

Kathy Esfahani, Costa Mesa resident and parent of a Youth in Government participant, expressed disappointment in comments made at the Study Session. She felt that Council members were not viewing the Youth in Government program as a great opportunity for the students. Speaking during public comments could be an intimidating process for the students and if the Council really wanted to hear from the students, they needed to give them a practical and workable forum. She was bothered by Council Member Leece's comments and encouraged Agency members to make the Youth in Government program work, as it would be beneficial to everyone.

Jennifer Broderick Perry, Estancia High School teacher and liaison to the Youth in Government program, said she spoke to over 1,000 students and recruited them to take applications for the program. Over 75 applications were handed out and nearly 20 applications were received, reviewed and accepted. She advised that no more than one week is dedicated to local government and that a maximum of three days, in any high school career, is spent on city government as mandated by the State of California. Therefore, there was no greater benefit to the students than to allow them to participate and see government in action. She was disappointed because community members did not want students participating and the lessons learned were how bureaucracy worked and that their opinions were not worthy of hearing.

Haunani Dwight-Geyzen, Costa Mesa resident since 1959, was interested in opportunities that polished the image of the city, which is why her daughter became involved in the Youth in Government program. She wanted the best for Costa Mesa and thought the Council should give the Youth in Government program a chance.

Kiope Geyzen, Youth in Government participant, thought it was a great program due to her interest in government. She was excited to be a participant but was upset when the program was cancelled. She wanted to find out why the program had been cancelled and felt that some of the Council members were unwilling to make changes, listen to their reasons and consider the Youth in Government program as a possibility. It was a great opportunity for the students, who were the future voters of Costa Mesa, to learn more about government. She encouraged Council members to reconsider bringing back the program.

Meagan Koonert thanked Agency members for granting them the opportunity to speak in support of the Youth in Government program. She wanted the program to be at the advisory level so students could voice their ideas more efficiently through discussions, processes and systems because five minutes at a Council meeting or three minutes at a Redevelopment meeting were not enough. She saw her participation in the Youth in Government program as an opportunity to help her city and was saddened when Council took that privilege away. The Youth in Government program was a great way for the students, who cannot vote, to offer their input to the city.

Chair Dixon thanked everyone for speaking in support of the Youth in Government program. She encouraged students going to Sacramento, to talk to the Governor if they had the opportunity and tell him the importance of youth in government programs because the Governor was a youth advocate. Chair Dixon closed the public comment session.

VI. AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Agency Member Leece thanked the students for addressing the Agency in a public forum. She restated her interest in the thoughts, ideas and viewpoints of the students, as well as, her concern regarding how the Youth in Government program would evolve and stated her desire to continue to be open, as well as, listen to the youth.

Agency Member Mansoor stated that comments from the youth were very important. Since they already had an advisory component, he questioned why those putting the Youth in Government program forward were not also putting education forward. He suggested focusing on education and asked why the school district was not providing an avenue.

Vice-Chair Bever shared some of his personal experiences and stated that venues were available, where people with a passion could share their ideas. He suggested writing letters to the editor as a means of drumming up support for an idea and said that

topics could always be discussed without the City forming a committee. He explained that Council had parameters they had to follow when creating a committee and those parameters did not have the space, in the City's Municipal Code, for a Youth in Government program,

Agency Member Foley challenged Agency members in support of the program to put their ideas on paper and on the Council Agenda because they needed three votes and actions spoke louder than words.

Chair Dixon thanked the 17 community youths who applied and said she wanted to see the formation of a youth committee. It saddened her that only 3-5 days were dedicated to teaching local government issues because local government was an important part of our lives. She commended the students and hoped they would continue working together to ensure that Council approved a committee for them.

VII. WARRANT RESOLUTIONS

1. Ratify Warrant Resolutions CMRA-353, 354 and 355, and Approve Warrant Resolution CMRA-356

MOTION: On a motion by Agency Member Mansoor, seconded by Vice-Chair Bever, and carried 5-0, Warrant Resolutions CMRA-353, 354 and 355 were ratified, and Warrant Resolution CMRA-356 was approved.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

1. Annual Meeting – Selection of New Chair and Vice-Chair

MOTION: Agency Member Foley made a motion and nominated Chair Dixon to continue as Chair of the Redevelopment Agency. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Bever.

MOTION FAILED due to Chair Dixon declining the nomination.

MOTION: Chair Dixon made a motion and nominated Agency Member Foley to be Chair.

MOTION FAILED due to lack of a second.

MOTION: On a motion by Agency Member Mansoor, seconded by Agency Member Leece and carried, 5-0, Vice-Chair Bever was appointed to serve as Chair of the Redevelopment Agency for the next two years.

MOTION: Agency Member Mansoor made a motion and nominated Agency Member Foley to serve as Vice-Chair of the Redevelopment Agency for the next two years. The motion was seconded by Chair Dixon and carried 5-0.

2. Appointment of 3R Committee Alternates

Chair Dixon opened the session for public comment. There being none, she closed the public comment session.

Agency Member Foley stated that Sam Clark would have to be removed from the list of regular members because he had recently been appointed to the Planning Commission. Management Analyst Penalosa advised that staff had checked with the City Attorney's office and were told that no conflicts of interest existed; therefore, Mr. Clark could choose to serve on the 3R Committee. Agency Member Foley mentioned that she had to be removed from the 3R Committee when she was appointed to the Planning Commission. Management Analyst Penalosa offered to have the matter rechecked. Assistant City Attorney Potter clarified it was a different City Attorney back when Member Foley's appointment was made.

MOTION: On a motion by Agency Member Mansoor, seconded by Vice-Chair Bever and carried 5-0, existing 3R members Chrissy Brooks, Christian Eric, Sam Clark, Christian Olson and Robert Norling were reappointed to the 3R Committee.

MOTION: Agency Member Mansoor made a motion to appoint James Winter and Daniel Skahill to fill two of the three alternate positions. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Bever.

Agency Member Foley asked the maker of the motion if he would be willing to add Mr. Richard Gillock to his motion since he was the only other applicant and there was one other vacancy.

Agency Member Mansoor stated he was not willing to add Mr. Gillock to his motion. He mentioned that the Agency and Agency members had taken criticism about past individuals and felt the Agency was accountable for who they appointed. He was only willing to nominate James Winter and Daniel Skahill.

Agency Member Foley asked if there was a reason why Agency Member Mansoor did not want to nominate Richard Gillock since he was commenting based on criticism received for a prior appointment.

Agency Member Mansoor reiterated that the Agency was accountable to the public, therefore, he wanted to be careful as to who the Agency appointed. Mr. Winter and Mr. Skahill were the only two people he felt comfortable appointing.

Agency Member Foley further asked if Agency Member Mansoor believed that Mr. Gillock would create a problem in being accountable to the public.

Agency Member Mansoor said he had stated his comments and was leaving it at that.

The motion to appoint James Winter and Daniel Skahill, carried 3-2, Agency Members Foley and Chair Dixon voting no.

Management Analyst Penalosa addressed the Agency and advised that the third recommendation of the 3R item pertaining to City Council appointing future vacancies to the 3R Committee had not been addressed. She did not know if it was an oversight or if the Agency had decided not to take any action. Chair Dixon thought it was part of the second motion. Vice-Chair Bever responded in the affirmative (that it was part of the second motion). Ms. Penalosa apologized.

X. REPORTS

- a. Agency Attorney - None.
- b. Executive Director - None.

XI ADJOURNMENT OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

There being no further business for discussion, Chair Dixon adjourned the Redevelopment Agency meeting at 7:37 p.m.