

UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

NOVEMBER 12, 2002

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in a regular meeting on November 12, 2002, in Conference Room 1A of city Hall, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairperson Monahan who led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL Agency Members present: Chairperson Monahan
Agency Member Robinson
Agency Member Steel

Agency Members absent: Vice Chairperson Dixon
Agency Member Cowan

Officials present: 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, November 7, 2002.

MINUTES On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Chairperson Monahan, and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent), the Minutes of September 9, 2002, were approved as written.

OLD BUSINESS None.

NEW BUSINESS

Appointment of Redevelopment and Residential Rehabilitation (3R) Committee Members Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported the term for four 3R Committee members had expired in October 2002, and they had requested reappointment. The City Manager's office recruited for these positions in August 2002; no responses were received. Staff, therefore, recommends the four members be reappointed to the 3R Committee, as requested.

Agency Member Robinson commented all four members had good attendance records.

Chris Eric, 1825 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, stated he was interested in joining the 3R Committee. Agency Member Robinson responded there were Alternate positions open and suggested Mr. Eric submit an application. Mr. Eric said he had already done so.

On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Agency Member Steel, and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent) all four 3R Committee members were reappointed to an additional term of two years: James Fisler, Marie Gilliam, Matthew Makin and Jayme Mekis.

Civic Solutions, Inc. presentation Executive Director Lamm stated the Redevelopment Agency had previously requested a brief presentation by Civic Solutions, Inc. (CSI),

**on its original
Scope of Work**

Facilitators to the Community Redevelopment Action Committee (CRAC), on its Scope of Work. He introduced John Douglas, Project Manager with CSI.

Mr. Douglas outlined the philosophy and approach brought to the process: the understanding that the City was seeking a facilitator to help the CRAC develop a broad consensus on vision recommendations for the Westside and adjacent areas. CSI's approach to such a process is different to that of the various agencies within the City. The Request for Proposal requested a consensus process – not majority rule. The goal is to obtain a shared framework understanding before moving forward to decision making. Therefore, considerable time has been devoted to understanding and identifying the process and purposes, membership, criteria and decision making methods to be used. CSI's experience is that these issues need to be understood at the beginning, or it will be necessary to revisit later on the control of the group and its purpose, etc.. Several meetings have been devoted to these items to ensure everyone is on the "same page". CSI believes conflict is inevitable in any situation, particularly with such a large group. Its task is to try to get everyone to understand the different values, visions, goals, etc., for a better chance of developing consensus/common ground on what actions should be taken.

As Facilitators, CSI does not present preconceived notions of what should be done, but to help the process and the CRAC develop its recommendations. In order for this process to be successful, CSI believes it is important all viewpoints from the community be adequately represented and incorporated. Inevitably, they will be heard at some point; however, one does not want to hear them at the end of the process.

Mr. Douglas deferred to his colleague Rigoberto Rodriguez who referred to page 2 of the handout previously distributed, and walked through CSI's 14-month timeline which consists of three Phases: Preparation – 2 months; Discovery – 8 months; and Convergence – 4 months.

In response to Agency Member Robinson's question concerning how was the "consensus process" decided upon, Mr. Douglas stated the RFP declared such a process. Agency Member Robinson said she saw the language but did not interpret it the same way.

Mr. Rodriguez described roles and tasks to allow movement into the second Discovery Phase which would develop into a framework of shared understanding. The third Phase – Convergence – would work down into specific items of recommendation. A report would be provided to the Redevelopment Agency and City Council where consensus was achieved, as well as minority issues which did not receive the 70% vote. According to the 14-month timeline, the CRAC did agree to use an accelerated model. There are five steps to go; it is hoped to present the CRAC's recommendations by April 2003.

Agency Member Robinson acknowledged the RFP states the facilitator will be building consensus among Westside residents, but did not feel that necessarily prescribe the specific way to go about getting that consensus. She asked again, how did CSI decide on the manner and mode to go about getting that consensus. As there are many ways to build consensus, what process would USI use to orchestrate this? There are concerns about the way the CRAC is being organized and directed towards certain outcomes.

Mr. Rodriguez responded, based on CSI's experience and work, it was the approach selected.

Mr. Douglas directed his response to the comment "the CRAC is being directed toward a certain outcome" to go on record. He did not believe anyone who has attended meetings could say any of the facilitators had made substantive recommendations. All CSI's recommendations have been process issues. He addressed the comment concerning process of consensus being structured in a variety of ways, by stating the process CSI suggested and which was agreed to by the CRAC, is based on a model used by many others as well as CSI, and has proven very successful.

Mr. Douglas responded to Agency Member Steel's comment that some CRAC members had reported CSI was employing "Hitler/Stalin-like" brainwashing techniques, by stating he had seen a flyer distributed anonymously at one of the CRAC meetings and had no further comment. He was emphatic, at no meetings had CSI suggested anything substantive – all remarks have been regarding process and how the meetings are run.

An unidentified member of the audience stated the term Agency Member Steel should have referred to was the "Delphi" technique.

Mr. Rodriguez said it was very important for CSI to take the time to make the process transparent, to ensure everyone understands the steps to be taken at the front end. His personal opinion is, because of the diversity of opinions within the group, as well as the diversity of people making up the group, it could never be "brainwashed" – it is insulated with clear opinions and commitment. When the CRAC recommendations are presented, it can be distinguished which ones have 70% strong support, as well as those that are important but may not have the level and depth of such support. CSI has decided on five more steps resulting in five more meetings. The CRAC has now decided upon a mode.

Mr. Douglas reported he is aware of frustration concerning moving forward and decision making. At the next meeting, there will be substantive small group discussions. Much time has been devoted to preparation because if the questions/issues are not addressed before the substance, they will return again repeatedly. It's a "go slow first in order to go fast later" process.

Mr. Rodriguez responded to Agency Member Steel's question in that the CRAC will generate a vision for the area, and classify general issues into key areas with recommendations.

Chairperson Monahan asked where CSI was in the process. Mr. Rodriguez said Phase II – Review & Selection Process Options has been reviewed and the model adopted. The remainder of Phase II and all of Phase III will be completed during the five remaining meetings.

A brief discussion of the agenda for the next meeting and the direction of the meetings continued.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson confirmed Urban Futures, Inc., had been asked by the Redevelopment Agency in September, 2002, to provide training to the CRAC; the Planning Commission has requested a special study session to which the CRAC was invited. He personally wanted added to the CRAC's next meeting agenda the item: is there was anything else the CRAC wanted to know? The

Redevelopment Area is on the Planning Commission's November 25, 2002 agenda and will not go to the CRAC before being presented to the Redevelopment Agency.

Agency Member Steel referred to a letter written by Agency Member Cowan in which she states the CRAC and CSI are headed on the right track if the letter highlighting the recent meeting is used as direction and guidelines for the CRAC. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported he had seen the draft letter Agency Member Cowan referred to. He briefed the Redevelopment Agency on its contents. UFI was to draft a letter summarizing the difference between the CRAC and the redevelopment process itself. The Westside is approximately 1,700 acres; the CRAC is looking at the Westside as a whole and any surrounding areas affecting it. The probable redevelopment area was narrowed down to a survey area which, in turn, has been narrowed down to a recommended redevelopment area. UFI has recommended only 400 acres for future redevelopment expansion.

Mr. Douglas reiterated his concept as to what consensus recommendations would be presented to the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Douglas felt, although somewhat vague, he could not give more detail because that would come from the CRAC.

Agency Member Robinson asked if the recommendations would be specific and gave as an example : 70% consensus decided it would like to rezone the bluffs. Mr. Rodriguez responded the level of specificity is intended. Another level of specificity is more detailed, and that is "how". A full implementation plan is not anticipated; it will be a well articulated issue because it depends on a whole series of factors that get negotiated if it is feasible to implement.

Mr. Douglas defined CSI's understanding of "vision" as conditions existing twenty-thirty years from now. The consensus felt the land use of a particular area should be changed from one type to another. Many technical, planning and legal issues arise from that. Such level of detail would not be gotten into. It is very appropriate for the CRAC to make a recommendation that a certain area should change over time. Agency Member Robinson concurred with that concept; she had concern time was not being used to work on details but rather on what the CRAC would like to see happen.

Mr. Douglas stated CSI was committed to completing this project within the budget and timeframe given by the City. He felt things were on track considering the size of the area and committee, and complexity of issues.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Mike Berry, 2064 Meadowview Lane, Costa Mesa, referred to the different uses of "consensus". Consensus assumes the direction is already known. He felt it would be a simple process to ask the CRAC what it wanted, and a consensus built around that. This has not been done. It seems a straight forward process has been made difficult. He did not believe rezoning the bluffs is part of the redevelopment area or process.

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, No. 264, Costa Mesa, said CRAC members are dropping off. The CRAC has no authority as the facilitators are taking the role as teachers. The facilitators should stand aside and let the CRAC talk about substantive things. He suggested bringing back the

revitalization plan to serve as a framework for the CRAC. He would like an in-house facilitator.

Ralph Ronquillo, 980 Grove Place, Costa Mesa, agreed there was too much focus on how the meetings would move forward. Focus on procedure over CRAC education, understanding the history of the Westside and goal clarification has impeded the process.

Chris Eric, 1825 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, said if there is not an actual definition of the term “stakeholders interest”, it can be used in any way desired.

Agency Member Steel defined the term as a person who either owns land or lives in an apartment in Costa Mesa, who is a member of the eligible electoral pool. It could be a homeownership or a business. He felt the facilitator should state this at the next CRAC meeting so that everyone is using the same definition.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, said he enthusiastically supports what the facilitators are trying to accomplish. There are a lot of stakeholders who are not represented. He gave examples of individuals who, if not a part of this process, could affectively sabotage it. His impression of the Westside Specific Plan was positive, but without the necessary consensus of the different groups, it was dangerous to go forward without a united group behind the plan. Although he shared everyone’s frustration, he took exception to the characterization that the facilitators have been doing all the talking. In his opinion, the members of the CRAC have been doing all the talking and perhaps the facilitators have not taken as much control as they could. He encouraged all to let the facilitators do their job in order to accomplish something this time.

Agency Member Steel suggested the facilitators ask the CRAC what its vision is, and work with that.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson announced the next CRAC meeting is on November 21, 2002 at the Senior Center.

Chairperson Monahan asked what items are on the agenda for that meeting. Mr. Douglas responded there will be the Scope of Work for the Bluffs Study; however, it was the sense of the CRAC at its last meeting this item should not take up a large portion of the evening. The main topic will be discussion of the history of the Westside, the purpose of which is to try to get everybody with a common base of understanding. A principal CSI has come to in this type of process is, before specifics and recommendations are put forward, the group goes through that mutual education process; then it is likely to reach a consensus to substantive recommendations. He listed the various documents provided to date as handouts to the CRAC.

Mr. Rodriquez suggested two languages were being used; one being the “profession” spoken, and the second, the “nuts and bolts”. At the end of the five interlocking steps remaining, the Redevelopment Agency will get a clear vision of what people want the future Westside to be, some key issues necessary to get to that place, as well as recommendations.

Chairperson Monahan responded that at a Redevelopment Agency a couple of months ago, it was discussed what would be on the CRAC agenda; a few days later an agenda was received from CSI and those items were not included. It was necessary for staff to redo the agenda. The City is paying over \$100,000 for the final document; he wanted to be sure the City is getting its money's worth. From the nuts and bolts perspective, he needed to know what is going on.

**MOTION
Receive and
File Report**

On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Agency Member Steel, and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent) the CSI presentation was received and filed.

**Community
Redevelopment
Action
Committee (CRAC)
Membership
and Meeting
Attendance**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported on the attendance of CRAC members. There were originally 75 members; 5 resignations to date have been received; 2 replacements have been appointed. 8 members have not attended a single meeting and 2 have missed the last three meetings. The Commission/Board Handbook states if a member misses more than three consecutive meetings without an excuse it is cause for dismissal. Membership is critical at this stage. The status of identified members was discussed. A memorandum of concern was sent to the entire membership in September 2002.

Executive Director Lamm said Council Member elect Alan Mansoor indicated in a voicemail today that he would resign from CRAC membership. This would reduce the number also.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Kathleen Eric, 1825 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, stated there have been only 40-45 people showing up at the CRAC meetings. At the last meeting, 23 people attended. In her opinion that shows frustration and a lack of interest.

Martin Millard, Costa Mesa would like non attendees to be dropped from the CRAC immediately.

Ralph Ronquillo, 980 Grove Place, Costa Mesa, concurred with Mr. Millard.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, reported in the five meetings there has been two hours of work accomplished. The next five meetings will be the most effective. He suggested if someone turned up for the first time at the next meeting, they could participate.

Dave Salcido, 945 W. 17th Street, Costa Mesa, did not attend the last two meetings and was not excused; however, there was an election going on. He thought that was a legitimate excuse. He left a message in Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson's voicemail. He suggested "legitimate excuse" be defined.

Chairperson Monahan reviewed attendance of several individuals with Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson.

Agency Member Robinson voiced concern with any person appointed to the CRAC who has not attended at least one of the meetings. She felt it inexcusable and shows a lack of interest in the efforts of the Redevelopment Agency. The rest of the CRAC has worked together to understand what the process is, and should, therefore, be the ones to carry this process through.

**MOTION
Dismissal of
Non-attendees to
all CRAC
Meetings**

A motion was presented by Agency Member Robinson to dismiss, and not replace, those CRAC members who have missed all meetings without an excuse, thus far. Agency Member Steel suggested a letter be addressed to all those members who are being dismissed asking for their vision/viewpoint. Agency Member Robinson amended her motion to include this recommendation.

Mr. Douglas reiterated the importance of hearing all viewpoints from the representatives on the CRAC regarding the Westside and adjacent areas. He was apprehensive that by dismissing some members, a viewpoint could be lost.

Agency Member Robinson responded the viewpoint is not being given because the members are not in attendance. The existing CRAC is of a sufficient size and could continue to do the necessary work.

Mr. Rodriguez inquired what if those non attendees are representatives of a particular group, i.e., business owners? Agency Member Robinson said each individual would have an opportunity to respond to the letter of notice, and the Redevelopment Agency can reconsider any appointment/reduction in appointments.

Chairperson Monahan read the names of those who will receive letters of notice:

Paul Frech, Steven Hayes, Phil Jimenez, Karen McGlenn, Bob Miller, Thomas Morrow, Chip Robinson, Tom Vasich and Robert Watts.

**APPROVED
CARRIED**

The motion was seconded by Agency Member Steel, and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent).

Chairperson Monahan announced CRAC member Stephen McNash will be on vacation until March 2003; therefore, he will not be contributing during that period of time. Around March 2003, the CRAC will be making its final recommendations. Chairperson Monahan stated he firmly believed when people sign-up, they are making a commitment to participate.

**MOTION
Letters to CRAC
Members who have
not attended several
meetings**

He motioned Mr. McNash be added to the list for dismissal, and staff be directed to send a letter under his signature to Gregory Lee, Howard House, Jr. and Russ Ramirez, inviting them to attend the November 21, 2002 meeting and any CRAC meeting thereafter. If these members do not attend the November 21 meeting, it would be the fourth/fifth straight meeting missed and they would be dropped from the CRAC for nonparticipation. Any other resignations should be accepted and not replaced.

Agency Member Steel requested staff provide copies of resignations received from Sherri Barrios, Bill Gartner, Cal Sawyer and Athena Sawyer.

**APPROVED
CARRIED**

The motion was seconded by Agency Member Robinson and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent).

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson confirmed for Agency Member Robinson that three unexcused absences would be the basis for dismissal (not automatic) in regard to other City committees. Chairperson

Monahan reiterated his intention that the letter of notice states “will” rather than “may be” dropped.

**MOTION
Commission/Board
Handbook Condi-
tions be applicable
to the CRAC**

Agency Member Robinson motioned should it not already been in place, the Commission/Board Handbook condition of three unexcused absences be basis for possible dismissal be applicable to the CRAC, with notice going out after second unexcused absence stating one more absence an the member could be dismissed.

**APPROVED
CARRIED**

Motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS

**Executive
Director**

None.

**Agency
Attorney**

None.

**WARRANT
RESOLUTIONS
CMRA-304 AND
CMRA-305**

On a motion by Agency Member Robinson, seconded by Agency Member Steel, and carried 3-0 (Vice Chairperson Dixon and Agency Member Cowan absent), Warrant Resolution CMRA-304 was ratified and Warrant Resolution CMRA-305 was approved.

**ORAL
COMMUNICATION**

David Salcido, 948 W. 17th Street, Costa Mesa, said he heard the Planning Commission is going to hear the Redevelopment Agency’s request to define the zone for redevelopment.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded the resolution recommending the boundaries of the added territory of the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area and also the Preliminary Plan for that added territory will be presented to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Salcido replied owners had not been notified of any action, as should be expected. The company contracted to do the study provided information to the City Council and Planning Commission in order to make a decision on this area. As a property owner he had not received any information, although he had contacted several people in City Hall. He has never seen the map indicating the presence of blight and was told he could not have the information. The map he did receive was not adequate to identify areas/parcels.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson explained one of the reasons this item was continued from the October Planning Commission meeting was in order to mail a notice to all property owners within the recommended Redevelopment Area on November 13, 2002, stating there will be a meeting on the Preliminary Plan and boundaries on November 25, 2002. Staff reports will be available around November 18. Chairperson Monahan clarified the Planning Commission will be making recommendations to the Redevelopment Agency. This is only the Preliminary Plan. There will be plenty of future hearings; the State required committee will need to be formed and several other actions will be necessary. This is only one step in the process. He outlined the process.

Mr. Salcido the Redevelopment Plan made in 1973, page 22, Item 7.4, 2nd paragraph, discusses nonconforming properties and the redevelopment zone. An agreement that has to be entered into with the City is mentioned. He has not received a copy of the agreement as he requested. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded he talked with Mr. Salcido and gave his interpretation of the item under Section 7.4 Property Disposition (Redevelopment Agency may sell, lease, sub-divide, etc. property) which applies to Agency owned property and does not apply to privately owned property.

Bill Turpit, 1772 Kenwood Place, Costa Mesa, stated Paul Frech, one of the CRAC members dismissed earlier was, in fact, in attendance because he had a conversation with Mr. Frech during a meeting. He asked if it could be substantiated he was at a meeting, could Mr. Frech be reestablished? Chairperson Monahan suggested Mr. Frech send a letter to Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson and the Redevelopment Agency.

**AGENCY
MEMBERS
COMMENTS
AND
SUGGESTIONS**

None.

ADJOURN

Chairperson Monahan announced, after discussion with staff, there are no items for a December Redevelopment Agency meeting; therefore, he adjourned this evening's meeting until January 13, 2003.