved
Carried**

After a brief discussion, Agency Member Robinson motioned to open the WRAC to two homeowners/members at large and one member of each Homeowner Associations. The motion was seconded by Agency Member Cowan and carried 5-0. Mr. Millard was welcomed as a Committee member.

**Westside
Redevelopment
Action Com-
mittee Public
Participation
Facilitator
Status Report**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported staff had sent a Request for Proposal to eight potential facilitators to define the purpose, direction and goals for the success and future of the Westside Costa Mesa. Proposals are due back by March 11, 2002 and will be presented to the Planning Commission at its Study Session on March 18, 2002. Interviews are scheduled for April 1, 2002, with Planning Commission selection scheduled at its April 8, 2002 meeting. Recommendations will be forwarded to the Redevelopment Agency at its May 13, 2002 meeting and staff will request final action and contract award.

**MOTION
Approved
Carried**

On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon, and carried 5-0, the report was received and filed.

**Redevelopment
Feasibility Study**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson announced the Redevelopment Feasibility Study was prepared by Urban Futures, Inc., and presented to the Redevelopment Agency in October, 2001. At that time, staff was directed to prepare responses to comments and questions, and arrange for the consultant to meet individually with each Agency Member. To date, those meetings were held except for Agency Member Robinson who had scheduling conflicts. The Feasibility Study Part II included a comment summary and responses to questions, and a tax increment analysis of four different Project Area scenarios. He referenced a correction to the staff report, page 2, Sub-Area 3: West 18th street neighborhood should have been included in Section 4. He introduced consultants Jon Huffman and Richard Tillberg, Urban Futures, Inc., who will make a presentation regarding the Feasibility Study, and Kathe Head, Keyser Marston Associates, who will respond to questions relating to the Redevelopment Agency's affordable housing obligations.

Jon Huffman and Richard Tillberg presented an overview of the process to date and what to expect should the Redevelopment Agency decide to move ahead with expansion of the Redevelopment Project Area to include parts of the Westside. It was emphasized there will be ample opportunity for the public to participate in both the Redevelopment Plan adoption and the Redevelopment Project Area expansion processes. Definition of blight was detailed according to the California Redevelopment Law and includes several major components. Five Exhibits were highlighted: Comparison of Orange County Redevelopment Agencies; Financing Alternatives Comparison; Focus Areas and Existing Project Area Map; Tax Increment Projection Table and Tax Increment Project Graph. Each of the four Sub-Area scenarios was compared to the tax increment projects completed for the entire Probable Redevelopment Area discussed in the Feasibility Study. Mr. Huffman compared amending the Existing Redevelopment Project Area to declaring a New Redevelopment Project Area. Mr. Tillberg used overhead projection to address various issues relating to the Feasibility Study: Urban Futures, Inc. Assignment; Feasibility Recommendations, and Following UFI's October 8th Presentation. He and Mr. Huffman discussed their response to several categories: Comments and Questions; Summary of Redevelopment; Housing Considerations; Sub-area Options, and Staff Recommendations. Since the Redevelopment process first began, cities have wrestled with how to spend public dollars to generate the highest return with the lowest risk. The California Redevelopment Association published a report entitled "Policy Making and Politics in Redevelopment" which was distributed to the Redevelopment Agency in January, 2002. The report covers affordable housing, economic development, finance and redevelopment, alternative options, responses to critics, and basic redevelopment topics.

Mr. Huffman stated the existing Redevelopment Project Area is very small and, when established, had physical and economic blight. Although the definition of blight has changed since the time the original Project Area was adopted in 1973, blight remains in the area to a substantial degree; however, the Redevelopment Agency has done significant work since its inception. Compared to other redevelopment agencies in the County of Orange, Costa Mesa has generated the third highest amount of dollars per acre during those fiscal years reviewed. If a redevelopment agency has no debt, it cannot collect tax increment. Currently, the Redevelopment Agency has \$13.2 million in outstanding debt which is calculated to be

paid off by the time its tax increment collection authority expires. If it was not for the Redevelopment Agency, \$35.4 million would not have been collected. Mr. Huffman explained what criteria is used to estimate the best time to establish a Project Area.

Mr. Tillberg reviewed the pros and cons of funding sources outlined in a table included in the report. Each alternative to redevelopment has an advantage and disadvantage. Each funding source would need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine if preferable to the use of redevelopment.

Mr. Huffman outlined the programs that could be structured by the Redevelopment Agency to be of assistance to commercial and industrial users as long as they are consistent with Redevelopment Law.

Kathe Head, principal with Keyser Marston Associates and manager of affordable housing process statewide, advised there are lots of reasons why Redevelopment Agencies adopt redevelopment project areas but they come with strings attached. A primary "string" is a variety of affordable housing activities and requirements – money and creation of units. Of the tax increment revenue collected, twenty percent of the gross revenue generated within the Project Area must be set aside for affordable housing activities. Not having money is not an excuse for not fulfilling this requirement. Replacement housing is very much in control of the Redevelopment Agency because the only time this obligation takes place is when its action causes the removal from the inventory of a very low, low or moderate income unit. If the Redevelopment Agency decides it wants to clear an area of housing units and create another use, it has an obligation to replace those units one-for-one somewhere within the City. The unit must be affordable to the income level of the household displaced and subject to long-term covenants which run for forty-five years for for-sale and fifty years for rental housing. Should the Redevelopment Agency take property for any type of use that has housing on it, that obligation is triggered and must be fulfilled within a four year period. Inclusionary housing requirement, also referred to as production requirement, is applied to projects adopted following January 1, 1976, and is therefore, not applicable to Costa Mesa. If a New Project Area is adopted then this requirement will apply. Any time a new housing unit is developed within that New Project Area, whether or not the Redevelopment Agency had anything to do with it, fifteen percent of those units become an obligation on the Redevelopment Agency's ledger to be affordable to very low, low or moderate income households in ten year "rolling cycles".

Ms. Head gave three scenarios concerning possible housing situations and the obligations that could affect the Redevelopment Agency. In response to Agency Member Cowan's question, Ms. Head confirmed if the existing Redevelopment Project Area was expanded, the exclusionary housing obligation would apply only to the new areas and not to those areas adopted prior to 1976.

Mr. Huffman reported a question had been asked as to what would happen if it was decided to do less than the Probable Redevelopment Area sited in the Feasibility Study. Sub-Area options were evaluated as reported in Part 2 of the Redevelopment Feasibility Study Part II. He identified the areas and synopsisized the findings, and concluded the presentation.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson announced the original Feasibility Study is available on the website. Extra copies of Part II will be available at City Hall. Both staff and the consultants have recommended the expansion of the existing Redevelopment Area. The Redevelopment Plan can be in place by the time the WRAC completes its deliberations. A revised Professional Services Agreement could be presented to the Redevelopment Agency at its March meeting to retain a consultant to do the plan formation process.

Agency Member Steel asked if revenue could be spent in one area if it is derived from another area. Mr. Tillberg responded it could be spent within a Project Area which could consist of noncontiguous parcels. Redevelopment tends to be opportunistic; it is not necessary to do one thing before another. Development of a \$1 million commercial center has less value in terms of property tax than a \$10 million housing tract. It is better to characterize land use rather than transactions. As land values increase, the Redevelopment Agency will generate tax increments commensurate with the value of land transactions.

Agency Member Steel said sixteen areas of blight had been identified and referenced the different combinations of study areas for a potential expanded Redevelopment Project Area; of the four Sub-Areas, he preferred Option 4 which includes industrial areas and the Mission/Mendoza/Fillmore neighborhood. There is much concern among the constituents about slumlords. Redevelopment is a long, arduous process. He hoped that the City Council could do as much as possible outside the Redevelopment Agency.

Ms. Head reiterated it is important to understand property tax increment housing set-aside funds can be used anywhere within the City. Mr. Huffman emphasized those funds can be spent in between the Added Area and the New Project Area; however, if a New Project Area is created separate from the Existing Project Area, the funds cannot be moved between the Added Area and the Existing Area. There is a benefit to amending the Plan to include the Added Area.

Chairperson Monahan confirmed if a particular area is not included, housing money can be used in that area.

Vice Chairperson Dixon asked if a developer wanted to purchase an apartment building in a Redevelopment Area, would certain housing requirements be automatically expected. Ms. Head responded if the developer buys the property within the Redevelopment Project Area and does not ask for any Redevelopment Agency money, relocation or replacement is not triggered; however, the "inclusionary" obligation is triggered. Fifteen percent of all units newly developed in the Project Area must be split forty percent to very low income.

Vice Chairperson Dixon wondered what the advantage would be to include the land-lease tri-plexes in the Fillmore/Coolidge area in a Redevelopment Area when possibly in ten years, it could be sold/developed by a private developer. Ms. Head responded tax increment would be generated. The disadvantage would be it gives property assemblage ability and triggers inclusionary housing by including that area. Brief discussion ensued to clarify understanding of the inclusionary obligation applicable in various scenarios.

Chairman Monahan posed questions of the consultants regarding income generated from areas and housing replacement costs, etc. Executive

Director Lamm responded to a question related to the Fillmore/Coolidge area posed by Chairperson Monahan concerning leased-land, in that the land under units is a fee ownership but the property is leased to the building owners. The majority of the residential triplexes are on leased-land. Leases have approximately less than twenty years remaining. At that time, the underlying property owner could take back all the buildings. If the Redevelopment Agency was involved, it might be able to assist in the purchase, remodeling, etc. Should this particular area not be included in the current modification of the Redevelopment Plan, Mr. Lamm stated there is certainly opportunity in the future to modify the Redevelopment Plan or form another Project Area. The opportunity to come back exists; however, it will involve the same process of Plan Formation but possibly with less cost. Mr. Huffman concurred the section east of 18th Street was not included but surrounded by possibly a redevelopment area and could be included. Boundaries could be moved around. Working with the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency, the final recommended Project Area would be defined.

Mr. Tillberg reiterated redevelopment is a financing tool. It will take between eighteen and twenty-four months to put the Plan in place. The WRAC has a mandate to come up with what the community and Redevelopment Agency wants, and bring that to fruition – there will be two parallel processes/activities running at the same time. Agency Member Cowan asked if the two processes could be concurrent rather than parallel in order to work towards the same end. Mr. Tillberg agreed the process is concurrent, and used the analogy of a car and engine to explain: one group of people are building the engine – another the car body. At some point, at the end of the process, the engine is put into the car body and there is a final product.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard #264, Costa Mesa, felt most of revenue comes from the north part of the City and it would be a mistake to not include the Fillmore/Baker/Mendoza area in any redevelopment. No one knows what will happen when the ground leases expire. Eminent domain will be needed in the area to break up the slum housing. He requested the application process for the WRAC be opened up to include those on the north of the City.

Vernon Taylor 1889 Parkview Circle, Costa Mesa, referenced a financial example estimating \$114.3 million as an anticipated maximum income from Sub-Area 4. Assuming the Redevelopment Agency floated bonds in order to obtain funds in a timelier manner, the interest repayment from the bonds would have to come from this money. Mr. Huffman concurred this was, in general, correct.

Eric Bever, 1046 Westward Way, Costa Mesa, referred to Example #3 Acquisition/Rehabilitation scenario as discussed earlier by Ms. Head, which triggered \$1.5 million inclusion, giving an \$8.5 figure “in the bank”. Ms. Head stated all those units done historically in Costa Mesa have met the incumbent affordability standards and covenants that would make the City comply with inclusionary housing. Mr. Bever asked how many units are in the City’s account to work against. Ms. Head stated there is zero in the account because the law has recently been changed to increase the covenant period. When inclusionary housing is done outside the Project Area it is required to get a two units-for-one unit credit. Mr. Bever asked if this meant all the good deeds done in the past have just fallen by the wayside. Ms. Head responded in the affirmative.

Dan Gribble, owner of property at 925 and 931 West 18th Street, Costa Mesa, noticed the focus had been on residential property this evening. The original Westside Specific Plan included the south side of 18th Street for redevelopment. He had heard this area was now excluded from consideration. If this is not the case, what would be the process to redevelop the property he owns? If the area zoning is changed to residential, will he have to relocate his business and what are the costs associated to move commercial property? Was the plan to buy the thirteen industrial properties located there? He assumed such a process of taking a commercial/industrial property and changing it to single family homes had been studied.

Chairperson Monahan responded there are many requirements involved. The Redevelopment Agency went through a process for commercial redevelopment in 1993 with what is now known as Triangle Square. At its last meeting, the City Council authorized a study of the Monrovia Corridor for possible rezoning to residential, and he indicated the area on a map. Anything east of Monrovia will not be included. What is being reviewed this evening from the Redevelopment Agency viewpoint is whether to include any or all areas in a redevelopment survey area. There are many aspects involved, such as relocation costs. The discussion addressed housing because of the low and moderate income housing requirements within any redevelopment area. Sometime in the future, the Planning Division will be studying other possibilities and rezoning of that area. Agency Member Cowan added no decision is being made tonight on Mr. Gribble's property. The next phase of the Feasibility Study would review economic issues of eminent domain, what would be viable, etc.; however, no decisions were being made at this time. Chairperson Monahan confirmed there are a few business representatives on the WRAC.

Vice Chairperson Dixon announced the WRAC meeting will be public. Anyone will be able to attend and have the opportunity to speak. Mr. Gribble said he would apply for membership to the Committee.

A motion to include Mr. Gribble as a WRAC member was posed by Agency Member Steel, and seconded by Agency member Cowan; however a vote by Redevelopment Agency Members was not taken, and therefore no formal motion was made.

Terri Breer, 956 Magellan Street, Costa Mesa, said she was pleased to be a member of the WRAC. Referencing Sub-Area 4 in the Feasibility Study staff report, she encouraged the Redevelopment Agency to make this area its choice to pursue. It would be a great start to improving the City overall.

Tom Egan, 1893 Parkview Circle, Costa Mesa, did not feel answers provided by the consultants to Agency Member Cowan's questions 1, 2 and 3 were persuasive or trustworthy. He could not tell if the Downtown Project Area was a success from the answers presented, and therefore, did not support a new area being tacked on to the existing Downtown Project Area.

Eva Marin, 1780 Placentia Avenue #20, Costa Mesa, reported living in the area for 32 years. A lot of improvement has been made in the neighborhood since the start of the clean-up eight years ago. Not everyone living in the area is living in a slum. Everyone has something that they want to make it a better community. A lot of people are working together to improve the Westside of the City. We hear "get rid of

apartments or renters of mobile homes” yet a lot of renters, the elderly and others living in mobile homes cannot afford a single family home. This did not mean they were living in slums. She enjoys living in her apartment, and makes an effort to keep it up; not everyone chooses to live in a house. She hoped everyone could meet somewhere in the middle to have one thing in common – what is best for the Westside. She wanted the Westside to be the “best side” of Costa Mesa.

Hildegard Gonzalez, 1932 Pomona Avenue #A, Costa Mesa, said property on the Eastside is higher in value than that on the Westside. She referred to Habitat for Humanity being excluded by the City Council from restricted parking requirements and open spaces, and asked if such projects would be restricted by the Redevelopment Agency. Chairperson Monahan responded each project comes forward on its own merit. The Habitat for Humanity project was reviewed by the City Council and it was felt the project would stand on its own with less than the required parking as currently in the code.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, expressed concern the Feasibility Study, Part II, glosses over a very expensive proposition which redevelopment represents. His own home is in the Downtown Redevelopment Area formed in 1973. At that time, his home was valued around \$75,000. Today, it is valued at approximately \$350,000. The property tax increment was frozen in 1973; therefore, although the value of his property has increased, it has not been contributing to the General Fund but to the Redevelopment Agency. The \$114.3 million revenue mentioned by the consultants does not represent capital improvements. He urged the City Council as well as the Redevelopment Agency to look at other means of raising money that will cost the City less.

Mike Clifford, 666 West 19th Street, #709, Costa Mesa, had a question concerning housing. Ms. Head responded there is no requirement to match-up types of units (senior for senior, etc.). There are certain practical concerns: a three-bedroom unit has to be replaced by a three-bedroom unit. It is difficult to get a forty-five year covenant for for-sale unit. Mr. Clifford asked if the same relocation services applied to illegal residents. Special Council Brady responded the same services apply to all residents of the unit because these are Redevelopment Agency projects.

Paul Bunney, 984 Linden Place, Costa Mesa, asked what was the difference between a WRAC member and a member of the general public. Chairperson Monahan replied WRAC member can take official action; the member of the public cannot. The WRAC will make recommendations to the Redevelopment Agency which will maintain its presiding authority.

Phil Tryon, resident of Costa Mesa, asked who currently owns the property to be developed. Chairperson Monahan responded there is no proposal to develop any area at this time. The decision needs to be made whether to set aside a certain portion of the City for redevelopment. Agency Member Steel asked Mr. Tryon what his interest was in the matter. Mr. Tryon said it would be unconstitutional to take property for profit. Chairperson Monahan explained there is a eighteen to twenty-four month process to go through before any decisions are made as to what will be done with the various areas under consideration at this time.

Allan Mansoor, 2973 Harbor Boulevard #406, Costa Mesa, agreed housing values have increased on the Westside; however, they are inconsistent with the rest of the City. Concerning his question on relocation, Ms. Head responded everyone is relocated from each unit.

Chris Hayden, 1805 Peninsula Place, Costa Mesa, asked what decisions are going to be made on the Sub-Areas. Chairperson Monahan responded the Redevelopment Agency is focusing on establishing a Redevelopment Study Area. Mr. Hayden requested Sub-Area 4 be all inclusive.

Chairperson Monahan closed the public comment portion of the meeting. He reported approximately one year ago, the Redevelopment Agency started looking at the feasibility of an extended Redevelopment Area. He felt the point had now been reached to move forward and define what that is. The WRAC has been formed to provide an Action Plan in the future. It takes time for things to get done but a start has been made.

**MOTION
Approved
Carried**

On a motion by Chairperson Monahan, seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon, and carried 5-0, the Redevelopment Feasibility Study and Feasibility Study Part II were approved.

**MOTION
Approved
Carried**

On a motion by Chairperson Monahan, seconded by Agency Member Robinson, and carried 5-0, it was agreed to proceed on No. 4: Sub-Areas 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12 and 13, and for staff to come back with a finalized survey area at the next Redevelopment Agency meeting and also return with the new contract to move forward with Urban Futures, Inc.

Agency Member Cowan said she will support the motion to move forward on this subject; however, there are some really important questions that have to be answered – a couple of which relate to what Mr. Turpit described as funding mechanisms. There are questions remaining concerning not only funding but alternative ways to do things. She is convinced the next phase begins when each individual parcel is reviewed, and that is when any question will be answered.

**Westside
Redevelopment
Action Committee
Public
Participation
Facilitator Status
Report**

Agency Member Cowan referred back to “Old Business” Item 2 on the agenda and said she had heard a couple of comments concerning the Request for Proposal. She was opposed to giving the Westside Specific Plan draft to the consultants until perhaps sometime in the future. She did not want any influence “driving” this process and was very disappointed the Plan has been distributed. She asked staff to include videos of both the Redevelopment Agency meetings of December 10, 2001 and this evening in the Request for Proposal.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded the Requests for Proposal were mailed out February 8, 2002. Copies of the meeting video tapes could be provided to those consultants who show interest.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

REPORTS

Executive Director

None.

Agency Attorney

None.

**WARRANT
RESOLUTIONS
CMRA –295
AND CMRA 296**

On a motion by Agency Member Cowan, seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon, and carried 5-0, Warrant Resolution CMRA-295 was ratified and Warrant Resolution CMRA-296 was approved.

ORAL COMMUNICATION Chairperson Monahan invited anyone to address items not included on the agenda. (Mr. Millard's comments are included under WRAC Participation item recorded earlier.)

AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS None.

ADJOURN There being no further business, Chairperson Monahan adjourned the meeting at 9:33 p.m.