

Central City East Project Area Committee
Monday, April 7, 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 6:40pm

I. Roll Call

- a. See attached roster of attendance

II. Open Forum

- a. No comments from member of the public at this time.

III. Motion to approve the March 4th meeting minutes.

- a. Tom Thurston: Proposed an amendment to item 5a on page 2 regarding Marge Gladman's presentation by adding "moving forward on the East 11th street".

Motion (by Gloria Jeffery, seconded by Jean Blacksher): to approve the March 4th meeting minutes with the stated changes.

Vote: 12 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. Motion Passed

IV. Administrative Items

- a. Nominations to fill PAC vacancies-
 - i. Tom Thurston presented Eugene Smith for the Fruitvale/San Antonio Residential Tenant position. Art stated that staff will provide Mr. Smith with the necessary forms to apply for the PAC.
 - ii. Gloria Jeffery has been in communication with Larry Reid and they are working to find someone to fill their vacancies.
- b. Announcement from PAC and Community Organizations
 - i. Gilda Gonzalez acknowledged the many Fruitvale community members that attended the meeting and the preemptive community meetings.
 - ii. Hitesh Jadav, a Project Manager from Habitat for Humanity announced a charette on April 17th and may 22nd at 7 pm for the Byron Ave. Project (located at 10211 Byron Ave). This project will come before the PAC in the coming months. The project will be seeking NOFA funds

- iii. Larry Gallegos gave an introduction and welcome to Doug Cole. Doug Cole spoke about his previous position at CEDA and his work on the base reuse in the City of Alameda.
- iv. Kimani Rogers explained form 700 which was due April 1st. He would email the form to the PAC.

V. Implementation Plan

- a. Staff presentation:
 - i. Jim Burns covered the purpose of the implementation plan.
 - ii. Next, he reviewed the adoption schedule. There is a need to move quickly in drafting the plan; however the PAC and staff will not know the precise amount of available funds before the May PAC meeting. The CCE area will not receive the actual increment until January of 2009.
 - iii. Jim also discussed the changing projections of tax increment money and reviewed the Tax Increment table which showed a total of 68.5M for projects. He stated that the total funds for non-housing projects worked out to approximately 64M, or 16M per subarea.
 - iv. Art Clark requested a hard copy of the charts Jim presented
- b. Subarea Presentations

Robert Klinger presented the Eastlake/ San Antonio priorities:

- i. Crime reduction as a focus because redevelopment can't happen with crime.
- ii. Change perception of the area from downtrodden to a trendy waterfront area that will get people to spend money.
- iii. 14th Ave. and 23rd Ave, Streetscape projects need a connecting streetscape project. Money set aside for this to link up the existing projects.
- iv. Housing money to be used for improvements of existing stock.

Ross Ojeda presented the Fruitvale/San Antonio priorities:

- i. The process included the 1st meeting on March 15th where community discussed issues. These issues were condensed and second meeting was called to refine the list down to 20.
- ii. 6 priorities resulted under the redevelopment purview:
 - 1. Comprehensive plan
 - 2. Streetscapes-35% streetscape project was a focus as they lack necessary safety components.
 - 3. Under-grounding utilities are a major focus for the community however this can't be addressed here

4. Street safety and improvements- priority to create
5. Façade program
6. Open space and creek restoration are seen as valuable assets for the community that need to be capitalized on and address for safety.
7. Miller library can be transformed into a community facility that would address the previously identified needs such as employment centers, youth center...etc.

Charles Chiles presented Central East Oakland priorities:

- i. Catalyst project at Eastmont / Seminary and the parcel at corner of 73rd and MacArthur, which could change the character of the area.
- ii. Teen projects/Community centers at 76th to Parker- as one area
- iii. Extend MacArthur streetscape from the Eastmont Post Office to Alvington Court
- iv. Potential development on the corner of 82nd and MacArthur
- v. FAME site at Seminary and Foothill. Opportunity for mixed use as it's close by dining which can create a major destination

Gloria Jeffery presented on Elmhurst priorities:

- i. The redevelopment and revitalization plan from 1996 has already been completed and are still relevant to the community.
- ii. Crime reduction was part of the plan that focuses on streetlights, security alarms, and cameras on and off MacArthur Blvd.
- iii. Flagship project
- iv. Streetscape projects with under grounding
- v. Façade program
- vi. School program which would encourage a high school students to be involved in the improvement of the community. There will be 2 proposed programs: 1) a scholarship program where students in turn will serve on the PAC; and 2) a select group of students would focus on a community improvement project for the area.

c. Question/Comments regarding the Subarea presentations

- i. A question was raised regarding the proper amount of funding for the priorities.
- ii. Jenny Mollica asked if there has been staff analysis for the effective use of housing funds used for rehab. Art Clark responded by saying Marge Gladman will cover some of these issues during her presentation.
- iii. Art Clark thanked the PAC members for their time, dedication, good work and presentations.

d. Marge Gladman presented on the breakdown of housing funds that have been allocated during the first Implementation Plan and the proposed

allocation of funds for the new plan. She also provided a handout showing more details regarding the funding.

- i. Over \$21 million has been spent on 452 households in the first 5 years; part was directed towards rehab, part was substantial rehab and part was to First Time Homebuyers Program (60-80% AMI). Marge supplied handouts that provided information on the breakdown including definitions of the acronyms. The \$21 million expended was from City-wide Low/Mod funds, CDBG and HOME funds, and CCE Bond Funds (not from the CCE Low/Mod funds).
 - ii. CCE Low/Mod Housing funds spent in the first 5 years accounted for 10 homeowner rehab loans (using the CCE Homeownership Rehab Program started in 2006). Based on the current Implementation Plan, Low/Mod funds were allotted to other programs but those programs (rental rehab, first time home buyers, new rental and ownership housing) have not been development
 - iii. Marge presented the proposed allocation of funding to be available for housing programs for the next 5 year Plan, showing three quarters of the anticipated funding going to rehabilitation programs and a first time homebuyer program and the balance going to new construction of both rental and ownership housing.
 - iv. Marge also presented the expected breakdown of the \$50 million in projected low/mod housing funds for 2008/09 through 2012/13. This included a projection of \$10 million for administration. Marge will provide a breakdown of the \$50 million in May.
- e. PAC Questions/Comments:
- i. Robert asked if the housing administrative costs were in addition to the previously discussed non-housing administrative costs. Jim Burns replied that they were. Marge stated that the housing administrative costs cover staff in multiple departments (City Administrator and City Attorney's office, and other departments that are involved in affording housing) as well as Housing and Redevelopment staff directly involved in housing.
 - ii. Gilda Gonzales wants clarification on what costs are mandated by state law. Staff responded that they will provide that information.
 - iii. Oak to 9th is a substantial cost for the area. Gloria Jeffery asks what the project and funding breakdown is and Marge responds by saying she doesn't know; it is projected numbers by Jeff Levin and others.
 - iv. Gloria Jeffery asked if this is a state or federal mandate. Larry responded by saying that we can come back with a break down chart that shows the answer to this, but most are state mandates.
 - v. One PAC member wanted clarification on how the administrative projections were developed, Jim and Marge responded by saying the budget department does these projections.

- vi. Tom Thurston wanted to know if any administrative costs went towards the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA). Marge responded that no administrative costs went to OHA.
- vii. Gilda Gonzales wanted clarification on whether the funding balance from the first 5-Year Implementation Plan was carried over to the projections for the second 5 year plan. Marge responded that it had not, but there is no requirement that states the roll over funds can't be reflected. The PAC requested a true figure that shows the amount of funding available from both the first and second 5-year Implementation plans.
- viii. Jenny asks if there are any lessons learned in the uptake of the funds allocated by program.
 - 1. Marge responded by saying that all of the NOFA funds for new construction (or substantial rehabilitation) have been used and that those funds were from the 2006 Affordable Housing Bond, not CCE Low/Mod funds in the first 5 years. She acknowledged that many of the PAC members do not want any more affordable housing in the CCE project area.
 - 2. The first time homebuyer program for households that fall in the 81-100% AMI cannot be implemented until approved by Council
 - 3. The CCE HRP, a fairly new homeowner rehab program, has only 10 projects to date, which is not a whole lot.
 - 4. The proposed new Rental Rehab program focuses on larger projects (20+) units that are older and that need of substantial rehabilitation. Foothill Plaza Apartments is a prime example. Staff would like to create a more flexible program than the NOFA for this purpose and is proposing this new program.
 - 5. The information for different projects needs to get to the community, which would require funding for advertising.
- ix. A PAC member asked if all the NOFA funds were allocated. Marge responded by saying that 100% of the NOFA funds set aside for projects in CCE were allocated according to the PAC's recommendations.
- x. Tom Thurston asked if CCE could collaborate with the local community organizations to solicit participation in the programs that aren't being used. Marge responded that it could.
- xi. Robert Klinger is concerned with the "new rental housing" titled category and feels it should not be called substantial rehab. He requested discussing alternatives. The topic will be discussed in more detail at the end of the meeting.
- xii. Corona Rivera wants to have crime reduction as a line item saying it is hard to live in a dense area that doesn't address crime prevention. Marge responded that is not an eligible use of Housing low/mod funds.

- f. Public Comment
 - i. Michael Kinane, a resident in the area thanked the PAC for their work; had questions about the administrative costs; encouraged cross-sub area interaction; better camera monitoring by the police; had issues regarding undergrounding the street and then later demolishing the street for improvements.

VI. Discussion of Imp Plan, continued

- a. Jim Burns presented the percent allocations according to the \$16 million available per sub area. He requested that any changes in the allocations of the funding be communicated to Kimani Rogers by Monday, April 14th.
- b. Gloria Jeffery asked if we can make changes in January of 2009 when we know the full amount of money. Jim responded that the Implementation Plan can be amended in the future.
- c. Robert Klinger asked about non capital priorities (such as letter head and logo) and whether operating costs could pay for them. Larry responded that operating costs can pay for those.
- d. Robert Klinger requested an email copy for the priorities and percentages. Kimani Rogers responded that he would send one out.
- e. Jenny Mollica had questions regarding the priorities process and whether the entire sub area's wishes. She proposed a wider request of input of the community within the sub areas to potentially get a different representation of the sub area's desires.
- f. Robert Klinger felt the comment was out of order and that the priorities accurately reflected community members within the sub area.
- g. Corona Rivera asked if these sub area priorities will go before the council as apposed to a collaboration approach. Staff responded that the CCE area's priorities and funding allocation as a whole will go before the Council.
- h. PAC members requested that Marge Gladman have the requested housing allocations breakdown by the next PAC meeting. Gilda Gonzales clarified that she would also like a chart that has the amount of allocated housing funds that roll over from the first Implementation Plan to the second plan.

Motion (by Kayode Powell, seconded by Robert Klinger) to extend the meeting for clarification of the intended meaning of the line item of the housing program "new and substantial rehab housing"

Vote: 17 Ayes. Motion Passed unanimously.

Continued Discussion of Housing line Item

- i. PAC members stated that the line item of a housing program currently reads as “new rental housing.” There were multiple requests for clarification on whether it is to read as rehab *and/or* new housing.

- j. Marge Gladman explained that the program category “rental rehab” would be available only for existing affordable housing projects of 20 or more units that received City or federal funds 15 or more years ago and are now in need of rehab. Projects of 20 or more units that have not previously received City or federal funding but that need substantial rehabilitation would have to apply for funding through the regular NOFA. This type of project would be applying under the NOFA’s new rental housing category of funding even though it is an existing building applying for substantial rehab funds.

- k. Tom Thurston suggests that it’s crucial how the NOFA terms are worded. The NOFA needs to have new housing or substantial rehab of existing housing categories separated for evaluation concerns.

- l. Sheryl Walton wants to label the category as new rental housing and /or substantial rehab. Marge agrees that the NOFA covers both of those types of housing development and that the title in the table could be changed that way.

- m. Marge Gladman further clarified that the term “rental rehabilitation” as used in the Low/Mod tables also assumes the project already has an affordability restriction while “New Rental” assumes the project will become subject to affordability restrictions.

- n. Sheryl Walton says the meeting is the place to do this discussion as we are not privy to this information before hand.

VII. Items for the next PAC meeting on May 5, 2008

- a. Final discussion of the 5 Year Implementation Plan
- b. Fremont pool funding request
- c. Bancroft row development project funding request
- d. Other items include developer for properties that Charles Chiles identified during subarea presentations.
- e. Gilda Gonzales reminded PAC that we need to revisit the issues brought up at the retreat about how we do business as a PAC so we don’t lose momentum from the progress we have made.

VIII. Adjournment

a. Adjournment at 8:38