

UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
JULY 9, 2001**

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Costa Mesa, California, met in a regular meeting on July 9, 2001, in the Police Department auditorium, 99 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 Agency Members present: Chairperson Monahan
Vice Chairperson Dixon
Agency Member Cowan
Agency Member Robinson
Agency Member Steel

Agency Members absent: None

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

POSTING The Redevelopment Agency agenda was posted at the Council Chambers and Police Department on Thursday, July 5, 2001.

MINUTES On a motion by Agency Member Cowan, seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon, and carried 5-0, the Minutes of June 11, 2001, were approved as written.

OLD BUSINESS None.

NEW BUSINESS

Redevelopment Project Area Feasibility Study Workshop and Training Chairperson Monahan announced that, due to technical difficulties with equipment, this item will be postponed until the next Redevelopment Agency meeting in August 2001.

Public participation Options for Redevelopment Plan formation and Adoption process Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported, at its June 2001 meeting, the Redevelopment Agency awarded the contract to Urban Futures, Inc. for a feasibility study to create a new or expand the existing redevelopment project area. Concern was expressed regarding public participation for the next phase of the redevelopment process when the move will be into the redevelopment plan formation. Agency Member Cowan had requested that the issue of public participation be reviewed and an agreement be in place as to how to proceed. Public participation is critical in the next phase of adopting and forming a new redevelopment project area and plan. The following options to solicit public input prior to taking the next step are presented, in addition to the extensive public notice and hearing requirements in accordance with California Community Redevelopment Law (CCRL) for plan adoption and formation.

Option 1: Project Area Committee (PAC). CCRL requires a PAC if the project area includes a substantial number of low- and moderate-income families and the redevelopment plan contains eminent domain authority to acquire residences, or contains public projects that will displace a substantial number of these persons. Redevelopment law is very specific regarding procedures for the election and conduct of the committee, and shall include elected representatives of residential owner occupants,

residential tenants, business owners and existing organizations within the project area.

The primary purpose of the PAC is to advise the Redevelopment Agency on affordable housing related improvements and programs for a period of three years following adoption of the plan/project area; however, the technical requirements may restrict the public interest at large.

Option 2: Redevelopment and Residential Rehabilitation (3R) Committee committee already exists to provide input on redevelopment and housing related issues. If a PAC is not required, the 3R Committee could serve as the primary source of public input; if a PAC is required, the 3R Committee could augment the work of the PAC. The Committee membership includes a wide range of interests.

Option 3: New Advisory Committee. This committee could include members from the two previous options (PAC or 3R Committee), existing Commissions (Planning, Parks and Parkways, etc.) and the public at large, but offers an opportunity to expand the scope and base of public participation.

Staff does not have any specific recommendation but is seeking direction from the Redevelopment Agency in order to return with a more detailed description of the process, and information on how the committee might work.

Agency Member Cowan clarified that no matter what option is decided upon, if eminent domain is included on public projects that will displace low or moderate-income persons or includes a substantial number, a PAC is required. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson said the PAC stands alone, but CCRL does not preclude having another advisory committee with a PAC representative to provide ongoing reports back to the PAC.

Agency Member Robinson said she understood that the Redevelopment Agency had already decided when going forward with Urban Futures, Inc.'s feasibility study, that it would include eminent domain as an option and part of this plan, even though it may not be used. Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded eminent domain had been discussed at length by the Redevelopment Agency before entering into the contract with Urban Futures, Inc., therefore, staff is comfortable that eminent domain is acceptable as part of the plan; however, a formal decision is not made until the adoption of the redevelopment plan probably eight to twelve months into the future.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Tom Egan, 1893 Parkview Circle, Costa Mesa, referred to a handout he had distributed to the Agency concerning the feasibility study. He agreed with the PAC but thought its scope was too narrow. 3R Committee is too focused on residential issues. He favored the third option of a new advisory committee with representatives of government, business and public. He outlined his reasoning for this support and how he felt it should be structured.

Bob Graham, 3280 Dakota Avenue, Costa Mesa, stated to do justice to what the Agency, as developers, wants to do with redevelopment, all options must be considered, one being what would happen if 19th Street is extended to the beach.

Agency Member Cowan emphasized the importance of focusing on what is “envisioned” and where the Redevelopment Agency wants to go - not only in the defined redevelopment project areas, but in the City.

MOTION
Establish Advisory
Committee
Failed to carry

A motion was made by Agency Member Cowan to form a new advisory committee and, if the time comes when a project area is established that requires a PAC, that the PAC have membership, to be defined, on the new advisory committee. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon.

Discussion then ensued to clarify the structure and responsibilities of such a committee. Agency Member Cowan stated the community has difficult work to do just in creating the definition of what is to be accomplished. If this is not done, she did not see any reason to go forward with the feasibility study.

Agency Member Steel asked if Agency Member Cowan was proposing Option 3; however, membership was not being decided at this time. Agency Member Cowan confirmed this was correct. She proposed one advisory committee for the complete process, and a PAC for each project area defined. Agency Member Robinson questioned if Option 3 was, in fact, being proposed, or if the proposal was for a step before getting to this area. Agency Member Cowan confirmed this would establish another “layer”, but would open the public process to work through to a definition of what is wanted through redevelopment.

Chairperson Monahan said he could support forming another committee; however, it was vague to him as to what role such a committee would have. Agency Member Cowan responded if this role was further defined, the City would have a workable Westside Specific Plan. She suggested it not be too defined up front in order to determine what is to be accomplished in a redevelopment area. Vice Chairperson Dixon said she supported Agency Member Cowan’s suggestion of dialogue up front, and liked the idea of people outside the Westside area also providing input. Agency Member Steel requested clarification of what authority each committee would have and whom each would answer to. Agency Member Cowan responded the visioning committee would do the work up front, and then provide information for the PAC to work with. She emphasized the value of dialogue up front and pulling back to “take a look”. She said she had previously mentioned the Westside Specific Plan only as an example of what did not work. Once a PAC is formed, the City is committed to redevelopment.

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson reported the feasibility study would be presented to the Redevelopment Agency in September – October 2001, the latest. Agency Member Steel suggested waiting until that time, and then talk about what Agency Member Cowan is proposing. Agency Member Robinson said she supported Agency Member Cowan until her comment concerning the committee exploring whether redevelopment is needed. A consultant is being paid to find that answer. She suggested Agency Member Cowan might be proposing what was done in the City of Laguna Beach, which was an awesome effort by that community and took considerable time. She was unsure there would be a full benefit from such a proposal.

Vice Chairperson Dixon said all Redevelopment Agency members were in agreement regarding forming an advisory committee to get input from different active groups in the community. This would give a step ahead of

the feasibility study to allow people to “cuss’ n discuss” (a phrase introduced by Mr. Egan) in order to determine what they want. Agency Member Robinson responded she would support such a committee if its purpose was as now described; however, she felt Agency Member Cowan’s train of thinking changed direction.

Agency Member Cowan posed the question what if the feasibility study shows an area is not “blighted”. The consultants are being asked to review a very large area. The Redevelopment Agency is in debt to the City of Costa Mesa for millions of dollars. Without knowing what the communities want, she did not believe the end of the redevelopment process would be any more satisfying than the Westside Specific Plan.

Agency Member Steel supported the idea of keeping the process simple by starting at the grass roots. The residents and businesses in the targeted small neighborhoods should decide what they want.

Chairperson Monahan stated if an area is found not to qualify for redevelopment then it becomes a City Council question going back to the General Plan. Once the feasibility study is received, then the focus can be on forming a new Redevelopment Project Area and, at that point, a committee can be selected.

Lengthy discussion ensued concerning how to get and how to take full advantage of public input, defining and establishing an advisory committee, its responsibilities and how to conclude what specifics are desired.

Motion failed to carry 2-3 (Chairperson Monahan and Agency Members Robinson and Steel voting no).

**Substitute
MOTION
Establish Advisory
Committee after
Feasibility Study
APPROVED
CARRIED**

Agency Member Robinson posed a substitute motion to establish an advisory committee to do exactly what Agency Member Cowan was interested in, as commented on by Agency Member Steel, Chairperson Monahan, Vice Chairperson Dixon and herself, once the feasibility study is complete. The motion was seconded by Agency Member Steel, and carried 4-1 (Agency Member Cowan voting no).

REPORTS

**Executive
Director**

None.

**Agency
Attorney**

None.

**WARRANT
RESOLUTION
CMRA-289**

On a motion by Vice Chairperson Dixon, seconded by Chairperson Monahan, and carried 5-0, Warrant Resolution CMRA-289 was approved.

**ORAL
COMMUNICATION**

Martin Millard, 2973 Harbor Boulevard, Costa Mesa, disagreed with Agency Member Cowan’s earlier comment that there is no clear understanding of what is wanted to be accomplish with redevelopment in the City. The “vision” is to upscale the City to be more like Huntington and Newport Beaches, and suggested the name “Costa Mesa by the Sea” with the slogan “City of the Arts”. Any redevelopment must take the coastal location into account. To have various groups with their own

agendas could cause many problems; as an example, one group involved with the Westside Specific Plan would have turned the City into a new Huntington Park. In his opinion, it would have been a disaster.

John Rule, 215 East 23rd Street, Costa Mesa, a member of the Residential and Residential Rehabilitation (3R) Committee suggested that the 3R Committee be “the” committee. Volunteers could join in on this particular project. Chairperson Monahan responded the 3R Committee could not be designated at this point because of the previous motion; however, he would accept a letter of recommendations from the 3R Committee.

Bob Graham, 3280 Dakota Avenue, Costa Mesa, stressed his opinion that the Redevelopment Agency should ensure any redevelopment project made financial sense.

**AGENCY
MEMBER
COMMENTS AND
SUGGESTIONS**

**Agency Member
Cowan**

Planning and Redevelopment Manager Robinson responded to Agency Member Cowan’s question concerning the current Redevelopment Agency losing its ability of eminent domain, which expired in 1998. Both he and Agency Attorney Wood did not feel authority could be recovered once it had expired. Jon Huffman, Urban Futures, Inc., apologized for not being able to make the presentation agendized this evening which would have answered many of the questions posed. He spoke to the eminent domain question by stating to reestablish authority, the existing redevelopment plan must be amended. The feasibility study will make recommendations whether the plan should be amended, not only for extending eminent domain authority (for a maximum period of 12 year) but also whether it is prudent to extend fiscal and time limitations contained therein. There are two ways to enlarge redevelopment jurisdiction – the existing redevelopment plan can be amended or a new redevelopment plan can be created. Based on discussions this evening, he suggested amending the existing redevelopment plan, adding any new territory and reestablishing the Redevelopment Agency’s eminent domain authority within the existing redevelopment project area.

Agency Member Cowan said eminent domain was an important tool, and she was interested in doing what was necessary to extend the Redevelopment Agency’s authority.

ADJOURN

There being no further items for discussion, Chairperson Monahan adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

