

**CENTRAL CITY EAST PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE**  
**Monday, March 4, 2008 PAC meeting**  
**Patten University, 2433 Coolidge Ave, student Activity Center**

**(The minutes are in draft form until approved by the PAC)**

Art Clark, Chair of the Project Area Committee (PAC), chaired the meeting. The meeting started at 6:35pm.

**I. Roll Call**

- a. See attached roster of attendance

**II. Open Forum**

- a. No comments from members of the public.

**III. Motion to approve the Feb. 4<sup>th</sup> meeting min.**

- a. Tom Thurston: Proposed an amendment to page 5 of the minutes to accurately record the amount approved for the Pineview Project. The maximum amount approved was \$275,000.
- b. At the top of page six the amount of \$350,000 should be noted in the motion to fund improvements for Sunshine Court.
- c. Also on page seven, the amount of \$180,000 should be added to the motion for additional funding for the CCE Security Program.

**Motion (by Tom Thurston, seconded by Frank Rose): to approve the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes with the stated changes.**

**Vote: 13 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. Motion Passed**

**IV. Administrative Items**

- a. Nomination to fill PAC vacancies-
  - i. None were made.
- b. Announcements from PAC community organizations
  - i. Laura Jerrard announced that she will no longer be serving as a PAC member representing the Eastlake/San Antonio CDBG Board and thanked everyone. Staff requested that Laura please send a letter to staff saying that she will not be serving on the board anymore. The Chair and other PAC members expressed their appreciation for Laura's services.
- c. Vote to officially confirm CCE PAC moratorium through April.

**Motion (by Tom Thurston, seconded by Robert Klinger): To officially confirm the CCE PAC moratorium on non-5 Year Implementation Plan items and to only discuss issues related to the 5 year implementation plan for the March 2008 and April 2008 meetings.**

**Vote: 14 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. Motion Passed**

**V. Continued Discussion on CCE Budget & Update on CCE Affordable Housing Funds**

- a. Staff (Marge Gladman) presents CCE Budget & update on CCE affordable Housing. There is forward movement on the East 11<sup>th</sup> Street project.
- b. PAC Discussion:
  - i. Tom Thurston commended Housing staff for the high quality proposal.
  - ii. Gilda Gonzales asked that if the proposed AMI moves to 100, is the housing price going to change respectively based on the proposals.
  - iii. Marge replied that there are 5 proposals and it would depend on which Affordable Housing proposal is passed.
  - iv. Art Clark asked that if the 2006 bond fund is exhausted, are the available housing low/moderate income funds gone.
  - v. Marge replied they were not.
  - vi. Art followed up by asking that if they are not exhausted then what happens to them? Can they be rolled over and used for another program?
  - vii. Marge replied she was unsure, however it's difficult to assess how much money CCE will have until the end of this fiscal year.

**VI. Review of Retreat, Continued Discussion of Vision and Five year Implementation Plan**

- a. Larry Gallegos reviewed the process flow chart and vision road map discussed in the retreat.
- b. PAC Discussion
  - i. Robert Klinger raised concerns regarding another April meeting or extending/elongating the process.
  - ii. Larry responded that staff was showing certain steps illustratively as a way to incorporate the community in the process.
  - iii. Sheryl Walton asked for a copy of the previous community outreach meeting since things have not changed
  - iv. Gilda Gonzales stated a preference to focus on the 5 Year Implementation Plan now and not focus so much on the strategic vision.
  - v. Art Clark stated the strategic vision will be discussed in the next section.
- c. Paul Downs: Facilitator
  - i. Provided the Strategic Vision Outline-

1. Discussion of the vision; the brainstorming that the PAC went through the vision process.
  2. Priority setting
  3. Decision making process
  4. Common and unique elements
  5. Improved communication
  6. How PAC meetings are run
- ii. Discussed what was meant by the strategic vision report
    1. Thinking broadly and boldly about what “community” means.
    2. The PAC can map out their desires via sub area then discuss differences and commonalities CCE wide with the entire body.
    3. The SNI plan for the San Jose Redevelopment Area uses maps to show the spatial analysis which illustrates the relationship between each area.
    4. The implementation plan shows responsibility, time line, city service area, potential funding sources etc... basically an accountability
    5. This type of analysis and strategy is powerful.
    6. Map of improvements: Including the top ten prioritization list of the sub areas.
- d. PAC Discussion/Questions:
- i. Various PAC members requested guidance and/or more discussion to identify and prioritize desires and actions in relation to the vision.
  - ii. Sheryl Walton stated that each sub area doesn't have to do “community outreach” but can do a “community presentation” or update
  - iii. Gilda Gonzales wanted to separate the Shared Vision process from the Implementation Plan process; focus more on the Implementation Plan
  - iv. Larry reminded the PAC that the Implementation Plan is the major concern of staff as it must be completed within the next few months.
  - v. Art Clark stated that separating the two will not be best as the vision helps to inform the plan.
  - vi. Paul stated that the PAC can do a hybrid, leaving the Implementation Plan more general and then Shared Vision can plug right into this
  - vii. Tom Thurston wanted there to be metrics. The quantifiable aspects of the Redevelopment Area's success or failures can be viewed and compared in 5 years.
  - viii. Art stated that the Shared Vision and Implementation Plan must move together but a hard deadline for the 5 Year Implementation Plan is set. The first Implementation Plan didn't accomplish everything the PAC had wanted to do in the first 5 years.
  - ix. Paul stated that the visioning process will probably continue beyond May.

## **VI. Continued: Implementation Plan Overview**

- e. Jim Burns presented the Implementation Plan process and requirements.
  - i. Jim suggested that the PAC look at specific projects in their sub areas and see how those projects relate to one another

- ii. Staff could meet with the sub areas so that staff can make sure that the projects are in line.
- f. Goals objectives and procedures:
  - i. Reduce blight, with a mid term review to check effectiveness.
  - ii. The Implementation Plan is also amendable.
  - iii. The Implementation Plan was necessary due to a need to regulate the proper use of funds by Redevelopment Agencies.
- g. Other Discussion:
  - i. Flagship project
  - ii. General consensus to use affordable housing funds to improve existing housing stock; less of a desire for new affordable housing.
- h. Deadline for the Implementation Plan
  - i. PAC deadline- May
  - ii. Draft deadline-June
  - iii. Council report- July
- i. PAC Discussion
  - i. Jean Blacksher stated that she felt they already have a vision and have been through all this. They want a flagship project but are not going to get projects in their area with all the crime.
  - ii. Sheryl Walton responded that violence prevention is a facet of public health, improving the built environment does improve crime levels. So when a nice environment is created crime leaves, like the broken window theory.
  - iii. Jim Burns encouraged PAC members to think about specific projects in their sub area to help advise and guide staff.
  - iv. Paul Downs stated that a strategic analysis can assist in making sure there is no conflict in regards to different programs or priorities; if projects are aligned correctly, they can be sufficient.
  - v. Art Clark stated that the PAC members should do a check-in with their respective community organizations before the April 7<sup>th</sup> PAC meeting whether it is exhaustive or not.
  - vi. Jim clarified that the sub area representatives could get together to discuss priorities if they prefer.
  - vii. Art requested that CCE staff email the flow chart to the PAC members, and that the PAC members should look review the implementation plan
  - viii. Bari Scott wanted clarification on what should be presented to their respective organizations.
  - ix. Art responded that PAC members could inform their groups of what happened at the retreat; provide an overview of the first implementation plan; solicit comments or requests regarding the group's priorities for their area; and discuss the process road map.
  - x. Gloria Jeffery had concerns whether the meetings of the sub area representatives would violate the Brown Act?
  - xi. Art responded that staff will double check and inform the PAC members.

## **VII. Items for the next PAC meeting of April 7, 2008**

- a. Robert Klinger wanted to know what the April agenda's meeting may contain.

- b. Art Clark responded that the PAC will discuss each sub areas list of prioritized projects, discuss unique and common goals, etc.
- c. Jim Burns added that staff can identify the various areas' priorities, look for commonalities, look at total funds available and consider how to allocate projected funds. Early approximates of available funding have: \$50 million for Affordable Housing funds; \$85 million for non-housing projects and \$50 million in bond funds. The Affordable Housing and non-housing funds will be impacted by administrative fees so the final numbers may be \$10 million less each. Jim stated that allowing for administrative costs and dividing per Sub Area, the amount of increment per Sub Area would be approximately \$17.5 million; the approximate amount for housing funds would be \$10 million per Sub Area; and the bond funds would divide into approximately \$12.5 million per Sub Area. Staff must clarify that these are all estimations; the final adjusted numbers for increment and housing funds will most likely be different.
- d. Art stated that when the PAC returns they should come back with proposed projects.
- e. Sheryl Walton wanted clarification on whether the PAC agreed to split the funds equally.
- f. Art responded that that has not been agreed upon by the PAC.
- g. Jim stated that equality in distribution of funding per sub area will be a factor.
- h. Gilda stated that the PAC didn't have to specify the equality in writing but the PAC should be cognizant of that equality amongst the sub areas.
- i. Jim clarified that if there is a major flagship project in one area, the PAC could choose to fund it as it would have the greatest impact.
- j. Art requested that the sub area representatives get together and arrange a meeting time for them to discuss and set priorities.

The agreed upon dates for the respective Sub Area Meetings:

**Fruitvale-** Saturday, March 15<sup>th</sup> 10 am at 1900 Fruitvale 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**Elmhurst-** Tuesday, March 11<sup>th</sup> 6pm at Eastmont Substation

**Central City East** – (set after PAC meeting adjournment for Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup> 4pm at 7711 MacArthur Boulevard)

**Eastlake/San Antonio-** (set after PAC meeting adjournment for Wednesday, March 12<sup>th</sup> 6:30pm at 2302 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue)

### **VIII. Adjournment**

Adjournment at 8:30pm