

**Central City East Project Area Committee  
Monday May 2, 2011 PAC Meeting  
Patten University, 2433 Coolidge Avenue, Student Activity Center**

**(“Notes of the Gathering” due to lack of quorum)**

Gloria Jeffery of the Project Area Committee (PAC) chaired the meeting. The meeting started at 6:43 p.m.

**I. Roll Call**

- a. See attached roster of attendance.

**II. Open Forum**

- a. Shawn Roland from East Bay Housing Organization (EBHO) spoke. She spoke about some of the discussions in Sacramento revolving around the elimination or reform of Redevelopment. She stated that multiple groups and interests are seeking to reform Redevelopment and make it more favorable to some of the legislators that were previously seeking to eliminate it. She spoke of the efforts to use the affordable housing component as the “soft face” of Redevelopment.

**III. Approval of the March Minutes**

**No vote was held as there was no quorum.**

**IV. Administrative Items**

- a. Nominations for PAC positions.
  - i. No nominations.
- b. PAC member attendance and absence status.
  - i. No updates were given at this time.
- c. Announcements from PAC community organizations
  - i. Gloria Jeffery informed the PAC that Jean Blacksher’s mother had recently passed away, and that Jean had traveled home to be with family.
  - ii. Gloria Jeffery also informed the PAC that Frank Rose had recently had surgery and would be unable to attend the next few PAC meetings, but would return when his health would allow.

- iii. Sheryl Walton stated that on Saturday, May 21, the Mayor and Councilmember Reid will host a town hall meeting for District 7 at Castlemont High, and that the goal of the local Neighborhood Associations is to have that town hall meeting packed with residents.
- d. Council Item and Staff updates:
  - i. Theresa Navarro-Lopez gave updates on items headed to the City Council. The Clinton Park item is schedule to be heard by the City Council on May 3<sup>rd</sup>, and the Streetscape Design/Build item will be heard by the CED committee on May 10<sup>th</sup>.
  - ii. Doug Cole informed the PAC that the Foothill Square project will be heard in front of the Planning Commission regarding permits and other related matters.
  - iii. Meg Horl provided information on one of the proposed Housing related reforms for Redevelopment, SB450. SB450 will address and restrict the uses of Housing funds, the services which are affected by those funds and the administration of those funds. Gloria Jeffery inquired about the rates and limits for the various levels of income (lower-income, very-low-income, extremely-low-income, etc). Meg replied that she was not sure at that time, but that she would pass that information along.

## V. CCE 5 Year Implementation Plan Review

- a. Kimani Rogers presented the 2008-2013 CCE 5 Year Implementation Plan Review. He informed the PAC that Redevelopment Law requires that each Implementation Plan be subject to a midterm review that culminates in a public hearing to review the plan and hear public testimony, and that this must occur between years 2 and 3 of the Plan. Kimani clarified that the time period for the CCE Implementation Plan ran from July 2010 to July 2011. Kimani stated that CCE staff was recommending no changes be administered to the 5 Year Implementation Plan at this time due to: 1) the uncertain status of Redevelopment in California linked to the Governor's attempted elimination/reform; and 2) the uncertainties of the Budget process in Oakland and the available increment for the CCE Redevelopment Area.
- b. Tom Thurston suggested that July's Budget presentation tie in with the funding categories discussed in the CCE Implementation Plan, and compare how the increment has been dispersed via those categories to date.

### **Staff Recommendation: No changes be administered to the Central City East 5 Year Implementation Plan for the 2008-2013 Fiscal Years during its midterm review.**

- c. The PAC was informed that this item was time sensitive, and that the item must go to Council according to a timeline that did not allow the item to be heard and voted upon during a future PAC meeting. Due to a lack of a quorum, Kimani Rogers suggested taking a "straw poll" to get a sense of whether PAC members in attendance supported

Staff's recommendation. All 9 of the present CCE PAC members supported Staff's recommendation via the straw poll.

## **VI. Redevelopment in California Update**

- a. Gregory Hunter gave an update of the state of Redevelopment in California. He briefly reviewed the previous measures that the City and Oakland Redevelopment Agency (ORA) have established to protect the existing increment if Redevelopment were to be eliminated. He then stated that it appears the attitude in Sacramento towards Redevelopment has shifted from elimination and more towards reform. He briefly touched upon SB450, which Meg Horl previously had discussed. He then discussed SB286, a bill submitted to the State Senate floor for discussion that will explore possible Redevelopment form. He expanded that SB286 will look to strengthen the definition of Blight, and wouldn't allow Redevelopment Agencies to use Redevelopment funds towards golf courses or sports facilities without the approval of local voters. It would also limit the size and expansion of Redevelopment by not allowing Agencies to expand beyond 25% of the area of the entire city or county in which the Agency is affiliated with. Gloria Jeffery inquired as to what percentage of Oakland was currently comprised of Redevelopment Areas. Gregory responded that Oakland's Redevelopment Areas currently take over more than 50% of the area of the City; however Oakland and other existing Agencies that exceed the limit would most likely be "grandfathered" in.
- b. Gregory Hunter continued explaining SB286 by stating that another aspect of it would be to address the increment dispersal towards school district. He also stated that SB286 also appeared to have performance based standards and goals; with the likelihood that at least 50% of increment be directed towards addressing job creation, contaminated site cleansing, affordable housing, and other categories. It would also limit Redevelopment funds going for non-Redevelopment staff related administration costs or salaries, such as for city officials. Gloria Jeffery asked about whether this would extend towards funds directed towards the City Attorney's Office. Gregory responded that it would depend; but clarified that Oakland's City Attorney's Office does do a lot of Redevelopment related work, so a more in-depth review of the eligible expenditures would be needed.
- c. Gregory finished by stating that the City of Oakland's Community and Economic Development Agency's website has links that provide analysis of SB450, as well as proposals from the "Big 8" California cities.
- d. Bari Scott asked Gregory for his opinions on the various proposals. Gregory stated that there are many positive parts for most of the measures/plans that exclude the elimination of Redevelopment. He does thing that stricter oversight –especially for the use of low-moderate income affordable housing funds – is a good thing.
- e. Sheryl Walton inquired as to whether Gregory was in support of the performance based goals of SB286. Gregory responded that he did support performance based goals and that he feels the ORA meets those guidelines and standards currently. The only adjustment the ORA would need to make would be to draft another report for submittal to the State. He stated that a number of ORA projects are currently meeting the various standards and guidelines required.

- f. Bari Scott sought clarification for what a redefined definition of “blight” would entail. Gregory Hunter stated that one example would be that redevelopment funds could not be used on previously undeveloped land to build an automall. The previously undeveloped land would not be seen as “blighted.”
- g. A member of the public asked whether the Redevelopment Areas had the same boundaries as the Enterprise Zones. Gregory replied that the boundaries are similar, but that the Enterprise Zones tend to follow the Census Tract boundaries, and Redevelopment Areas do not necessarily do that.
- h. Gloria Jeffery sought clarification on whether adopting SB286 would eliminate the ORA. Gregory replied that adopting SB286 wouldn’t terminate any of the existing Agencies, but that there are still many aspects of SB286 that he was not familiar with and would need to review in more detail.
- i. Sheryl Walton asked that if the funds are transferred to the schools, will those funds be legitimately used to improve those schools. Gregory replied that he was unsure, but that an Oversight Committee would most likely be in place to review how those funds are distributed to schools and therefore the ORA would just have to show how those funds are being directed towards the appropriate schools within the Redevelopment Areas. Gloria Jeffery inquired as to whether SB286 had already identified what the Oversight Board would be comprised of. Gregory stated that he was unsure of that at this time, but he assumes that some level of oversight will come into play.
- j. Gregory Hunter stated that he anticipates another impact of the redevelopment reforms would be a significant cut to staff administrative costs, that would most likely result in a reduced number of PAC meetings; most likely bimonthly PAC meetings as opposed to the existing monthly meetings. Sheryl Walton said she would be in favor of such a move, as long as there would exist an option to call an emergency PAC meeting if necessary. Gloria Jeffery wanted clarification about what benefit a diminishing number of PAC meetings would grant staff. Gregory replied that fewer meetings will allow staff more time to focus on their existing projects; that preparing for monthly meetings was very time intensive and that fewer meetings would decrease that time commitment of the staff. Tom Thurston stated that staff should explore allowing for consecutive meetings during the months of September through December due to the annual meeting and the NOFA process. Gregory replied that staff will look at various options.

## **VII. Potential Items for Next Meeting**

- a. Tom Thurston requested that Economic Development (ED) staff provide the PAC with information regarding what is planned and happening within CCE. Gregory replied that the June meeting could look at multiple projects occurring throughout CCE, which would include projects from ED, Real Estate and Redevelopment staff.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

- a. Meeting adjourned at 8:15.