

**CROSSROADS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA
PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
(FINAL) MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2003**

The members of the Crossroads Project Area Committee (PAC) held their meeting at Blessed Sacrament Church in the Basement Hall at El Cajon Blvd. at 56th Street and El Cerrito Drive, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:25 p.m.

The following members were present at Roll Call: Shukri Adam-Fara, Kevin Carter, Alison Grant-Carlos, Abdi Mohamoud, David Nelson, Laura Riebau, Michael Trunzo, Christine Van Spronsen (8); arrived at David Parsons 6:40 p.m (9).

The following members were not present: Anthony Frankhauser, Barbara Hutchinson, Harry Kattoula, Jody Talbott, Mason Younan and Jennifer Wieder Gamez (5)
Consultants and CED Staff in attendance: Kathy Rosenow, Tracy Reed, Todd Hooks and Michele St. Bernard.

CALL TO ORDER: Called to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. by Michael Trunzo.

1. ROLL CALL: A quorum was established when 8 of the 15 PAC members were present. Barbara Hutchinson, Harry Kattoula, Jody Talbott, and Jennifer Wieder Gamez contact agency staff to inform them that they would not be able to attend. Staff will mail distributed meeting material to each of the absent PAC members.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: for January 9, 2003.

Motion – Dave N./Laura: Approve the agenda for January 9, 2003 meeting; passes 8-0-0.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Final November 14, 2002 minutes and Draft December 12, 2002 minutes were mailed to PAC members on January 3, 2003.

Laura: (synopsis) I have revisions for the Final November 14th minutes. I would like to have my comments on page 5 regarding the constitution revised. The constitution says private property cannot be taken for public good only public use.

Laura: (synopsis) I have revisions to the Draft December 12th minutes on page 1 under item 4, board comments. I would like the minutes to say that I distributed a copy of the 5th Amendment to the Constitution and an Article from Virginia Institute regarding how important private property rights are and that they equal in importance with life and liberty. I also said that due process is not met through the redevelopment process. I would like to have a statement added regarding a response from me to Gary's comments on page 2, item 4, public comments. I said we were told something completely different at our EACPC meeting two months ago. On page 4 regarding my comments I think the answer regarding my question on North Park was from Tracy not me. I would like to have the minutes revised accordingly.

Motion – Laura/Adbi: Approve the revised final November 14th minutes and the

draft December 12th minutes as revised; passes (8-0-1).

4. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: None

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

(Synopsis)

Audience member: What was the City's response to the letter from Paul Hasty in the back of the room?

Tracy: It was placed there for your information.

Laura: Is the department taking action re: the Hasty letter?

Tracy: No

Alison: Can the PAC contact you to respond so this is not an embarrassment?

Tracy: Yes. No one from the PAC has contacted me about this letter.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

Kathy: (Led a discussion on the PAC Duties; process to develop PAC recommendations and format of PAC recommendations.) The following is only a synopsis of what was said:

Kathy: There have been a number of documents distributed to the PAC over the last few meetings. We have reviewed those documents with the PAC in detail. I want to remind the PAC of their legal requirements. I recommend the PAC prepare a report with their recommendations and submit that report to the Agency. The first draft of the PAC's recommended changes to the Redevelopment Plan could be reviewed at the next PAC meeting and then you may take action at that time. Your action can be to accept the staff's Plan, adopt the Plan with your amendments, etc. If the PAC does not support the Redevelopment Plan, the Agency could still adopt the Project, but they would need a super-majority vote for it to pass.

Tracy: Distributed revised copies of the Owner Participation Guidelines, explained the format. Staff has incorporated the suggestions and comments of the PAC on the OP guidelines.

Laura: I'd like the PAC comments to be separate from the staff report, not an attachment to the staff prepared plan.

Kathy: There is a section in the staff report specifically set aside for the PAC recommendations.

Tracy: Staff has agreed with most of the PAC changes so far, so we have just added them in to the draft version of the plan.

Laura: Staff didn't agree with the longer PAC term, so what happens then?

Dave N.: When does the 2/3 majority vote kick in?

Kathy: We will discuss the PAC term later on in the agenda. The PAC can make a list of proposed changes from PAC, staff can incorporate them in the draft plan provided to Council when we are in agreement. At the next PAC meeting, we'd really like the PAC comments because the Planning Commission is scheduled for 9:00 am on Jan 30th.

Laura: The schedule says 6:30 pm.

Tracy: That schedule is incorrect. It starts at 9:00 am. No specific time for our agenda item.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

Tracy: Distributed the exhibits that are referred to in the draft Crossroads Plan and Method for Relocation.

Kathy: Led a discussion on the draft Crossroads Plan and Method for Relocation. The following is only a synopsis of what was said.

Kathy: The purpose of these documents is to establish a format for the process of giving info to anyone who may be relocated as a result of redevelopment. The grievance procedures follow the state law and guidelines. State law controls relocation. If the Agency would get involved in a project that may result in displacement of a community member, the Agency must prepare a displacement plan before they can begin the project.

Dave N.: Was this just written? Wouldn't each Project Area have the same documents because it follows state law?

Kathy: The Agency special counsel drafted these.

Tracy: I believe the only reason why it may change would be because the law changed.

Michael: If the state law changes to the detriment of the person being relocated in mid-stream, would the benefit go to that person?

Kathy: I'm not an expert on this, but in the years I've been doing this, the law has changed only to increase benefits, not take them away.

Dave N.: There was some controversy with City Heights *sub-committee*. The government will not pay relocation costs for residents in the country illegally.

Michael: I spoke with someone who was relocated due to redevelopment 18 years ago and then 4 years ago. They said the two experiences were very different. Said the recent experience was a positive one.

Tracy: There was an article in the paper today about relocation due to private development.

Tracy: Distributed copies of text sections that could be included in the revised draft Redevelopment plan to address community participation and transit and gave an explanation. Some of this language comes directly from other Project Area plans. I recommend adding the transit section because the Planning Commission specifically requested that information. Does the PAC agree?

Dave N.: What is a DDA?

Kathy: It is the agreement between the City and the developer.

Dave N.: Would we review an exclusive right agreement?

Todd: PAC would review ENA (exclusive negotiating agreements).

Kathy: That needs to be added. Will add to PAC responsibilities section.

Kevin: What is a typical "reasonable time period"?

Kathy: We don't want PAC to take 6 months to evaluate an ENA but design elements and guidelines may realistically take that long. Depends upon issue under review.

Kathy: This is the language we are proposing to add to the plan. The PAC can make further revisions.

Kathy and Todd: Led a discussion on PAC Responsibilities.

The PAC discussed and asked questions. The following is only a synopsis of what was said.

Dave N.: The City Heights PAC thought it was reasonable to extend the length of time for the PAC. It's hard to restart a PAC after it goes away. No PAC if no money. I think it is

necessary for the PAC to be around when there is money (TI) and decisions to be made. What about a PAC if the TI exceeds \$100,000? With so many community groups in our area, the Agency could spend money in one area and not in others, and the other groups would have no way of knowing. I don't want Agency to spend money on projects that should be funded by the General Fund. PACs historically stay around, but I don't want to rely on history.

Todd: Correct, PACs stay around. State law says PAC is to provide comments re: relocation, low/mod housing, etc. Barrio Logan just had money this year, but PAC had been in place for a while. The Redevelopment staff recommendation will be to remain consistent with state law 3-years with 1-year extensions by Council. PAC can make an alternate recommendation.

Dave P: I'm in favor of the annual elections.

Kathy: Keep in mind elections are costly and time consuming. If someone vacated a position now, the board could locate a qualified replacement without an election.

Michael: Are there any project areas in San Diego without a PAC?

Todd: San Ysidro. They have no PAC and are getting along OK. Centre City has a type of hybrid group called a CACC. Membership overlaps and some folks can't vote on certain issues.

Tracy: Linda Vista and College Grove. No PAC, they don't affect low/mod housing.

Michael: When you have PAC elections in the future, where is the money coming from? Is it the TI money that should be spent on improving the community?

Kathy: Yes.

Daniele (audience): In the by-laws, how many times can a person miss before being kicked off the PAC? Also, in a project area with just shopping centers, how is the 20% for low/mod housing spent?

Todd: The low/mod housing money can be spent outside the project boundaries.

Daniele: Shouldn't there be a PAC wherever the 20% money is spent?

Todd: Don't need a PAC to spend the 20% or in the area where the 20% is being invested.

Kathy: PAC is created because of the potential for displacement. Investing the 20% money doesn't mean folks are being displaced.

Tracy: Regarding PAC attendance, if a PAC member misses 3 consecutive meetings or 3 meetings within a 6-month period, the PAC can vote by a 2/3 majority to remove him/her from the PAC.

Laura: What about spending the money to help people stay in their places and making a real effort to help people rehab their property? We have focused so much on the displacement aspect, most people interested in the using the money to stay. What type of form can be used for this? Where can we add this?

Kathy: It's already in the five-year plan (read a list) and in the owner participation guidelines. An owner can submit a statement of interest if he/she wants to rehab their property.

Tracy: We need to adopt the plan before we can rehab property. We, by law, must go through this process first.

Kathy: Look at the 5-year implementation plan. It's there.

Dave N. and Michael: Once the Redevelopment Plan is adopted, we will have years of planning for infrastructure, rehab, etc. while the money is accruing.

Dave N.: Why do you not want to put on extension on the PAC?

Todd: State law is sufficient. *We do not want to set precedence.*

Michael: We can recommend what we want done.

Kathy: Yes. Being devil's advocate...what happens if no interest on a long-term PAC? How do you make something happen?

Laura: We can add language that says, as long as there is interest or something like that.

Christine: We don't want to impede progress with our recommendation either.

Todd: Look at pros and cons. Just don't lock yourself into something that may not work in 10-15-20 years.

Kathy: Once it's in the actual "Redevelopment Plan" it is a nightmare to amend. I recommend you do this in other ways...request a council resolution or place it in the PAC Procedures.

Tracy: I recommend revising the PAC procedures.

Michael: Can staff develop a draft resolution?

Audience: I'm concerned with PAC recommendations just being a memo. Doesn't seem to have much bite. What happens if projects merge together...we are so close to other redevelopment project areas. What about the PAC then?

Tracy: Memo is effective way to list recommendations. Coming from a Planning background, it's a good way to get input and I listen to that input.

Kathy: Don't go there, regarding the merger of project areas. Not for this discussion.

Dave N. Lots of folks in City Heights think the City is out to screw them. *I don't agree with them.* It's much easier for the City to run things without a PAC. The City needs community/PAC input. The City can fire the PAC if we get out of hand. Things get ignored if there is no PAC. It can be written with a money limit clause (TI +\$100,000) and a lack of interest clause...I'll work on language.

Abdi: I'm comfortable with the 3-year term and 1-year extension.

Christine: Dave, basically, what you're saying is that the community should decide to have a PAC and not the City Redevelopment Agency.

Dave N.: Yes.

Dave P.: Let's put our recommendations in writing.

Tracy: (synopsis) Distributed copies of Section 11 (comments and responses) from the final EIR and gave an explanation. PAC will be mailed a copy of the Final EIR with responses to comments once it is completed by the Print Shop. Revisions to the Redevelopment Plan will also be mailed to PAC.

Daniele: Did you ever get a letter from the Sierra Club?

Tracy: No

Daniele: Will they get a copy of this?

Tracy: Final EIR is only sent to those you made comments, the PAC and those who have requested a copy.

Daniele: The Sierra Club can still comment at City Council meeting on this?

Todd: Yes.

Daniele: Dates and information on the maps still wrong.

Tracy: The dates listed on the maps are the dates they were run from the system and they are not the date of the map.

Daniele: Can the maps show the date of the map?

Tracy: We can't modify the data of another agency. We will be notifying Planning Department, SANGIS and SANDAG of the discrepancies listed in your comments. The comment section will also be posted on the Web Site.

Tracy: We'd like you to vote at the next PAC meeting re: the Redevelopment Plan. Planning commission is going to ask for PAC recommendations, or at least, is going to ask if PAC has determined that the Redevelopment Plan is consistent with the community plan.

7. NEXT MEETING DATES AND PRELIMINARY AGENDA ITEMS:

No comments.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion – [REDACTED]: Adjourn meeting; passes (8-0-1) @ 8:25 p.m.

Prepared: 01/10/03 twr/ms
Revised: 01/24/03 twr

Draft (Final) Approved as Amended: 01/23/03
Motion was by: David P/Laura

Amendments (Revisions) are in *(italic's)*
PAC vote was: 11-0-1c