

**CROSSROADS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA**  
**PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE (PAC) - SPECIAL MEETING**  
**FINAL - MINUTES OF THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009**

The members of the Crossroads Project Area Committee (PAC) held their Special Meeting at the College Avenue Baptist Church, Visitor Center Building at 4747 College Avenue, San Diego, California, from 6:32 p.m. to 8:20 p.m.

Members present at Roll Call: William (Bill) Albrektsen, Cynthia Lewis, David Nelson, Charles Maze, Kasra Movahedi, John Mireles, Anna Orzel-Arnita and Jody Talbot [8]

Arrived Members that arrived after Roll Call: None

Members not present: Jennifer Finnegan (e), Lina Dewey, and Daniele Laman (e) [3]

Agency Staff in Attendance: Ulysses Panganiban and Tracy Reed

Public in Attendance: Thirteen (13) signed registration attendance sheet

Documents Distributed: 1) NCCD status memo dated 6-25-09; 3) Draft CentrePoint Project Revised Replacement Housing Plan; and 4) Second Amended Schedule of Performance for CentrePoint Project.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Called to order at approximately 6:32 p.m. by Charles Maze, PAC Chair.

**1. ROLL CALL:** A quorum was established at 6:32 p.m. when 8 of the 11 PAC members were present. Currently 4 positions are vacant (1-Residential Owner, College Area/City Heights; 1-Residential Tenant, Eastern Area, and 2-Business/Property Owner Southern Area).

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** For June 25, 2009

**MOTION** – Cynthia/Anna: Approve as submitted, passes. (7-0-1c)

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** For May 28, 2008

**MOTION** – John/Bill: Approve minutes as submitted, passes (3-0-4 [Bill, Anna, David & Kasra] 1c).

**4. CANDIDATES FORUM:** Each candidate was allow up to 3 minutes

- 1 – Residential Tenant: Eastern Area, *1-year term*
  - No Candidate
- 1 – Residential Owner-Occupant: City Heights or College Area, *2-year term*
  - Cynthia Lewis; I am a long term resident of Streamview Drive.
- 1 – Residential Owner-Occupant: Eastern Area, *2-year term*
  - No Candidate
- 1 – Business/Property Owner: Northern Area, *2-year term*
  - Kenneth Carpenter; I am a real estate appraiser and property owner
  - John Mireles; I am on the College BID board
- 3 – Business/Property Owner: Southern, *2-year & two 1-year terms*
  - David Nelson; I have been on PAC's for 15-years
  - Herald Lau, I am involved with real estate and affordable housing.

- 1 – At-Large Community Organization Representative, *2-year term*
  - Mario Ingrasci, Rolando Community Council; I am a civil engineer and I have been eastern areas representative on COMPACT.

5. **ELECTION:** Polls Open at 7:00 pm.

6. **COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** Committee & Public  
**Committee:**

Jody: I will be going off the board and I have been on it since its inception. I would like to thank everyone. I will continue to be involved in the community.

**Public:** None

7. **REPORTS:** (synopsis of discussion)

**Elected Officials:**

Kimvan Nguyen: None

**Agency Staff:**

Tracy: The University Avenue Streetlights project is out for bid. I attended the pre-bid meeting last Thursday. Bids are due July 7th. The award process will take 3-months. Construction should start in Sept. or Oct. and take 3 to 4-months. The North Chollas Park multi-purpose building is tentatively scheduled to go to the Agency and Council for this public improvement on July 14th or July 28th. The construction of the Multi-Purpose Building should be complete in Fiscal Year 2012. The monthly code enforcement memo is available.

**City Staff:** None

**Chair:** none

**Subcommittee(s):** None

8. **OLD BUSINESS:** (synopsis of discussion)

- **Discussion & Possible Action:** Update on Proposed 4<sup>th</sup> Implementation Agreement and Revisions to the Replacement Housing

Tracy: Background; I wanted to provide some background regarding this item. In Jan. the Developer sent a letter to the Agency requesting a 4<sup>th</sup> Implementation Agreement to the existing DDA. Subsequent to that letter, representatives of the Developer and the Agency have held meetings and discussions. In March the Agency, issued an administrative time extension to several Schedule of Performance items as permitted by the DDA. All administrative extensions have expired and no further administrative extensions are available under the DDA. Agency staff believes that the present physical condition of the Site is in violation of provisions of the DDA. The DDA requires the Developer to carry out development, construction and improvements in conformity with all applicable local and state laws. The Schedule of Performance requires the Developer, as part of the demolition and site preparation work, to maintain the Site in a condition that is safe and free from any nuisances and/or violations of any local and state laws. There is some disagreement between the Agency and the Developer regarding the DDA and ongoing site conditions and issues.

Tracy: Revisions to Replacement Housing Plan; The Agency must amend the adopted Replacement Housing Plan to fulfill law requirements. Under redevelopment law the Agency is the responsible party to ensure replacement units are available and occupied by June 2011. The adopted plan requires two replacement units to be built on-site by June 2011. Because of delays this will not occur. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Implementation Agreement designated the financial responsibility for these two units to the Developer (i.e., \$260,000). The Agency must revise the approved plan to designate the location of these two replacement units off-site. In the

revised plan we are designating that these replacement units will be located within the Village Green Apartments Project.

Committee: How will this affect the Agency's financial participation in the CentrePoint or Village Green projects?

Tracy: There will not be any financial affect on either project or agreement.

**MOTION** – John/Cynthia: Recommend the Agency approve the revised replacement housing plan for the CentrePoint project; passes (7-0-1c).

Tracy: 4th Implementation Agreement; The Agency sent a letter on June 5th to the Developer which identified certain terms and conditions to ensure the Project is in compliance with the provisions of the DDA. The letter provided the basis for the preparation of a draft 4th Implementation Agreement. In the letter a conditions for moving forward was the ability for the Agency staff to make a determination that the Site is in compliance will all provisions within the DDA, including local laws and regulations. The terms in the letter addressed: demolishing the vacant office building by Feb. 2010 which would be excluded from admin extension; submit to the Agency payment for two replacement units by Dec. 2010. Full payment would be due if the property is sold prior Dec, 2010 and this term is excluded from admin extension; commencement construction no later than Dec. 2011; and complete construction no later than Oct. 2013.

The letter also informed the developer that they must agree to certain conditions regarding the site prior to proceeding: dispose of debris off-site; install 8-foot high in-ground fence; board and secure the vacant office building and maintain at all times in good condition; developer shall submit to Agency staff, on a monthly basis, an impartial, third party written field/inspection report on site and post signs on site that provides contact information by which the public may report to the developer trespassing, vandalism and graffiti.

On June 22<sup>nd</sup> the Agency received a written response from the developer regarding the Agency's letter. The developer agreed to the four terms for the 4<sup>th</sup> Implementation Agreement with one exception. The developer proposes that the payment for the off-site replacement units be due by Jan. 2011 instead of Dec. 2010. The developer did not agreed to the site conditions prior to proceeding to hearing.

I have provided you with a copy of the current schedule of performance. That is the current schedule and you can see that the previous revisions are shown. We have not reached a formal agreement of a 4<sup>th</sup> implementation plan with the developer so there isn't anything for the PAC to recommend with a vote. I expect to provide the PAC with a revised schedule of performance prior to the July meeting.

Charles: In the past we had good communication with the developer. For the last 3 to 4 months the PAC has been receiving community concerns regarding the condition of the site and the community is frustrated with this blighted site.

David N: Does the Agency have deposit as part of the agreement? Code enforcement takes a long time to resolve issues. This project is giving redevelopment and the PAC a bad name. I don't think the Agency's letter or conditions were strong enough. We need to assure the debris is removed.

Jody: When will the demo be complete? I mean the vacant building and concrete rubble.

Committee: We need to clearly define demolition and what that includes.

John: Is the property for-sale? I have some questions regarding the conditions requirements in the letter. For the long term we need to consider how to beautify and screen the site. We could landscape the portion that is outside the fence along El Cajon Blvd.

Bill: The condition of the site makes it hard to move forward with a new agreement. We need to see how the issues regarding the current condition of the site proceed under the City Attorney.

Anna: How did the AMCAL property demo get addressed in the past?

William Simmons: I thought the PAC was going to vote on this tonight. Deliverables have not been made on the current agreements by the developer. They should not be awarded with an extension or new agreement. The PAC should vote this down tonight. The community does not want this to continue any longer.

Charles: If we don't have an agreement with the developer the Agency and PAC would not be involved in this project.

John Hintzman: Without the Agency agreement the developer will have a harder time finding a buyer.

Jan: David Kieffer I appreciate you attending to nights PAC meeting. The PAC and Agency could and should exert authority over the condition of the site. It does not appear the owner is interested in the community concerns or desires. The Agency needs to require the developer to be responsible to the community. The developer may be improving the condition of the site today but what about tomorrow, future and long term.

Anne Schoeller: I thought we would have a vote tonight?

David Kieffer: Project is at the design level we have not created construction documents. It takes about 9-months to get approval of construction documents. A new fence would be very costly we would rather use the money to address the concrete rubble. The agreement benefits the Agency and the developer. Regarding the condition of the site and addressing it. Money is the issue and money is the solution as well. There are three solutions for the concrete rubble; remove and dump in a land fill, crush on site and remain, or centralize the pile and fence. We do have a good faith deposit with the Agency as part of the agreement. We would like to be able to access and use the deposit to address the current site issues. We know what the desires are of the community for the site. The costs are about \$100k to dump, about \$50k to \$60k to crush and \$15k to \$30k to centralize. We currently have a contractor securing the building, removing the graffiti and covering or removing the signs. We also have someone that will be inspecting the site, building and fence on a weekly bases and addressing issues.

## **9. NEXT MEETING DATES & TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS:**

Charles: July 23, 2009 will be our next meeting; CentrePoint and El Cajon sidewalks.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION** – David/John: Passes (7-0-1c) @ 8:20.

## **11. ELECTION:**

Prepared: 07-01-09 twr  
Revisions: 08-31-09 twr

---

Draft (Final) Approved: August 27, 2009  
Motion was by: Cynthia/ Kasra

Revisions are in: *Double Underlined and Italic*  
PAC vote was: 4-0-3 (Jennifer, Bill & Daniele)/1c

---