

**CROSSROADS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA  
PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE  
- SPECIAL MEETING -  
FINAL - MINUTES OF THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2007**

The members of the Crossroads Project Area Committee (PAC) held their Meeting at College Avenue Baptist Church, Adams Hall, 4747 College Avenue, San Diego, California, from 6:38 p.m. to 8:25 p.m.

Members present at Roll Call: Adam Futo, Daniele Laman, Jose Lopez, Charles Maze, Christine Van Spronsen, Jody Talbott and Michael Trunzo [7]

Members that arrived after Roll Call: James Simon (arrived @ 6:55 p.m.). [1]

Not Present: Anthony Lovio and Kasra Movahedi [2].

Staff in attendance: Tracy Reed (Redevelopment Agency)

Public in attendance: Forty-three (43) signed attendance sheet. Twelve (12) requested to be added to the interest mail and email list.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Called to order at approximately 6:38 p.m. Charles Maze, Chair.

1. **ROLL CALL:** A quorum was established when 7 of the 10 PAC members were present. 5 PAC positions were vacant at the time of Roll Call.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** for August 23, 2007

Charles: I would recommend that we revise the agenda in order to have the Reports prior to Non-A

**MOTION** – **Jose/Daniele:** Approve a revised agenda which has Item No. 5 (reports) prior to Item No. 4 (non-agenda comments): passes (7-0-1c)

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** for June 28, 2007.

**MOTION** – **Jose/Jody:** Approve minutes with revision: passes (4-2- [Mike & Christine] -1c).

5. **REPORTS:**

Jody: The UA subcommittee meet on August 20<sup>th</sup>. We reviewed and discussed a draft business survey.

Jose: I am trying to schedule a meeting of the Housing & Park Subcommittees. I am having a hard time finding a meeting location.

Tracy:

- El Cajon Medians – Agency is scheduled to approve an additional \$250,000 to be transferred to the City to complete the improvements. There is currently an issue with contaminated top soil. The contractor will be removing most of the top soil and replacing it with un-contaminated top soil that has been amended to meet City specifications.

- CentrePoint – Recently JPI submitted an application for Substantial

Conformance Review (SCR). Development Services denied the SCR. Several of the requested action could not be approve per an SCR. Those requested action would require an amendment to existing entitlements or discretionary permit which was granted for the project/development in January 2006 by the Planning Commission. The permit did not require City Council approval. If the permit is amended the Agency may not be involved in the project. The Agency would only be involved in the project/development if the property requests that Agency assistance or participation. If the Agency is involved in the project/development the PAC would be asked to make a recommendation. Generally the Agency's participation involves affordable housing, property acquisitions and financing. The funding would come for tax increment from the project/development or project area.

- UA Streetlights – Agency is scheduled to provide funding of up to \$500,000 for the City to install of 47 streetlights at their September 11<sup>th</sup>.

**4. COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** (synopsis of comments)

**Committee:** Members spoke - Charles Maze, Michael Trunzo and Jody Talbot.

**Public:** Fourteen (14) members of the public spoke and nine (9) speaker slips were submitted (Mike Lancaster, Marjorie VanNuis, Mary Ann Polk, Allan Polk, Dan Stoddard, Jon Welch, Karen Collins, Lissa Adams, Anne Schoellen)

**Subjects:** JPI, CentrePoint, Student Housing, 63<sup>rd</sup> & El Cajon, Student Mega Dorm.

**Comments:** (synopsis of comments) The PAC has not been requested to take any action regarding JPI purchasing CentrePoint (63<sup>rd</sup> & El Cajon). A lot of my neighbors did not know anything about the CentrePoint development and the high end condos. We are gathering signatures from the neighborhood. The development was presented to the Rolando CC several times over a couple of years. Rolando CC is dark most of the summer. Our main concern is regarding the process. Where does it go from here? We have heard that it will be a majority of 4 bedroom units and JPI rents by the bed. We are vested in our neighborhood and this proposal will be detrimental to our neighborhood. Any new approvals would take 6 to 24 months and it would go through the Eastern Planning Group. This property is not in the College Area Community Council (CACC) area of land use responsibility. You need to talk to your planning group. JPI has made a presentation to the College BID regarding a revised development with additional retail space. JPI was directed by the Council member to speak with and present their revised project to groups and individuals that are active in the area. What do you think they are proposing that is positive? I want the public to have the right information. What is the on-site parking? They lease by the bed not by the unit. Each resident will have a contract with JPI. How much parking will each unit have? We are concerned with the affects this development will have on our quality of life (traffic, noise and crime). I have lived in the neighborhood for 25-years and did not know anything about the approved development. What are the noticing requirements for such a development? This is regressive redevelopment. We support what has been approved. There has been a failure to communicate with the community. Who is responsible for communication? We should not have to learn about the development from our neighbors. This type of redevelopment will not be good for the community. I support redevelopment that

improves the quality of life of the neighborhood/community. We are concerned that JPI has been meeting with community member for months. At the May PAC meeting we were informed that the development could become a rental project then in July we hear that the development would be student housing. High quality student housing does not matter to us. It is a done deal and groups are only advisory. How did JPI get the names? Project will have retail which will go along way to help the business district. Per the approved agreement the Agency must approve the sale of the property and the transfer of the agreement. However, the approval could occur at separately. If the change the development they will have to return to the planning group in order to obtain and new recommendation. They may also need to return to the PAC. The PAC is not responsible of land use approvals. The PAC's participation in this project is for financial support of affordable for-sale housing. What is the demolition schedule? There park needs improvements. The park should have a restroom. The park also needs security.

**Elected Official:** Don Mullen (District 7): the councilmember appreciates all of your comments. I want to provide you all with some background regarding the project. Around the time the City broke ground for the El Cajon Medians DWC informed the council office that they were in discussions with a national rental developer (JPI) to purchase and develop CentrePoint. They stated potential developer would develop the project as entitled and the developer would need the financial assistance from the agency per the current agreement. We were not informed they wanted to change the design of the project. The council office directed them to obtain the support of the community/neighborhoods regarding the revised project.

**6. OLD BUSINESS:** (synopsis of discussions)

**Update – Chollas Triangle RFP; Recommendation & Status**

Tracy: The Selection Committee has recommended the Agency enter into Pre-ENA discussions with the Barratt American Team. However, there are some issues that the committee wants staff to resolve prior to having Barratt make a presentation to the PAC and Agency. Can the project area afford the proposed project? Is the cost and gap reasonable? Why didn't the construction cost estimates assume paying prevailing wages? Some of the property values seem to be low? If property is transferred below market value it could affect other project costs. Why is Barratt assuming funding from other sources? We want additional information regarding these funding sources and assumptions. What affect would not receiving these funds have on the project? We hope to have reach some agreement regarding these issues and have the Team make a representation to PAC at your Sept. meeting and ask for a recommendation regarding entering into a ENA.

**7. NEW BUSINESS:** (synopsis of discussions)

**Discussion/Action** –PAC Appointments, Candidate(s): Business/Property Owner North & South.

Tracy: We have one qualified candidate for the Business/Property Owner North and

that is John Mireles. He is a property owner and business owner on El Cajon Blvd he is on the College BID board. We have one qualified candidate for the Business/Property Owner South and that is David Nelson. He owns property and manages property with in this area. These appointments will be until the next annual election.

**MOTION** – **Mike/Christine:** Approve John Mireles for the vacant Business/Property Owner North seat: passes; (6-0-1c)

**MOTION** – **Mike/Christine:** Approve David Nelson for one of the vacant Business/Property Owner South seats: passes; (5-1 [Jose] -1c)

**Nominations/Introduction/Action** - Elect PAC Officers; Chair, Vice-Chair & Secretary.

Tracy: I have not been contact by anyone regarding an interest in any of these PAC positions.

Charles: Do I have any nominations from the committee? Do the current officers wish to continuing in your current capacity?

Jose: Yes

Jody: Yes

Charles: Yes

**MOTION** – **Christine/Daniele:** Nominate and Approve Charles as Chair, Jose as Vice-Chair and Jody as Secretary: passes; (6-0-1c)

**Information/Action** – University Ave. Sidewalk Improvements (CIP 52-761)

Tracy: The current design estimate to repair and install sidewalks along portions of University Avenue is up to \$3,000,000. Should the Agency to assume the cost for this improvement? Staff believes that it would be appropriate for the Agency to provide up to \$500,000 this fiscal year to start design work. After the plans are complete we can re-evaluate the improvement and determine how to proceed. Would the PAC recommend that the Agency provide funding up to \$500,000 for design work this fiscal year and for the Agency to potential assume funding of up to \$2,500,000 of the improvements in future years?

**MOTION** – **Jose/Jody:** Approve the Agency assuming the possible funding obligation for the UA Sidewalk CIP (curb, gutters & sidewalks) for up to \$3 million overtime and \$500,000 for design this fiscal year: passes (6-0-1[John]/1c)

**Discussion/Action** – Five-Year Implementation Plan Update

Tracy: We need to start working on the Project Areas 2<sup>nd</sup> Implementation Plan. Per a previous meeting the PAC assigned the implementation plan to the Admin Subcommittee. We need to decide on a meeting schedule for this subcommittee.

Committee: There was a discussion and a concern about having an additional monthly meeting.

Tracy: What about the Subcommittee meeting for the hour prior to the regular

meeting?

Committee: There was a general agreement with the proposal.

Charles: I will chair the Subcommittee and we will meet the hour prior to the regular meeting in order to prepare a new implementation plan starting in September.

Tracy: The subcommittee meeting will be included and noticed as part of the regular meeting agenda/notice starting in September.

#### **8. NEXT MEETING DATES AND PRELIMINARY AGENDA ITEMS:**

Charles: Our next meeting will be September 27<sup>th</sup> and the Admin Subcommittee meeting will be at 5:30 p.m.

Tracy: After that your next meeting will be on October 25<sup>th</sup>. I will be on vacation at that time.

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** – **Mike/Christine:** Adjourn meeting; passes. (7-0-1c) @ 8:25 .p.m.?

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.

Prepared: 09-14-08 twr

Revised: 09-28-07 twr

---

Draft (Final) Approved: 09-28-07

Italic

Motion was by: Jose/Daniele

Revisions are in: Double Underlined and

PAC vote was: 6-0-1(David)/1