

MEETING DATE: 10/22/07

AGENDA ITEM: A Joint Item to Consider Termination of an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with Champion Realty Ltd. and to Authorize Preparation of a Specific Plan for Sepulveda Boulevard between Machado Road and the 405 Freeway; Jefferson Boulevard between Sepulveda Boulevard and the 405 Freeway; and Slauson Avenue between Sepulveda Boulevard and the 405 Freeway.

ATTACHMENTS

		Pages
1	Citizens Advisory Committee Adopted and Draft Meeting Minutes	1-100
2	Champion Exclusive Negotiation Termination and Release Agreement	101-104



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEPULVEDA REDEVELOPMENT
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

ADOPTED AS AMENDED DURING THE CAC MEETING OF 5/2/07

April 25, 2007

Call to Order: The meeting of the Sepulveda Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee (the "CAC") was called to order by Todd Tipton at 6:40 p.m. in the Cafeteria of La Ballona Elementary School; 10915 Washington Boulevard in Culver City, California.

Roll Call: Roll call was taken (and introductions made):

Members present: Allan Goldman
Asher Schechter
James Jun
Laura Stuart
Loni Anderson
Marianne Kim
Marla Osband
J. Marvin Campbell

Members with

Excused absence: Howard Lichtman

Staff Present: Joe Susca, Redevelopment Project Manager
Todd Tipton, Interim Assistant Executive Director

Conduct of Meetings: The Deputy City Attorney was called away at the last moment and was not able to provide a briefing.

Committee Duties and Overview: Joe Susca reiterated the role of the CAC was to review and provide input on the Sepulveda Redevelopment's design, business tenants and traffic study. Joe Susca also announced that an e-mail account was being set up that would be posted

on the Sepulveda Redevelopment web page once created so that members of the public can send e-mails to the nine CAC members. Joe Susca also announced that the meeting that night was being audio recorded.

**Appointment of
CAC Chair and
Vice Chair:**

Selection of Chair and Vice Chair:

Laura Stuart nominated Allan Goldman for Chair,
seconded by Asher Schechter:

Vote: All ayes

Marla Osband nominated Loni Anderson for Vice-Chair,
seconded by Allan Goldman:

Vote: All ayes

**Project
Manager's
Report:**

It was moved (Laura Stuart) and seconded (Loni Anderson) and passed by a vote of 8-0 (Lichtman absent) to receive and file the Project Manager's report of the posting of the agenda for the meeting.

**Approval of
Minutes:**

Not Applicable.

**Audience
Participation
for Items on the
Agenda:**

Through the Chair, Todd Tipton announced that members of the audience who desired to participate would be recognized at the time the agenda item is called. An additional opportunity for audience participation on non-agenda items was also be provided.

**Public
Comment for
Items on the
Agenda:**

Dr. Roger Woodard: Stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for 23 years and inquired about population density and whether or not the CAC could stop the project and he also voiced other concerns.

Chris Georges: Requested to speak after the Redevelopment Brief presentation.

Chip Netzel:

Asked if an EIR would be required for the redevelopment?

Joe Susca: The Planning Division would make that decision when completing their CEQA evaluation of the redevelopment.

As property owners, are Mr. Allan Goldman and Mr. James Jun willing to stay or sell?

Mr. Asher Schechter- How are you going to balance your developments.

Request: Can meetings be pushed back to 7:00 p.m. and be held closer to the Sunkist Park area? Joe Susca stated this was the only time and place he could get for tonight's meeting and indicated he didn't have any problem with the request, but would look toward the CAC to determine future dates, times and places for their meetings.

Allan Goldman: I have not met with the developer to talk about staying or selling my property. The businesses I have sold had indicated they want to stay in project.

James Jun: I haven't gotten into too many details as of yet and are still considering either continuing at the current location or maybe relocating. James June stated that his family had been there 23 years, and that it would be hard for his father to accept relocating.

Asher Schechter: It is early in the game, and as we move along in the process, I will see what commitments will be made. I want to work with the City and build a good relationship.

Bob Champion: I became familiar with the project via his review of the adopted Sepulveda Street Improvement Master Plan. Bob Champion noted the existing disjointed parking lots in the project area and too many curb cuts and reiterated his commitment to create a project that benefits the community. Bob Champion also recommends the City Council implement a Specific Plan to guide the areas future redevelopment.

M. Levine inquired about how much influence the CAC will have on the overall project from Slauson to Sawtelle.

Redevelopment Brief Review: Todd Tipton gave a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of good urban planning concepts, redevelopment agency goals, industry terminology, and project examples. Following the presentation, the CAC members were provided the opportunity to ask questions and Bob Champion participated in the responses.

Audience Participation for Items Not 1. Bob Champion provided the names of the architects who participated in the design competition and stated why he selected KTG:

on the Agenda:

- i. AC Martin/Togawa
 - ii. RTKL
 - iii. KTG Y
- b. Peter Messinger: On your One Westside redevelopment, how much is rented to family owned vs. national chains. 25,000 SF of total interior shop space. Half is owned by local and independent business owners, such as the sushi, optometrist, and Robeks and the remainder at national chains.
- c. Laura Stuart: About the CC Observer article, it indicated that you weren't interested in doing the whole project area is that true? Bob Champion responded that he originally envisioned the redevelopment being built in 3 phases, in 12 month increments. After completing the pro forma financial analysis and plans, Bob Champion recognized a few things. 1. If conceptual plans were built out, present cost would be about \$640 million and would need to be built in multiple phases. 2. Since it appears that there is a strong interest in protecting the existing shop owners, particularly on the Berryman-to-Sawtelle block it seemed logical to Bob Champion, that if the project was going to be built in phases, to create opportunities for those existing businesses, they should be completed as the last phase, so they could be relocated back into one of the first three phases, which would minimize displacement. However, the Agency has the power to decide what portions of the redevelopment will be completed and in what order. My proposed redevelopment adheres to the City's General Plan and Municipal Code requirements, and thus requires no variances. Bob reiterated his commitment to build the entire project area in four phases.
- d. Todd Tipton: The team selected KTG Y based on their experience, ability to follow directions, and quality of their team members.
- e. J. Marvin Campbell: Will it be LEED certified? Bob Champion: No, but will reflect smart growth principles. At the next meeting, Bob Champion will indicate what LEED certification level he may be able to adhere to.
- f. Chip Netzel: Why wasn't there a public visioning

process for a project this size? Other parts of City under major development went through similar processes, including Downtown, and the western portion of West Washington Blvd. No real buy-in in community has resulted, and I am concerned that the property owners who serve on the CAC do not know if they will sell or not. I see a serious conflict of interest because they can profit from their property or business sale. What will be done to allow existing business owners to relocate back into the redevelopment? Will incentives and reduced rental rates be provided to them to give them a chance to be a part of the new development?

- g. Tipton: If a business who wants to lease space in the new development is not able to be immediately relocated into the project, we can find them a temporary location. If the business is relocated, the Agency/Developer is required to pay for moving costs and subsidize increased rent for a period of time until the business stabilizes at their new location. It should be noted that many of the businesses in area are paying below market rate rent. Typically, businesses relocated back into a redevelopment boost their sales as a result of it, and thus are able to pay higher rent than they were before.
- h. Bob Champion: I've looked at a few leases that are now encumbered in the general area. Those leases coming up for renewal have landlords asking \$2 -\$3 per square foot. Similarly, when leases expire in the project area, those rents will be going up significantly as well to be more in line with the market.
- i. Gary Silbiger: What kind of participation or communication works best? This process is new for us and together with the CAC, we will figure out the best way the community can be heard and their ideas implemented.
- j. Unidentified Audience Member: Rick Caruso spoke on National Public Radio today. He mentioned he looks for local businesses to be in his shopping center projects and gives them special reduced rental rates because it creates an overall better feeling for his projects.
- k. Todd Tipton: This is worthy of investigating with

Caruso further.

- l. Bob Champion: Any successful project will have a combination of tenants. That is what makes a good project work. I'm not surprised Caruso has adopted such a strategy.
- m. Unidentified Audience Member: Did the architects have in mind the goal of inclusionary housing?
- n. Bob Champion: They did not. This has to be a decision made by the City. If the City Council requests it, and the City made a policy decision to financially support it, then it may be incorporated into the redevelopment. The State wants affordable housing built and is applying pressure on local communities to create it, but affordable housing is not necessarily incorporated into every new project.
- o. Todd Tipton: The City is formulating an inclusionary housing ordinance and remains committed to its goals and the ordinance will be presented to the public soon.
- p. Unidentified Audience Member: The slide show commented on "eradicating blight" but I think the real goal is to raise property values. I think that existing property owners and businesses affected by this redevelopment should have a way/opportunity to invest in it.
- q. Chris Georges: I am the property manager/owner for the Comp USA shopping center. I have owned the property for 10 years. I feel this process is not as organic as it should be as it feels like it is coming from the top down and imposed upon community. Creation of a Specific Plan is more work for the City, but it provides for more individual input by community members. I also think that it should include incentives to reward developers for specific projects that would adhere to the adopted Specific Plan. In this way, the process is driven by the people who live and work in the City everyday.
- r. Unidentified Audience Member: I have been told tonight that no specific number of housing is planned, but the CC Observer article published numbers.
- s. Todd Tipton: The housing numbers generated are pursuant to the City's existing Municipal Code requirements. I can't tell what the final number

will be yet. This is all part of what the CAC will discuss and recommend.

- t. J. Marvin Campbell: Has the City considered inclusionary housing for firefighters and school teachers?
- u. Todd Tipton: This is an important issue for staff and the City that we'd like to address in the coming fiscal year.
- v. Maria Osband: Q. In a mixed-use project, who owns the spaces that the businesses will occupy?
- w. Bob Champion: On projects I've done so far, I am the landlord and the businesses lease the space from me.
- x. Loni Anderson: I'd like to explore the opportunity to see if the CAC can work on development of a Specific Plan for the area. What is the current zoning for the area? What is possible for construction?
- y. Todd Tipton: The project area is currently zoned commercial and allows housing in a mixed-use fashion. The ground floor must be retail. The Municipal Code currently permits a maximum of 65 units per acre in density. We have certain requirements from RHNA to create 500 housing units for the City between now and 2014 and we have not yet met those requirements.
- z. Unidentified Audience Member: So, the RHNA requirements are not a law that the City has to abide by?
- aa. Discussion ensues: Todd Tipton: Penalties for lack of compliance, including the withholding of gasoline taxes from the City are now being discussed by the Southern California Association of Governments. Unidentified Audience Member: Some people like to live in Manhattan. Some people like to live in Wyoming. Different people like different things. If people are concerned with increasing population density in this City, how can we address this issue in our community?
- bb. Todd Tipton: Public hearings and forums are the place to speak your mind. The CAC is an advisory body whose recommendations will be presented to the City Council. Their comments about the Sepulveda Redevelopment are important.
- cc. Tom Supple: Is there a different Municipal Code

- for a redevelopment area than that of the City's?
If property owner didn't want to sell property,
would the City use eminent domain to acquire it?
- dd. Todd Tipton: Only the City's Zoning Code applies
in redevelopment project areas. No discussion
has been had and no decision made on the use
of eminent domain to acquire any property in the
redevelopment area. As a tool of the Agency's, it
is a last resort.
- ee. Peter Messinger: Is Bob Champion aware of the
fact that there are residential units in the
redevelopment area?
- ff. Todd Tipton: Yes. It should also be noted that
the Agency cannot acquire residential property by
use of its eminent domain condemnation powers.
- gg. Marianne Kim: What percentage of property has
the Agency acquired by use of its eminent
domain powers?
- hh. Todd Tipton: We are currently working on about
8 different projects comprising a good number of
parcels and property owners and we've pursued
eminent domain on two of those, but that was
after an extensive number of months trying to
negotiate with the property owners.
- ii. Carol Gross: In looking at the history of the City,
most of the time the Agency entered into
negotiations with property owners and settled on
a purchase price without going to court.
- jj. J. Marvin Campbell. Does the Agency offer tax
breaks or incentives to developers?
- kk. Todd Tipton: The Agency is often involved
usually because developments don't make
economic sense for private developers. The
Agency may be a source of funding for the
redevelopment, which is usually paid back to the
Agency over time either through increased Tax
Increment or other means.
- ll. Unidentified Audience Member: The Fox Hills
remodel worries me, in that Bob Champion's
project may compete directly with it.
- mm. Todd Tipton: The two projects are working
closely together to make sure they complement
one another and don't compete with one another.
- nn. Unidentified Audience Member: What are the
boundaries of the First Phase?
- oo. Todd Tipton: Between Slauson and Berryman.

pp. Bob Champion elaborated: The properties from Just Tires to where Winchell's Donuts is located. The second phase is south of Winchell's to Slauson; the third phase is Just Tires to El Pollo Loco and the last phase is the Berryman-to-Sawtelle block.

Future Meeting Scheduling:

Future Meeting Scheduling

Motion by Loni Anderson to move all meetings to 7:00 p.m.
Laura Stuart seconds motion.

Vote: All Ayes

Loni Anderson made a motion to have meetings on 16th and 30th of May and there was no second. Laura Stuart requested that we move the third meeting to the last week of May since she will be out of town.

Allan Goldman: Asked if there was a time constraint if we went into June with their future meetings? Joe Susca indicated that staff has the ability to extend the ENA schedule with Champion Development by up to 6 months administratively, but that it would put the project behind schedule.

Allan Goldman: Amends Loni Anderson's motion to May 23 and June 6.

Gary Silbiger stated that a Sister City event will be held on May 23, 2007, so that day is not good for him.

Loni Anderson amended the motion to May 22 and June 6.

Laura Stuart seconds motion

Vote: All Ayes

Adjournment

Upon hearing no other business, it was moved (Allan Goldman) and seconded (Laura Stuart) and unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. to the next regular meeting of May 2, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. in the Rotunda Room of the Veterans Memorial Complex located at 4117 Overland Avenue.



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEPULVEDA REDEVELOPMENT
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ADOPTED MINUTES OF THE
MAY 2, 2007 CAC MEETING

Call to Order: The meeting of the Sepulveda Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee (the "CAC") was called to order by Allan Goldman, Chair at 7:10 p.m. at the Rotunda Room in the Veterans Memorial Complex on 4117 Overland Avenue.

Roll Call: Roll call was taken :
Members present: Allan Goldman, Chair
Loni Anderson, Vice Chair
J. Marvin Campbell
Marianne Kim
Marla Osband
Asher Schechter
Laura Stuart

Excused Absence: Howard Lichtman

Absent: James Jun

Staff Present: Joe Susca, Redevelopment Project Manager
Todd Tipton, Interim Assistant Executive Director
John Fisanotti, Acting Redevelopment Administrator
Christopher Evans, Management Analyst
Arlene Fetizanan, Redevelopment Agency Intern (and Minutes Taker)

Project Manager's Report: Allan Goldman: Requested a motion to accept the Project Manager's Report. Marla Osband made the first motion, and Loni Anderson seconded the motion. Vote: All ayes.

Approval of Minutes: RE: Minutes from the 4/25/07 meeting: Laura Stuart stated she did not ask Bob Champion about whom the architects were and how they were selected, and requested that those comments be removed from the minutes. Loni Anderson also noted a correction that Champion's project is called One Westside, not Westwood One as stated by Peter

Messinger. Allan Goldman requested a motion be made to approve the revised minutes. Loni Anderson made the first motion, and Laura Stuart seconded the motion.

Vote: All ayes.

Items on the Agenda:

Laura Stuart made a motion to swap the order of items five and six on the meeting agenda. Marla Osband seconded the motion.

Vote: All ayes.

Conceptual Plans:

- Bob Champion: Bob reported that in some local papers that the project had been reported as shrink-wrapped and that there were financial issues; stating that those comments were not true. Bob said that at the last meeting, in the newspaper and now, that he was asked to create a vision for the Sepulveda corridor and that he has. "The redevelopment is being proposed in series of phases, and I would love to do all the phases. From our meetings, I have learned about the various concerns of the community. The community is concerned with issues such as massing and business relocation. I would like to build all four phases as planned, but this is at the discretion of City Council as to what I will be asked to move forward with. I am delighted to build the first and all phases if they want me to. I communicated to the City Council that they need to give me direction on what they want me to do."
- Albert Croft of KTG Y Group (Champion's architects): Albert introduced Stan Braden, Principal of KTG Y to begin the conceptual plans presentation. KTG Y has offices in Irvine and Santa Monica. Stan Braden is an architect with the firm who specializes in commercial and mixed use projects.
- Stan Braden: We are excited about the redevelopment. The process to date has not had time for interaction. We want to listen to your concerns and incorporate them the best we can. We'd like to expand the community and bring more residents to the community, which is healthy for businesses.
- Next, Albert Croft, retail specialist based in Santa Monica spoke: It's a pleasure to be here this evening. The project will have 260,000 square feet of retail. Half of the s.f. is large anchor tenants, and the other half is inline shops. Retail is designed to be at street level and will create a warm and inviting pedestrian experience. We want to engage the existing streetscapes along Sepulveda and Jefferson. Articulation of storefronts will disguise the massing of the large anchor tenants. Rich building materials will be placed upon the buildings, with landscaping and hardscape to mitigate harsh lines. The main focal point of the retail plan is the corner of Sepulveda at Jefferson. Each phase has an anchor tenant. It is important for small shops to have an anchor tenant to generate pedestrian traffic who may patronize the small shops.

Parking is at grade and behind, not visible from Sepulveda and is designed for ease of access from structured parking to shops. Loading and delivery are located at the rear alley. Designed for ease of maneuvering. Fully screened with screen wall from side, but fully roofed. Aesthetics and sound control.

- Stan Braden then discussed the residential component of the project, stating that the design would have each unit face quiet, passive green landscape courtyards. Stan noted that the rear of the building is stepped backward on the upper floors to minimize massing and shade/shadow impacts to the adjacent single family homes. Also, windows in the rear of the building would be either frosted or eliminated entirely to preserve privacy to the adjacent single family homes. The residential units will have their own, access-controlled separate parking below grade, with a separate elevator from the retail component as well. The residents can also choose to exit and participate in the retail level. Most of the residential units will face Sepulveda. Two landscape buffers are proposed on both sides of the alley. The commercial shoppers will not travel through the alley to find parking.
- Greg Lyon, Retail Architect at KTG Y also spoke, indicating that with vertical mixed use projects, what it would be like to live and shop here, and to be a pedestrian from the street. Greg's goal was to create a pedestrian relief from street, doubling the size of the existing sidewalk and at the same time, creating an organic retail environment by pulling the retail to the sidewalk. People may park behind the development, but when on the sidewalk, patrons will get a more "main street" type of experience. The design includes water features, kiosks, outdoor dining, coffee houses and room for a real type of urban environment. The residential portion is setback from the retail, with a softscape on top of the retail component which creates a visual relief for the residential units above. Residents will feel safer from above as they will see street activity; especially in the evenings. He stated that he wanted to wrap an urban fabric around the buildings corner which is experienced when you drive into the side parking entrances, thus you will still feel like you are in an activated streetscape environment, and not have the sense that you are at the rear of the development.
- Rocky Shen, a KTG Y designer spoke, saying that in regard to elevation and massing, the goal is to create an environment that is memorable, unique and vibrant, where the buildings act as a backdrop for people to gather. Articulated building features – such as the undulations will mitigate the affect of a wall. Think of it as sequence of spaces rather than a monotonous environment. There are four levels of residential units above the ground-floor retail. The strategy was to create a variety in the upper levels.

For example, each building corner has special features and a unique design. Shops are articulated to be more diminutive in scale. Open spaces provide for outdoor cafes and landscaping. The heart of projects gathering area is the center court at Jefferson and Sepulveda, where the project spans in each direction from this center point, where a water feature resides. A pedestrian can feel like he is walking through a different series of individual events that are unique and attractive, but cohesive at the same time. The proposed design also has features like lighting elements. KTGy did massing studies to study the projects impact to the surrounding buildings and to put it into context. The computer model also simulates shadows at different times of the day and year. Most of the shadow impacts would be felt during the early morning hours. Most shadows would be cast upon Sepulveda. Even during the winter solstice, which is time of year that creates the most shadow impact, those shadows would be seen only during the morning hours.

- Michael Flynn of KTGy LEED certified designer gave a presentation on LEED and sustainability. Michael Flynn stated that sustainability and green design is a philosophy and how LEED is evaluated and applied to buildings. When you apply sustainability to buildings, it means using less water, less energy, and creating open space. There are costs tied to its implementation, but as technology and popularity increases, the costs are coming down. Most manufacturers of construction materials are beginning to realize there is an increasing demand for sustainable materials and that it is smarter to sell them. Sustainable design implementation can increase construction cost by a range of percentages, averaging about 3% to 5%. This doesn't seem like much, but in this case 1% of construction costs can translate into over \$1 million. There are four levels in LEED: Certified, Silver, Gold and Platinum. The benefits of green buildings are; Lower energy costs because they use less water and electricity as well as lower maintenance and operations costs because the sustainable materials used are more durable. Green buildings also contribute to the better health and productivity of their occupants. The LEED evaluation program by US Green Building Council is now ten years old. The Federal government and almost all of California state government and UC and Cal state systems use it. Why LEED? It's a well defined program that is nationally recognized and may be used as a good road map. The LEED certification committee assesses projects in six different categories. Points are awarded for:
 1. Sustainable sites: Redeveloping sites that are already built out, increasing their density and locating them at or near transportation centers.

2. Water efficiency: Using indigenous/native landscaping that uses less irrigation with capture/reuse measures.
 3. Energy and Atmosphere: Measured by reduction in energy use and atmospheric emissions.
 4. Materials and Resources: Use of recycled and/or local building materials located within 500 miles of a project.
 5. Indoor Environmental Quality: Better control of temperatures inside.
 6. Innovation and Design Process: Deploying measures that are different and/or or exceed goals.
- Bob Champion: In addition to being a developer I teach mixed use development at USC. Residents are concerned about massing, traffic, and where they will shop and eat. These are real concerns. In reality, when you look at change, you have to balance the affect of change to their positive results as opposed to negative impacts. The easiest thing for people to say is "I don't want change and leave it alone." I'll tell you why for the last ten years I've been advocating mixed use developments. To begin with, when you look at traffic, at the cities on the west side, and to some extent Santa Monica, the increase office space and jobs has resulted in more commuters going to the Westside to work. At the RAND Economic Summit I attended recently, they analyzed what was happening to cities on Westside. In the last ten years over 10 million SF of office space has been built. That's almost 300,000 jobs. The area has less than 25,000 housing units, the result being that those jobs are creating more commuting traffic coming outside of and through your community. Next to Culver City, Playa Vista has announced they are going to build 2 million SF office space. You may say, well, they built housing at Playa Vista, but all that housing is sold. This reality means that aging communities need to change and adapt. In the case of Sepulveda, you have a corridor that is cramped. For example, I was on down there recently and it took me almost 25 minutes to get off the 405 ramp. It's bad, but it can be improved. I saw a draft report/preliminary plan that has outlined Sepulveda street improvements. The Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan envisioned the Sepulveda/Jefferson intersection as having a gateway, with landscaped street medians in its center and trees along the sidewalks. The Plan called for improved crosswalks, noting five or six different places for pedestrians to cross the street safely. It was a wonderful plan created and approved by the community, but then the plan was not implemented because it was discovered that it would cost about \$4 million dollars to improve the Sawtelle to Slauson segment. Second, the Sepulveda project area has 22 different property owners and over 30 points of egress and ingress from Sepulveda which means 30 different

points of confronting oncoming traffic flows. The City's General Plan calls for certain areas to have mixed use redevelopments. Those guidelines include retail on the ground floor and heights up to 56 feet. With the 22 property owners, redevelopment that would occur would be spotty and not cohesive. Property would go up for sale; a developer would come in and propose mixed use development because mixed use is the highest and best use for land. So market forces dictate that the project area will be built out to allowable maximum according to the City's approved General Plan. Mixed use proponents will say that it is the best method for redevelopment, and I believe it too. However, it could be better if done as a single, cohesive plan in the project area. On Sepulveda I see a large field of parking and buildings built in the 1940's and 1950's. In a cohesive plan, you'd create a plan that minimizes curb cuts and provides parking that is adequate and usable for everybody. In my project parking is off the street front and back into the rear and sides of the project. This way I am creating a livable corridor, a place you can stroll up and down and go to restaurants, have outdoor dining, shop or go to bookstore. We want to create a project that addresses concerns the community has. It is only 56 feet tall. No taller than five story building. It's the same height as City Hall. In the industry, it is considered low rise construction since it is less than 65 feet tall. This project has a very low impact in terms of height. What are the benefits it will create and are they worth it? A 30,000 SF public plaza will be constructed. Right now I see the public plaza residing on the Big Lots corner. This corner should be a place that signifies this is the entrance into the redevelopment. My development will have restaurants surrounding the public plaza, a place you will want to get out of your car and spend time strolling about. No cars, no surface parking lots to see. Surface parking and cars do not facilitate pedestrian activity or encourage people to stroll. Instead of having 30 points of ingress/egress conflict we will have only a few, creating new streets that are traffic controlled. One reason people are proposing mixed use these days, when you have people who live, work, and shop in same place, they take great ownership and pride in their community. They will be concerned about safety and cleanliness. They will have and participate in a home owners association. My plan is cohesive, rather than 22 different property owners who have their own game plans for their property. There are only three streets in my proposed plan. Think of the increased value to the community this project will create. It will create additional property, sales and businesses taxes, allowing the City to pay for things you wouldn't be able to otherwise. We want to adopt the goals and measures outlined in the Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan. So this is not

just a project, but an opportunity to implement those street improvements. Our intention is not to eliminate the existing alley but to improve it. The oil pipeline that runs along the alleyway will stay where it is. The plan includes the creation of two landscape buffers in rear portion of the alley adjacent to the single family home residents. We'll have tree plantings on both sides of the alley so that when you are in your backyard and looking out you will see trees. Behind the trees, you'll only see three stories of the building that is 30-40 feet high, since the plan proposes a tiered setback, increasing in height to its full 56'. The setback between the single family homes and the project is about 55 feet from the rear alley wall.

I know change is scary and the project is huge, but if it is developed in the phases I propose, it won't seem like a huge project because it will be implemented in phases. The project is evolving and that is why you are here to give me input into on the project. Let's suppose I didn't partner with the City's Redevelopment Agency to talk about a project, and instead I did it as an independent developer. For example, let's say the Tattle Tale property went up for sale. I could build buy it and build retail, in adherence to the City's General Plan. If I did, this conversation wouldn't be occurring. Instead, my partnering with the City's Redevelopment Agency has provided the community a unique chance to have input on developing a plan, and to address concerns and problems. So you can be assured when this project is built out, it will be with your input. I am not a big developer. I own my company and we have a total of 16 employees. We only do about three projects a year, which are mostly infill redevelopment. We seem to work well with communities. This is our first presentation of our vision of how we see the Sepulveda corridor as it could be redeveloped. We now ask you to help us come up with a refined plan. I'm here to listen. For example, we could probably go for LEED certification. It would probably be the first mixed use project of its kind that does so, but we could try to do it, if this is what this community wants. Not sure if the corridor were to be built between 30 different developers if they would sit here and listen to how to mitigate the concerns and impacts of their individual projects.

- CAC Member Comments** After Bob Champion and his team of architects presented, CAC members made comments. The CAC committee decided to ask all their questions at one time and then have Bob Champion respond.
- Laura Stuart: Some of my concerns – First, signage. I notice that signage is being put on the building. I'm concerned with light spillage in my neighborhood from the restaurants and loading docks. I would like to see the alley privatized. Would like to see

plans for traffic mitigation for the neighborhood. I have concerns over egress/ingress into the alley, and the added noise and air pollution as a result of its operation. Are the walls you're considering erecting sound absorbing? We had to fight for sound walls with the 405 widening project. Is there a way of marrying the two sides of the street to ensure they are complimentary? I haven't seen that. What about crosswalks and stop signs; things that would bring other side of street visually into street.

I'm concerned about entrances into Berryman. Once you put an entrance there, you invite a lot of people into our Sunkist Park neighborhood. It doesn't look like you stopped that traffic.

I think the number of condos is a little high. 700+ or so condos. 1,500-2,000 people. Maybe bring that down? Concerned that visitors or people who don't want to pay for parking and workers who don't get reimbursed for parking will be parking in my neighborhood as an alternative to paying. On the green areas--they need to be more kid and playground friendly. If more people come to the neighborhood, our one City park will become crowded. I prefer more green space in lieu of hardscape BBQ and eating spaces. I also want to see something more charming in the architectural design. One of my favorite mixed use projects is in Hoboken, revitalized downtown Hoboken. Architecturally right now, this project does not appeal to me.

- Marla Osband: Thank you for the presentation. You [Bob Champion] talked about gathering places. Traffic on Sepulveda is impossible right now. If there is to be gathering places in front of restaurants and stores, how are you going to mitigate noise from traffic on Sepulveda? Are there any provisions for parking that is exclusive to the project's residents?
- Marianne Kim: I thought the presentation was very good. Only comment about presentation is that you spoke about the project being good for people who live within it, but I didn't feel like I heard enough about how it would affect people living in the community surrounding it. The Grove does good job of letting the community use their open space as meeting areas for events. The presentation was good if you want your audience to be those who are in the market to buy the condos to, but it didn't quite speak to the rest of the community. I have a question about additional property taxes -- will they be dedicated to implementing desirable streetscapes?
- Asher Schechter: With a four phase build out, any preliminary study on what the residential property values would be?
- Loni Anderson: During the presentation you talked about how loading will be off of the rear alleyway. Sounds like that will create a lot of noise for delivery in the morning and at night. What kind of studies have you done on sound impacts and mitigation of those

impacts? Also, I would like clarification of where the trucks will be coming from -- the side streets or from Sepulveda? Any studies done on sight line? I'm also concerned about people residing in the residential units looking down into the Segrell single family home backyards. Do you plan to use mature trees or seedlings, because mature trees can be quite expensive. During the presentation -- the architects made light of the fact that the developments shading in morning is minor, and thus acceptable. This doesn't sound like something residents will be happy with.

Allan Goldman: The alley is almost an alternative street to Sepulveda right now, and I know the residents have concerns about its continued existence. How will you address problems at Berryman, Sawtelle and Slauson crossways?

Bob Champion responded to questions from CAC members:

Regarding concern about signage, it will be geared towards Sepulveda and away from adjacent residents. All of the signage will be below the second level of the project and be beneath the upper floor residents. No signage will be visible west of the project or by residents adjacent to the alley. The signs facing Sepulveda won't be visible to the adjacent residents.

Regarding light spillage from the loading docks -- when we get into more detailed plans, it will reflect that the loading docks are not open and visible; rather they will be obstructed by a wall prohibiting them from being seen and also providing light and sound mitigation. Today, the trucks maneuver through the alley and unload. This existing condition and operation won't exist anymore. Instead, we will have a dedicated ramp where trucks come down alley and will back into the down ramp and the loading dock will be shielded by a wall. The loading dock operations will not be visible by residents on other side of wall.

Regarding privatization of alley. In discussions with staff, I thought of taking responsibility for redesigning and maintaining the alley though the City would continue to own it with preservation of the existing utility easements within it. We are contemplating contouring the alley and potentially installing speed bumps to deter people from speeding and using it as an alternative to Sepulveda like they are now.

Regarding traffic mitigation studies, at this point we haven't done traffic studies for the project, but a preliminary analysis included the suggestion to add a southbound lane on Sepulveda Boulevard. The traffic study will be completed as part of the next level of planning for the project. Regarding the desire to see both sides of the street married, our present agreement with the City does not include the east side of Sepulveda. I believe there is a

benefit however, to ensuring that both sides of the street implement street improvements that link them together. I also believe that redevelopment of the other side of the street should be well planned out and compliment my project.

Regarding the concern made about the entrance into Berryman. There are several ways to mitigate this issue, although a traffic engineer hasn't evaluated it as of yet. One way may be to make it a one-way street. Another way would be to create neighborhood identification signs on the street, sidewalk and perhaps above, so drivers realize they are entering into a residential neighborhood. This can also be achieved through landscaping.

Please note that in the latest plan the office building is gone, and we have replaced it with residential. This is for two reasons; first, we found office buildings create much more traffic than residential, and second, Playa Vista announced their construction of 2M SF of new office space.

Regarding more kid/family gathering places and talking about the project being more an amenity for its future residents rather than existing adjacent ones. I want to create gathering place at Sepulveda and Jefferson that will be used by adjacent residents as well as project residents. The projects setback will create a pedestrian walkway that is about 16 – 20 feet wide.

Regarding the comment that architecture wasn't significant and that the community would like to see more charm. I'm not concerned about that comment because the way I created this designs competition; it was conceptual and focused more on the layout of the spaces than design. When it gets to the next level of design, I will ask the architects to come up with three or four different architectural styles that they can bring back to you so you can decide which the best is. We're here to work with you and come up with a project you will be proud of, and that includes picking the architectural style as well.

Regarding mitigating street noise from Sepulveda – this is primarily accomplished thorough landscaping and creating wider sidewalk setbacks from the street. We won't be able to mitigate everything, but we may be able to add low-volume music in the outdoor dining areas to mitigate the street noise impacts.

Regarding the projects residential parking. As proposed, 50% of the retail parking is at grade and one or two levels above are also used. Studies show that retail customers typically do not like to use below grade parking when patronizing a business, but don't mind going above grade one or two levels during peak hour use. The residential parking is subterranean, completely segregated, and its access is controlled. There is a vertical separation between the different parking uses.

Regarding property tax increment, I'll let staff answer that one.

Regarding adjacent property values, we will employ a consultant to determine their effects, but typically the property surrounding my projects increase more than market rates.

As for loading in the alley and its impact to adjacent residents, we will design segregated loading areas, with a wall enclosing them. As the project moves along, we can talk about what loading hours best works we have residential units above and adjacent. Regarding the abutting residential impact, an image of the sight line from the adjacent residents will be created, where the rendering will include a depiction of standing in the back yard of the Segrell residents for our next CAC meeting. Let me assure you that we have designed the project so no units look into the rear residential neighborhood. Instead, they look into the interior courtyards. Regarding shading, all of residential units are designed with “fingers,” creating all this open space between units, so as not to have a solid mass facing the rear of the project. The building height will probably cause shadows during certain times and days of the year, but we will design the building to mitigate those impacts to keep them to a minimum. In comparison, if 22 different projects [in lieu of a single, cohesive plan by one developer], were undertaken by the existing property owners, they wouldn’t be able to prevent this type of sun blockage from occurring.

CAC members wanted to follow up on Bob Champion’s responses to their questions.

- Marla Osband: Are you going to invite existing businesses to become part of project – give them the first right of refusal to lease available space? Who’s doing that?

Bob Champion: Is your question about how we will relocate them, particularly those located in the northern block of the project area? This is how the phasing notion came about. If we did the project in phases, those businesses located in later phases could relocate back into the projects first few phases. I’m not prepared to state that I’m inviting all the businesses to be relocated back into the redevelopment, but I will be working with staff on a plan for their relocation either back into the redevelopment or elsewhere.

- Laura Stuart: Property value impact: I’m concerned property owners on Culver Park Drive and Segrell Way will have their property values diminish, while others will be fine. I would like to see an analysis that targets property values for the streets immediately adjacent to the project. Can they analyze this specific area separately when completing their evaluation of the overall impact to the neighborhood?

Bob Champion: I don't know if consultants can get that specific, but I will ask them to.

Todd Tipton responded to CAC members comments.

- Todd Tipton: In regard to property tax for streetscape improvements, there is no reason why increased property taxes generated as a result of the project cannot be allocated to adjacent streetscape improvements, but you have to not only think the capital costs associated with buying the trees, building landscaped medians and widening sidewalks, you also have to think about the resulting maintenance burden it placed upon the City because it's expensive. With the Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan specifically, capital costs were only one part of equation when deciding not to proceed with its implementation. Maintenance was also an issue and costs of services tend to rise over time. What's great about the Sepulveda project is it provides an opportunity wherein we can ask Bob Champion to provide the streetscape improvement and subsequently maintain them. This is a good chance to get some desired items for the community. We have gone to businesses to ask for some of these things and their response has been that they didn't find them a priority. Regarding the architectural comment about a charming development – in addition to architectural elements for charming we can also include such factors as people, strollers, casual, dogs, activity, good food, interesting, pleasant. Charming is a good word, but I propose number of those descriptive may also be used to guide us in this process.

**Audience
Participation**

Allan Goldman called upon people who filled out speaker cards to the podium to make their comments.

- Tom Supple: For written record. I'm looking at the drawings, and see no indications...?
- George Laase: Mr. Champion mentioned there would be some kind of control on the three exits? What kind of control? I'm also skeptical about the statement that the buildings won't shade the adjacent residential homes in a significant way.
- Lee Norris, Sunkist park resident: First issue, seems like it is incestuous for the developer to sit with the CAC committee next to the Redevelopment Agency Administrator at the same table because often times relationships shape the reality. I agree about the notion that a single developer is good idea for the project area because it brings consistency. There are too many units of housing proposed. Also, the retail is also too large, even with the proposed setbacks and tiers. I chose Culver City

specifically for its small town feel. I could have lived in Santa Monica which has a lot of density, permit parking, etc., but I chose Culver City because you could actually drive it without getting on the 10 or 405 freeways. I'm not opposed to change but this degree of change is significant. The developer didn't talk enough about the impact of project on the quality of life of the existing residents. Finally, we need more information to understand how this project in its current configuration, coupled with Playa Vista and Symantec project impacts and how they result in increased daytime traffic. What is the impact on Fire and Police services? Our Police Department has about 100 police officers.

Allan Goldman responds to comment on the developer sitting up front, next to the CAC panel.

- Allan Goldman: We had Bob sit up here because we have a limited number of microphones in the room to speak from, and there was no more room at the KTG architect team table for him to join that table as well.
- Chris Georges: This was a lovely presentation. It is a lovely start in the process of improving this part of Culver City. Though there are flaws in this process since its beginning. A truly organic process would have meant that the City would have gone to its stakeholders in the area first. Instead, we were brought on board at this stage in the game. "It's like you built this beautiful ship, and asked us what do you think – and if you want us to move some of these deck chairs around, please let us know." The way it was handled and is being handled could stand some improvement. There is still a way to get involved. How many property owners are there in the area? They have a lot of say in how this project unfolds. It cost lots of money for relocation, and I don't think the City wants to write the check for that. This process could be improved, though the vision is wonderful. There are two ways to achieve a main street USA feel --- one is to involve people who live and work there and the other is to say "Hey, we made a Disneyland USA, what do you think?"
- Shirley Chami, a former business owner on Sepulveda: I enjoyed the presentation very much. The community needs many the existing stores -- such as the television, dry cleaning, shoe store, and I especially like the hardware store. I used to own The Aquarium store. What is going to be done for the community, and the existing small business owners? Did anyone contact Rick Caruso about leasing rates for local stores? *[In reference to an inquiry from the last meeting's comments on what developers like Caruso get as leasing rates for local store owners]*.
- Les Wagner, resident for 54 years: Wife and him love the project

and look forward to seeing it completed.

- Bernard Bronstein: I have a follow up on the comment that George Laase mentioned -- who is the target consumer for the residential units? Are they one or two bedrooms, or studios? I want to know so we can grasp who we are bringing in to the neighborhood, be it singles or families? I know the City is desperately trying to attract teachers, police officers, and fire fighters -- maybe a potential discount for government employees who've been working in the City for number of years could be offered to them. I need some sort of idea of what this new population coming in might do in regard to loading up of our existing school system.
- Jennifer Ryba, resident next door to project: Next time when you bring in a slide on shadowing effects, I want to see the impact from different season's renderings. Your comment *[Bob Champion]* about single family home distance of 50 feet from your project is too generous. The trees and wall you will put up will also impact me as they will create shadows into my yard. How is the proposed alleyway wall going to impact access for the existing residents who use the alley to get in and out of their property now? My next question is about construction. What are you going to do to mitigate dust and noise during construction? We already have problems given the 405 widening project. The plan doesn't look like Culver City at all to me. It would be great if the project were located in Beverly Hills or Downtown LA, but not here. Do we have to meet all of Culver City's housing needs in this one place? What is the impact to our air quality as a result of the parking structure operations into the neighboring backyards? I don't see how my property value will go up -- I see my property value going down.
- Paul Bergstrom called to make his comment, but was no longer present at the meeting.
- Charles Hoult: My question is primarily for Todd Tipton and Joe Susca. What are the impacts to the City's books? You talked about increased tax revenues, but what about impacts to our schools, police, fire, parks and recreation and trash pick up? I would like to see projections of the increased tax revenues versus impacts on our infrastructure.
- Jerrie Beall: I really like the planning so far, except that my house is right behind Big Lots. I love this town, was able to afford a house here and I put so much into my house, the pool, and its landscaping. The picture *[slide on massing from presentation]* scares me to death. I'm relieved that residents of the project will not be looking into my backyard. I want to get on board for the project, but I'm still scared by it. I need to know you are still thinking about the adjacent existing residents. I don't know if

“fingers” in the development landscape design coming through will allow enough sun through to heat my pool. I’ll keep coming to these meetings and hopefully we’ll be able to work it all out.

- Harold Hyman, property owner: I own property along with five other partners, on the northern most tip of project at Sawtelle and Sepulveda. (Tattle Tale, King Kabob, Elena’s beauty shop, The Aquarium). I want to repeat words I stated at first meeting in this non-organic process. I think it’s rare (and I’m sure the developer and architect will understand this) that the community has not been involved in what the project looks like from its beginning stages. I’d like to remind everyone that the CAC is responsible mostly to people sitting out here, not the City government. I worked in the school system for 50 years, 30 of which I was a school principal. In this project there are 600-700 residential units. Where are the play areas for little toddlers? Where are the slides? Where is that rendering? This project belongs in big cities like Chicago or New York, not Culver City. I thought we were downsizing to make the City friendlier to children. Each property owner of the existing site should work with the City and its Redevelopment Agency in partnership to improve their properties. We need to work together. If that comes about, a win –win situation for business tenants and the existing property owners will be achieved.
- Chip Netzel: Maybe if some of the property owners invested back into the project, it would be different, but I would like to hear what you *[CAC members]* think of the City’s vision for the project area. Would you like to see the Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan implemented? Did that Plan include creation of 800 residential units in the Sepulveda corridor? KTGy displayed Noon Day shadows *[in slide presentation]* -- I strongly hope the CAC committee will recommend that an EIR be done when the time comes. I heard concern about the impact to City services, and as resident of Sunkist Park, it’s a real concern of mine as well. El Marino is a charter school. El Rincon is the closest school, K -5. How will these two schools be impacted? I want to be assured that Berryman will be completely closed off from the redevelopment. I would like to ask each CAC committee member what they think of the proposed 800 residential units addition to the City and if that adds value to the City’s quality of life.
- Katie Victors: Will the parking be free? I’m concerned employees or visitors will park on adjacent residential streets because they don’t want to pay for parking. Will the parking meters on Sepulveda Boulevard stay? There is a vote in Sunkist Park as part of the Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Plan to turn Segrell and Culver Way into one-way streets, along with their thought of taking parking meters away from Sepulveda during rush hour.

Todd Tipton responds to public comments.

- Todd Tipton: There are a number of issues related to impacts of the project that need to be addressed. There is environmental review required pursuant to State law called the California Environmental Quality Act that requires analyses of the impacts through an Environmental Impact Report or other means, what exactly those impacts there may be on traffic, schools, public works, noise, shade/shadow, quality of life, and an analysis of the impacts upon the City's existing infrastructure. The formal environmental review process would begin after a decision has been made upon what form the project will take and once completed, it will be presented before the Planning Commission to consider entitlement of the redevelopment. First we have to define what it the project it, then you work thru the various and different analyses required by the law. Once impacts are identified, we would then ask Mr. Champion to mitigate the impacts. One example that comes to mind is the new BMW motorcycles that Police Officers now use. Symantec bought three motorcycles for the Police Department to give them what they needed to better patrol the City. One of the mitigation measures implemented from the Symantec project was to require them to sponsor the additional Police services required to respond to the impacts their new development have upon them.

Regarding the project area, I see low vacancy, deferred maintenance, and very little reinvestment by its property owners, and no City infrastructure improvements. One opportunity for the City is that when something like this project comes along, we can ask the developer to help mitigate impacts by paying for City infrastructure upgrades and enhancements such as the under grounding of utilities, replacing of aging sewer mains, repaving adjacent roadways, sponsoring local school/police/fire activities, etc. A number of years ago we offered a façade improvement program to the property owners in the project area, and though it was a financially appealing program, we had very few takers. It was a generous program that offered substantial grants and other Agency assistance to ensure their buildings rehabilitation was seen through the City processes. Unfortunately only a few property owners came forward and took us up on the offer. Some examples of places that did participate include the Comp-USA, Culver Hardware Store and Serrano Market across the street. Funding for the façade program was re-appropriated into other Agency programs due to a lack of interest by property owners. Part of the redevelopment process required by law is the requirement that existing property owners be allowed to participate in any planned redevelopment of their property. Prior to entering

into the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with Champion, those property owners in the redevelopment area were allowed to come forward with a project for the area. We had a handful of those came forward, but most were not qualified, and Champion was subsequently selected to investigate the feasibility of a project in the redevelopment area. Regarding the Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan, it didn't address land use issues; rather it focused on the public streetscape only.

Vice Mayor Carol Gross spoke in response to CAC members and other public comments.

- Carol Gross: Regarding the comment about an incestuous relationship with the developer on the panel. Mr. Silbiger and I are sitting at the table as the appointed Subcommittee for the redevelopment. We are both City Council and Agency board members and we have been assigned the task of closely monitoring the progress of the redevelopment. Other Council and Agency members aren't here, as their attendance would be a Brown Act violation as three or more of us cannot attend a community meeting to discuss a project without formally conducting a publicly noticed Agency meeting. As such, Gary and I are answering questions on behalf of the City, though I understand what the gentleman was saying about perceptions.

Regarding the question about property taxes and where they go, recently, a 10-year financial plan was presented to the City Council. Along with that plan, was a list of 18 items of how to address anticipated funding shortfalls. Some had to do with reducing services, others with creation of fee increases and creation of assessment districts. The costs associated with running this City increase faster than the amount of income it brings in to do so. This leaves in my mind three choices a City has. (1) Offer a lower level of City services to the community. One option may be to turn Police services over to the County Sheriff, or to turn over Fire services to the City of Los Angeles. (2) Add additional fees and cost to residents and business property owners. (3) Bring in economic development that creates new jobs and funding sources. We need this kind of redevelopment to offset the additional costs of maintaining the kind of community we would all like it to continue to be.

Regarding the process and vision for the project area and the question about how and when we contemplated it, specifically the idea of mixed-use projects and building housing above boulevards? It appears in number of publicly created documents, including housing plans adopted some years ago, the Redevelopment Plan, and the Mixed-Use Ordinance. The City is under the gun by regional housing authorities to build additional

housing, and we have failed to meet our goals. Since we don't have agricultural land and open space to build the new housing upon, we have a couple of choices. Rezone single-family areas to multi-family or build mixed-use housing above commercial in our commercial districts, which makes more sense. I would rather leave the single family neighborhoods in tact and build housing over commercial on our major streets. To several people who live on Segrell, I would offer an invitation to the developer and his architects to come and visit and see what it looks like from your backyard so they can better understand your concerns.

Bob Champion spoke, answering audience questions.

- Bob Champion: Let me give my office number, it is (310) 312-8020. If any of you would like us to come photograph your backyards, we would love to do that.

Regarding traffic controls at driveways in the redevelopment. Those kinds of specifics will be determined by a traffic study, which will commence once the project's scope is defined. At this time, the scope and project are not defined as we are working with the community to do so. I said to the City that I am willing to build four phases, and I am now waiting to obtain direction from the City on how they want me to proceed.

Regarding traffic controls. A few different kinds of traffic controls may be deployed in the redevelopment. Street signalization, medians, signage, synchronization of existing traffic signals, limiting exits to right turns only and the like. I imagine when a traffic study is done those kind of recommendations will be reviewed.

Regarding new residential demographics and who is buying condominiums in the redevelopment, we are building a project in downtown Burbank that is similar. It has exact same density as Culver City in that it has 65 units to the acre. Of the 118 units, roughly 15% are studios (600-700 square feet each), 30% are one bedroom (750-850 square feet), 40% are two bedrooms (1,000-1,200 square feet) and 15% are three bedrooms; the average unit being 900 square feet. Buyers for Sepulveda will be same type as in my Burbank project. 10-15% is empty nesters, people who decided they don't want the hassles associated with single family home ownership, or retirees that want to move back into a City they grew up in. The second category is people in their late 20's to late 30's, single, and employed within the Burbank community. They are tired of commuting, but can't afford a single family house. The project was an opportunity for them to be able to afford property ownership, often for the first time. Some are married couples with no children, and less than 20% are married with small children.

Regarding trees as a buffer or obstruction to adjacent property. Intention is not to have a line of trees on the western walls along the alley, rather lower-height landscaping is proposed for that area, with offset taller trees to be planted along the alley on the redevelopment side. The intention is that when you view outside your backyard, you will see a variety of landscaping and staggering of trees. I will instruct the architect to select tree species that are designed not to grow higher than 15-20 feet high, so that light will not be obstructed into the adjacent back yards.

Regarding the too big versus small town feel issue. Density proposed in this project is in adherence with the City's General Plan and existing zoning. I take my direction from the City Council in this regard. If the City Council says, we want to build all four phases, I will build all four. If they decide let's build phases one and two and see how it will impact the area first, I will do that as well.

Regarding impact of other area developments, such as Playa Vista and Symantec. When we get to that point in the project, will study to see what those neighboring impacts are when evaluating my own projects impacts. I want to remind you that your City has a shortfall of housing now to meet the requirements of its workforce. Your City has single family homes starting at \$700,000 to upwards of over \$1M which is out of reach to many people. This project will provide buyers with more affordable housing stock that is currently not available to them. Sale prices will range to approximately \$350,000 to \$600,000 for the residential units.

Regarding the impact on Fire and Police services. When the project is defined and goes to the next step in the process, an economic study will be done that will evaluate public safety needs, and the City will also see how much tax will be generated as a result of the project. I am positive if the project doesn't offer a net gain to the City, it won't approve proceeding with the project.

Regarding the comment that this project is increasing the City's population by 15,000 to 20,000 residents. I hope you misspoke. I am proposing 800 units if all four phases are built. It is more like a 1,200 population increase.

Regarding child playing areas. In my Burbank project we have three courtyards. These have a Bocci ball court, pool and spa, sandbox, BBQ and green grassy area. The Sepulveda project has built into it facilities for residents to have privately used open space for their children to play in. The great thing about a mixed use project is you can use the verticality to create enclosed courtyards solely for its residents and their benefit.

Regarding the relocation of tenants. I'd like to go on record that I'd like to have Culver Hardware Store become a tenant within the project. Regarding backyard size and setbacks. We will take a

look at aerials and do the measurements. If misspoke earlier in estimating the distances, I apologize. At our next meeting, I will show what existing conditions are and provide an idea of what the project would look like from this perspective.

Regarding mitigation of construction activities. Issues of dust, sound, soil containment, adjustment of hours of operation and the timing of haul routes will all be addressed if the decision is made to move forward with a redevelopment project. Regarding paid parking, I'm not presently contemplating that parking would be paid parking. If the City agrees, we will probably come back and suggest that on west side parking meters be removed to create an extra lane for traffic flow, and move any lost parking spaces into the redevelopment's on-site parking.

CAC members responded to the discussion:

- Marla Osband: Is methane gas in the project area? Bob Champion: I have no idea, but soil boring studies will be performed prior to any construction activity to determine the presence of methane and environmental studies will be performed to determine the presence of other hazardous materials.
- Allan Goldman responded about the comment made as to whether or not the CAC represents the community. Allan Goldman: Mr. Hyman, I agree with you that we represent the public in whole. We were picked to represent homeowners, residents, business owners, and property owners. Regarding Chip Netzel's question to what the CAC thinks about the project's impacts, personally I just learned about the true numbers and am not ready to give an answer. I need time to absorb it all.
- J. Martin Campbell: I reserve judgment on that as well. Offhand, 800 residential units seem excessive. I just found that out myself.
- Asher Schechter: I know its cliché, but being young and single, I would like see this development as positive. I'd be a prospective buyer of a residential unit. I would like to live closer to work (which is at the Westfield Fox Hills Shoppingtown. I've seen how Culver City has evolved. The downtown transformation is remarkable. This looks like a strong project with a lot of potential. I would like to be part of the Culver City community, but can't right now given the cost of home ownership.
- Carol Gross: At this early stage, I don't think it's appropriate to ask each CAC member to comment on how they feel about the redevelopment since it is only just now being introduced to them tonight. Instead, today's meeting is about information gathering.
- Tom Supple, a Sunkist Park resident: I wish to make a comment on items not on the agenda: We have meeting after meeting. Why are we going so quickly at this stage? The City is giving me more opportunity to look at traffic mitigation in Sunkist Park than

what documents I've been able to see thus far for this project. Why do we have to have this meeting every two weeks? Why can't we spread it out?

- Todd Tipton: The answer is twofold; we have a schedule of performance in the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with the developer that should be adhered to by both parties. The idea at this point in time is to figure out if there is a project. We need your input so we can present your ideas to the City Council in the near future. So the sooner we get your opinion, the better.
- Marianne Kim: Is the slide show going to be on web?
- Todd Tipton: Yes we will do what we can to post as soon as possible.
- Unidentified CAC member: I noticed Howard Lichtman [a CAC member] has not showed up again for the second meeting in a row. Any discussion about how many times you cannot show up before being dismissed?
- Todd Tipton: That is something for the Chair of the committee to discuss and determine.
- Joe Susca: Howard Lichtman has an excused absence for the last two meetings as he is currently in China and plans to return and attend the upcoming 5/22/07 CAC meeting.
- Gary Silbiger: What time period do we have in terms of the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement performance with Champion?
- Joe Susca: We had hoped to bring this to the Agency board sometime in July to consider what phases they would like to project with the redevelopment. If the CAC would like to have additional meetings to be as thorough as possible in their review and comment of the proposed redevelopment, staff has the administrative authority to extend the performance schedule by a factor of up to six months if need be.
- Carol Gross: We have a sort of chicken and egg thing going on here. We need to get input from the community and CAC so we can define the project. Through this process we can pinpoint more specifically what kind of project we may want. Right now the project hasn't been pinned down, so we can't give specific numbers. We need to get some input from you all so we can refine the project. This is by no means the end; rather this is the beginning of the beginning.
- John Fisanotti, Acting Redevelopment Administrator: Some of you may have attended the ACOR [Advisory Committee on Redevelopment] committee, the standing committee of the Redevelopment Agency that meets once a month. The next ACOR meeting is tomorrow and the same project will be discussed at the Senior Center. The architects will do the same presentation to the nine members of ACOR. The ACOR agenda is posted on the City's website. If you want to come back and do

this all over again, you are welcome to do so.

- Chip Netzel: Which advisory body will give recommendations to the City Council?
- John Fisanotti: Both advisory bodies' input will be given to the City Council for their consideration.

**Future
Meeting
Scheduling:**

- Laura Stuart asked the committee if they would mind moving the May 22, 2007 meeting to May 30, 2007 since she plans to be out of town.
- Marianne Kim: I feel like if we set the date, we shouldn't change it. It confuses everybody out there who has already set their schedule to attend them.
- Loni Anderson: I would agree with that. As I recall Laura, you seconded the motion establishing the subsequent meeting dates. I hear what you are saying, but we discussed the schedule previously at the last meeting and we should stick to it.

Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting of May 22, 2007 at 7:00 PM at a location to be announced.



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEPULVEDA REDEVELOPMENT
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ADOPTED MINUTES OF THE
MAY 22, 2007 MEETING

Call to Order: The meeting of the Sepulveda Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee (the "CAC") was called to order by Allan Goldman, Chair at 7:08 p.m. at the Senior Center on 4095 Overland Avenue.

Chair Allan Goldman began the meeting by asking the members of the committee to introduce themselves to the group.

Roll Call: Members present: Allan Goldman, Chair
Loni Anderson, Vice Chair
J. Marvin Campbell
James Jun
Howard Lichtman
Marianne Kim
Asher Schechter
Laura Stuart

Excused Absence: Marla Osband

Staff Present: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director
Joe Susca, Redevelopment Project Manager
John Fisanotti, Acting Redevelopment Administrator
Christopher Evans, Management Analyst
Arlene Fetizanan, Redevelopment Agency Intern
Max Paetzold, Traffic Engineering Manager
Sherry Jordan, Senior City Planner

Council Present: Carol Gross, Vice Mayor
Gary Silbiger, Council Member

Development Team Present:	Bob Champion, Champion Development Laurel Gillette, KTGy Group, Inc. Architects
Project Manager's Report:	Allan Goldman: Motion to accept the Project Manager's Report. Loni Anderson offered motion. Laura Stuart seconded motion. Vote: All ayes.
Approval of Minutes:	Loni Anderson motioned, and James Jun seconded the motion for approval of the minutes from the May 2, 2007 meeting. Loni Anderson included in her motion a proposed change to page two of minutes; where the third line from bottom states, "The main focal point of the retail plan is the corner of Sepulveda and Slauson" should be changed to "Sepulveda and Jefferson." Vote: All ayes.
Conceptual Plans Discussion:	A female audience member interrupted the proceedings with the following question: Why do we have members on the CAC that are not from the project area? Joe Susca: This is a nine member committee, with five members directly affected by and adjacent to the project. The purpose was to have a balance of the entire community. Of those five members, we have two property and business owners, two residents from Sunkist Park and one from Blanco Park. The four others are comprised of residents and business owners from the remainder of the community. Allan Goldman proceeded with the agenda, and introduced Bob Champion and Laurel Gillette of KTGy who presented to the group a rendering created using a photograph from an adjacent Segrell Way resident to depict what the view would be from their backyard. Bob Champion commented: At the last meeting, the direction we were given was to provide an image of what the project would look like from the backyard of a home adjacent to the project. We got access to one of these homes, took pictures and depicted in this rendering what it would look like. In this rendering you see a continuous row of trees from the west side of the alley. The building you see is actually three stories, and then steps back 20 additional feet to the remaining two additional stories. Also, this rendering depicts the windows in the project face the courtyards, not the backyards. I'm addressing the privacy concern of people who live behind that the project that they fear people will be looking into their

backyards. We've made minor changes to the plans. The office building at the corner of Slauson and Jefferson has been taken out. In the last meeting, I said the plans hadn't been updated. The revised plans shown here today reflect the office has been removed and replaced by ground-floor retail/restaurants and upper floor housing. Slight tweaks to plans include change in size of the plaza, additional landscaping, and retail square footage.

CAC Member Comments: Allan Goldman calls on members to share their comments and to ask questions.

Asher Schechter: Are there any plans for traffic lights to stem the flow of traffic?

Bob Champion: With the Chairman's approval, I'd like to hold off and answer all the questions at one time.

Allan Goldman: That is fine. Would other members like to make comments?

Loni Anderson: On Sunday I walked Segrell Way to get a feel for how residents feel about the project. I wanted to try to talk to as many people as possible who are not able to make it to the CAC meetings. From many of the people I talked to, their concerns were focused upon traffic on Segrell Way. If this project goes through they hope they will receive something from the City to mitigate its traffic impacts. Another concern was the scope of project. If the individual buyer purchases property, they can build legally to a code permitted height of 56 feet. To have one developer build in totality could be of interest to the community since this developer is going to step back the building. I know the CAC can't make the decision, but we can make suggestions to City Council.

An audience member interrupted Anderson with her question about whose side she and the group were really on. Loni Anderson clarified she was not stating her opinion at this point; rather she was sharing information about citizens concerns that she spoke to. Anderson continued making her points, and talked about perhaps looking at changing the existing zoning to address these concerns.

Loni Anderson: I see many of the folks I spoke to during my walk here tonight, and I'm glad. One of the other concerns was what will my children be looking at when they see the project? I didn't know the rendering would be available tonight to answer that question. I talked to many folks, and some folks were for it, and some people just didn't care. I want to hear what you have to say because the CAC is

here to hear it. The biggest thing I heard when I walked the neighborhood was this project was too big. This is an opportunity to receive public input because you wouldn't have this opportunity if it were redeveloped by several property owners on a project by project basis. Maybe we should look at changing the 56 feet zoning to something we can live with. If this group says no to this developer, then he can't build to 56 feet, but if an individual property owner proposes a redevelopment, they can still do it to the 56 feet limit, so perhaps we ought to think about the bigger picture and look into changing the existing zoning.

Laura Stuart: A resident from Segrell asked me a question. Is the City and Developer going to compensate the residents for their losses? Are we going to be protected from the ravages of construction? I have a question about the Fire Station property, which is directed to the City Council members to answer. The Fire Station is moving away from Segrell and three single family homes will be built in its place as that is what the zoning allows. I wanted to ask the City was still planning to sell the land for single family homes, and if so, is Champion going to develop them, or can we think about making it into a Pocket Park? We need to consider what fits with the neighborhood.

Howard Lichtman: (Commenting on the backyard view rendering Champion brought). I appreciate the buffering and landscaping and trees. I know the aesthetics of the building and architectural style and specifics are still to come. As far as articulation, this is something that needs to be looked at further. In its current form, it does not do anything for me. Also I see utility lines feeding the building, and I think a case can be made for going underground with those utilities as part of the project.

Allan Goldman asked if anyone else had any comments. J. Marvin Campbell, James Jun, and Marianne Kim did not have a comment.

Allan Goldman: At this time, we need a CAC member to volunteer to contact officials from other cities Bob Champion has worked with. Only one person should be assigned to ask the questions. Is there a motion for someone to volunteer? If no one can, I will volunteer myself.

A motion was made to nominate Marianne Kim as the CAC representative. Loni Anderson seconded the motion.

Laura Stuart: What is the deadline (to talk to the other cities)?

Allan Goldman: June 6, 2007. At that meeting we will discuss the findings thoroughly. Perhaps we can meet one more time on June 27, 2007. I know the City wants to be done by July 1, 2007 if possible. We won't know officially if another meeting is necessary until we get feedback from Marianne. So we should schedule two more future meetings.

Allan called for a vote for Marianne Kim to be appointed as CAC representative to contact the cities of Burbank, San Diego and Pasadena.

Vote: All Ayes

**Audience
Participation**

Allan Goldman announced at this time they will now take comments and questions from the audience.

Allan Goldman: Bob, do you want to answer all the questions from the audience at once?

Bob Champion: Yes, I'd like to.

Allan Goldman called the first speaker, Tom Supple, to the podium.

Tom Supple had a comment: Regarding notification of this meeting, I went online nine days ago, and the meeting place was still listed as to be announced. It wasn't in the papers. People asked me if I knew where it was. When I found out, I did not have sufficient time to pass the information onto others. I was at that backyard when the photographer took the picture (in the rendering displayed at this meeting). The photographer took many pictures but this one is at the best angle for the developer. It does not look straight across the alley. It should be taken more down the alley as well. I also have two questions. Twenty – twenty-five years ago, the Planning Commission approved a ten story building on the site of the old bowling alley. It was not approved, but appealed. Part of the 56 feet height limit had terracing back on this project. Twenty years ago you couldn't build 56 feet or is the Code we established 25 years ago still in effect? What is the height on the alley property line? You say three stories, and for two stories above, what is the height? At the last meeting you talked about articulation. Does any of this articulation go above 56 feet? Would they be architectural features?

Phyllis Kissoff: I would like to know how the City Council voted on this project.

Loni Anderson: They haven't voted.

Ann Treleven, Segrell Way Resident: I live with my front yard facing the project and I have a view of the Culver Crest. When I look at these pictures (site plans and renderings displayed at the meeting) I can see a three story building, loading dock, and parking lot. It's cute but not accurate. I've heard lots of arguments if we don't get Bob, we'll get some horrible thing. Bob has a lot more buying power than others. Essentially he is taking 20 some owners, and turning it into one owner. In regard to traffic, it is interesting that the traffic discussion does not speak about Segrell. If they have trouble entering Sepulveda, guess what streets they are going to use – it will be Segrell and Culver Park Drive. We are the bypass roads for Sepulveda. If people are circling the area for retail to get into the parking lot, it's on our streets. There's got to be more than a statement that the traffic mitigation group will take care of it. Fox Hills is going to expand. Symantec is coming too. What about all those people living in the condos – where are their kids going to go to school? We only have one neighborhood school and a highly competitive magnet school nearby. We're going to need to build another school. I'm not an economist, but people who live behind the project will have a view of the buildings, while people who live in Culver Crest will still see the ocean views. The corridor angles across and blocks our side of the neighborhood, which is Sunkist Park. I'm not anti-development, but you have businesses there that people love, that would not exist. Nothing is that tall anywhere near us. Target is not that tall. Toys-R-Us is not that tall. The tallest one nearby is near Fox Hills. It will completely stick out and separate the two sides of Sepulveda Blvd. I think this thing is seriously too big. It's a lot to take twenty existing owners and turn the whole space into one owner.

Dorothy Inman, Segrell Way Resident: My mother has lived on the street since 1959 on Segrell Way. I remember when they proposed the ten story project on Jefferson as well. But I'm fighting this one. The woman who spoke before me voiced my concerns. Traffic is horrendous. I can't imagine 800 units behind my mother's house! No way, unless you build another road on top of Sepulveda. I live in Orange County now, and the only building we have that is five stories is our school district which is a huge enterprise. Five stories right behind my mother's house seems like an awfully high building.

Chris Georges of Harvey Capital Corporation: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We own CompUSA on Jefferson. We are one of the largest owners in the project area. I have nothing personal against Bob Champion, I'm familiar with his work and he has done it well historically. By the same token, everyone in this room is a stakeholder. One thing I want to point out is that all the advantages

that are being propounded before us; aesthetics and economic effects, how it will be a south end gateway; those ends are achievable in other ways. It will take more work for the City to do it the other way, through creation of specific plans, rather than the monolithic way. What about more of an organic process, albeit with a lot more work. I have a specific question for City Council members. I'm not quite clear what the July 1, 2007 deadline is, what it entails and what is driving this process with such speed? I want to know what it would take for the City Council to vote this down, because this is only an advisory body and frankly I don't know if anything the advisory body says will deter the City Council from approving the project.

John Wacker, resident of Sunkist Park: I have been coming to these meetings since the first one at El Rincon School. I'm a concerned resident. Many speakers addressed that this CAC is formed, assuming that this project will go through. We're not being asked to participate on this project. Gary Silbiger mentioned in last week's meeting that this is an experimental process. To me this is as experimental as can be. So what I've done in efforts to discuss with others such as Chip Netzel, as representatives along with property owners, we're going to go ahead on our own to form a committee to address the City Council to cancel this project and start all over. These people (CAC) have been appointed by the City Council to move this project forward. After this meeting concludes, representatives from the community (not the CAC) are going to meet and put together a strategy to go to City Council to get this project cancelled and to put together a proposal the community wants.

Chip Netzel, resident of Sunkist Park: I'd like to focus on the committee here since you continue to be the recommending body. I'd like to find out how each of you feel about this rendering, because this is your home. It says on the agenda (Agenda Item #5), "Once concluded, CAC members will consider the plans and their refinement." Speak up. I want to hear what you have to say. Talk. This is 65 units per acre in density; the Planning Commission may start to talk about this. Are 65 units per acre a good thing? Why not bring that number down. (Addressing Bob Champion): Bring shade and shadow boards next time. I took a look at all three architects' proposals for this project and of the shade and shadows boards I saw at City Hall, only one showed 8 a.m. shadows. The adjacent residents will not have any sun from 8:00 a.m. to about 11 a.m.

Jennifer Ryba, Segrell Way resident: A lot of my points have been made so I'll try not to repeat. This is too tall and too dense. I like the ideas of having restrictions changed. There is no reason why this has to be built to the maximum it can be. It's too big for the area. Mr.

Champion you tell us you will reduce traffic by getting rid of driveways, but it won't do much. I can't imagine people who work in the retail portions of the project would be able to live and work in same area, since they cannot afford the \$300,000 units. To the question about power lines -- you can't bury them, because the Mobile 75 oil lines are below ground. Most people in the neighborhood will not be able to afford to shop at the retailers within the project. Point about website posting -- you have to go through so many layers to get the information. I asked at the ACOR meeting that all meetings on this project be posted. Shade and shadow boards, we asked you to bring them. We don't see them.

Male member of the audience: I walk to work everyday. When I walk home at 4:00 p.m. everyday at Jefferson and Slauson, I see five to seven cars a day waiting to come out of the alley because they can't turn left. The light there lasts 15 seconds. On Berryman, if there are seven cars turning right or left, they can't exit the alley unless they exit through Sunkist Park. At Sawtelle and Sepulveda I see ten cars that are backed up past Culver Park Drive. And this is without 1,200 additional residents. I don't see how you are going to be able to mitigate that. You can't change the alley, but you will increase the number of cars.

Mary Banks Levine, Sunkist Park resident: First, I have lived almost 20 years in Sunkist Park. The area does need renovation. At the last meeting there was mention of taxes. If you don't have new developments to tax, you have to tax existing to maintain the same level of City services, right? Basically if you don't get new projects to provide additional taxes to the City, then existing property owners have to pay more by levying creased taxes, is that correct?

Allan Goldman: We'll answer all the questions all at once.

Mary Banks Levine: Also, are you considering solar energy, so not to put an additional strain on resources we now have?

Carlos Gutierrez, Orville Street resident: I grew up in the City. I am 40 something years old and have lived for 30 years in the City. If you are going through with this project, think of the children. At least have something for the kids included within the project. I live on Orville, and want something like a movie theater, or family fun center -- something we can walk our kids to. Traffic on Sepulveda is horrendous. You can get stuck in it for hours. You are getting rid of three bars. I would like to walk to a place to relax and get a drink, a place to get away from my home, where I don't want to drive home drunk. (Right now he can walk home from the bars). How many

tourist dollars are we going to get? Think of the neighboring dads like me who want to have a beer at the bar.

Parvis Shahabi, Segrell Way resident: #1- Thousands of cars are going to go through our neighborhood as a result of this project. We are going to suffer. After 4:30 p.m. every day on Segrell it is horrible. Lots of these people have grandkids. They can't walk on Segrell. I hope this project will not be approved. There's going to be eight to ten people living in these condos and it's going to be worse. Ms. Anderson talked to me, but I don't understand. Are you (CAC) here to push the project through or are you here to listen? According to one of my neighbors, they got a meeting notice flyer two days after the last CAC meeting was held. We have lots of senior citizens (on Segrell) with no where to go. I've been here for over 40 years. We are going to be living in Hell (if this project goes through). Next time, send a flyer for the next CAC meeting ahead of time.

Charles Holt: Unfortunately I had to run here from work. The reason I want to address you is because what really bothers me is finances to the City. I don't live on Segrell, but have friends who live there. We're going to need more infrastructure; such as schools, Police, and Fire. Somebody needs to give us an estimate to determine if this project will pay for itself or not, from the City's perspective.

Female Audience Member: Where is Fire Station going to be moved to, because if we will have 800 new residents, we need one to be nearby.

Mike Casey, resident in neighborhood: Are you (CAC) representatives of us, or of the City Council? Are you your own voice? Do you have their ear more than we do? Written Comment submitted for the record: Traffic congestion, over development and greed are just a few of many problems with the current plans for development. Mike Casey was the last speaker card.

CAC members Marianne Kim and Howard Lichtman spoke further:

Marianne Kim: Increased traffic has come up over and over again. I want to know more about the economics of how much and to what extent existing infrastructure will be impacted. With or without this project, traffic will get worse. It's getting worse. To the extent this project impacts existing traffic, Bob Champion will have to address this. I see an absence of analytical data from the City for the members and public to make a decision. (Addressing question about whose side CAC is on). I can't speak for everyone, but I didn't come into this process with prejudice. Public Works, Finance,

Redevelopment, and Transportation can provide some answers. I would like to see that type of independent data analysis will be generated by them.

Howard Lichtman: I want to follow up on comments people have made. I found out about this position from the local newspapers. I've lived here since 1983, and I love living here. I'm serving on the CAC because I want what is best for the community. I'm not here to represent the City Council.

Allan Goldman: Ms. Gross, would you like to respond to any of the questions?

Vice Mayor Carol Gross: Let me answer a few questions that pertain to the City Council. At this point it would be very inappropriate for any City Council or the CAC to go on record one direction or another. It's our job and their job to listen to what everyone says. When the time comes for them to collectively make decisions, it will come. It's not right for someone to demand them to say where they stand now. We're sitting here tonight to be a resource and listen and address all of you. Regarding the Fire Station; it is moving to Bristol Parkway in Fox Hills. Some of projects in Fox Hills are at least as dense as this project. Regarding the old Fire Station parcel being sold to construct single family homes – we have contemplated that idea. I know we have advanced the City's General Fund money to get the new Fire Station built that would be paid back by the old stations land sale. We asked the County, the State, and went all the way to Washington DC in hopes of securing additional funds for the new Fire Station construction, but a good portion of its construction cost will be funded by the sale of the former station's land. Secondly, the City Council hasn't voted on this project yet. The only thing the City Council has voted to do is to have a conversation with Bob Champion. We are listening to his ideas, and have been asked to contemplate them. We've included you in this conversation. This CAC committee is seen as another means to include the community in that conversation. Because we are at the beginning of the process in evaluating the feasibility of a project, no one has all the answers. In answer to the question of "Why didn't you talk to us from the beginning of the process?" and "Why don't you (City Council) have all the answers?" The thing is you can't have it both ways. If we move forward with the project, an Environmental Impact Report will be done. It will take a look at traffic, noise, and the impacts during construction. It will also look at impacts on all City services and infrastructure. In building of this project, a lot of existing infrastructure will be improved and upgraded at the expense of the developer. This is what we get from other projects in the City. You guys can contact us at anytime. We

(she and Gary Silbiger) are the two that comprise the Subcommittee who represent the City Council on this project. We are always willing to talk. I want to point out, some years ago; we had the Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan, which was created through input from a number of community visioning meetings and design guidelines were adopted at that time. As for the façade improvement program the Redevelopment Agency had, which put money out there to get business owners to improve their own buildings; I think only three -- the Serrano Market, Hardware store, and Big Lots took advantage of it. Even though we went door to door offering them the program which included payment of the majority of the expense to rehabilitate their buildings. Regarding taxes; the economic reality of it, as one lady pointed out tonight, is our expenses continue to grow. So to preserve our existing high level of City services, the choices become economic development, increased taxes or fees to our businesses and residents, or lowering the quality and level of services the City now offers. This is the kind of discussion we City Councilmembers have to look at. Max Paetzold (the Traffic Engineer associated with the City) - can clarify what's happening with traffic issues in Sunkist Park. Can you speak about traffic?

Max Paetzold came up to the podium to talk about traffic mitigation issues and measures independent of the Sepulveda project that are taking place in the adjacent Sunkist Park neighborhood.

Max Paetzold: I do know the Public Works Department has been sponsoring meetings in the Sunkist Park neighborhood and has developed a Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Plan. Sunkist Park has been divided into four parts in that plan. There is questionnaire being mailed out soon asking the residents to provide a simple yes/no to whether or not they vote to proceed with implementing the proposed plan. I am not really in touch with that project as it has been overseen by Gabe Garcia. Regarding the oil pipeline, it is a Mobil 75 pipeline that was abandoned 10-15 years ago and has subsequently been steam cleaned and given to City as an asset. Now the pipeline has fiber optics running through it, and the City gains fee from it. It would be expensive for you to pick up and move it. It is an asset to the City and an ongoing source of revenue. As far as traffic goes, Bob Champion's project is a moving target based on the desires of community. There was mention of 800 + units, but there is also retail involved. When the time comes for a project to be analyzed, we'll do a traffic study. I can give you some numbers though. Average trips for a single family home is 9.5 daily trips. For condos it is less than that six daily trips, for apartments, seven. On retail it depends on the value, if it is a restaurant versus a mortuary, they will have different traffic trips associated with them. It's something we have to evaluate

as it is determined in order to do a thorough and accurate traffic impact analysis. If a particular business was a big draw- it would generate a different number of trips as well, but usually something like a big draw (e.g. a movie theater) it would only be busy at a particular time of day or week. If it were offices, it would be busy during peak hour traffic.

Allan Goldman received one final speaker card and asked Peter Messinger to come up to the podium.

Peter Messinger: I am the owner of The Aquarium on Sepulveda and Sawtelle. What makes me very upset is that you keep bringing up the fact that businesses were offered money to make them look better, and that little businesses took the money to make their places look nice. You don't bring up fact that businesses that look shabby and the two that were fixed up are all going to be bulldozed anyway. I know personally four to five property owners are not interested in selling, which means that the only way to do this project is by eminent domain, to take the parcels by force because they most won't sell.

Councilmember Gary Silbiger: Thank you for coming today. The reason we established the advisory committee is to be able to more effectively communicate with the community and its formation is somewhat of an experiment, as the City Council and the Agency were trying to figure out what would be the best way to obtain input from the community. At any point if we can improve the process, we are open to hearing your suggestions. We have a variety of possibilities regarding this project at this point, and we are nowhere near making a decision about it yet. We thought this time we'd have a different way of getting information from the public, through establishment of an advisory committee. They would give us advice. I think these kinds of forums are helpful to us. No one has made any decision and we are looking at the information we are receiving. This is my feeling on the type of relationship you CAC members have to City Council. It's like taking an exam; you do your homework first before being faced with a decision to make. Regarding the public notices not getting to people, this is something we can deal with. It shouldn't be difficult, but often is. If you have suggestions on how to better publicly notice the meetings, please let us know. Regarding traffic, I think we should have more information on it as well. Keep letting us know, by email, phone, or coming to our house. This is the only way democracy will work.

Woman in the Audience: A lot of people have made comments to us about where we are in the process. When I talk to other people, the biggest question that comes up is why? He (Bob Champion) had a

nice idea, but I haven't seen anyone else's visions, because the City Council voted only to look at Bob Champion's vision. So, if you (the public) don't like this vision, you're automatically assumed to be in the category that seems like you want things to stay the same. So I feel like there's only one choice at this point. We only have the choice to see this vision whittled down, rather than built another, different vision.

Vice Mayor Carol Gross responded to the woman's comments with a little background on how the relationship was established with Bob Champion and how his project was started.

Vice Mayor Carol Gross: Bob Champion originally came to us three years ago, with an idea that no one had talked about or looked at. We played around with it. Then the project kind of went away for a while. We came back to his idea and thought maybe we should take a more serious look at it. As you become more serious with a developer, you enter into an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with them. It does not bind us to anything except while we are talking to him (Bob Champion) we aren't talking to other developers at the same time. When someone comes to you and says they have a great idea for you and for your business, do you say hey, let me get someone else to implement your idea? That doesn't mean we go on and do it. We give him (Bob Champion) the respect to have the conversation only with him, and then we turn around and see what else we can do if it doesn't pan out.

An outburst occurs and a man yells about representation on the City Council and other audience members begin talking at the same time. Bob Champion comes back up front to address the crowd.

Bob Champion: I think there are a few misconceptions voiced tonight that I'd like to address and clarify. First, the overriding concern that you aren't being listened to; The mere fact that this CAC exists means you are voicing your concerns now and in fact is the process you want. This is not being done in a vacuum. There is a huge difference in this process than other projects I see being developed. As far as my involvement, I will tell your story quickly. There was an RFP for developing in the City's Downtown area a few years ago. I responded to it, but wasn't chosen. Then Assistant Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency said to me- "I'm familiar with your work, would you be interested in looking at other parts of the City's redevelopment areas where you could make a positive contribution to the City?" I took a look at different areas in the City and saw the potential of the Sepulveda site. All you people are here to oppose my project. I'll tell you this. The project I propose won't be built. The

project that will be built if at all will be based on your input. A project that is best for the community as a whole, not just the Sunkist Park neighborhood. Is everyone in this room going to be happy? This process will make sure all these issues will be raised and addressed. The decision whether or not to proceed with a project won't be made by me.

Outburst from a Male Audience Member: What percent you think in this room will be happy (Bob)?

Bob Champion: Every community I've been in, when you check my record, has embraced the project I constructed. I'm known as a consensus building developer. This project adheres to the City's General Plan. I was asked to propose a project based on your City's General Plan. This project is within the scope of the General Plan and the City's existing Zoning. In fact, in the most recent reiteration, it goes beyond the Code requirements. The (General) Plan doesn't require my project to be tiered as much as it is, to have more and larger courtyards, or for windows to face inward instead of the back. But my project does. Regarding why this is a monolithic project? This project isn't going to be built all at one time. It will be done in a series of four stages for a number of reasons. If it was built all at one time, the construction activities would have a huge impact. It's done in phases to accommodate relocation of desirable business tenants back into the earlier phases. Why not have individual property owners do their own piece-meal redevelopment projects? Trust me this is what you want to see because if you do it with a bunch of individual developers, you'll end up with hodge-podge development. Let's see how parking is going to work, how retail is going to interact. Let's look at it in the totality. How do we address egress and ingress? How do we integrate parking so it's properly designed? I walked the street today. Almost all properties have walls. You can't drive across to the other shops since they don't share parking areas. That's not good planning and development. I walked the streets top to bottom. I had to continually confront cars. There was no pedestrian orientation; no livable street. The reason people do these types of pedestrian-oriented projects is to look at the area in its totality. I have said at two other meetings, that I have taught planning and real estate at USC for 9 years. Right now market forces have made housing projects the lands highest and best use. If this site was broken apart and developed by different developers, they are going to have all housing. Let's not have the tail wag the dog. Just because housing justifies best and highest use, I didn't just put in all housing. I wanted to have other uses too. (Regarding The Aquarium owner's concerns about losing his business) I never said I was going to not allow The Aquarium back into the project. Ultimately the decision to do this

project will be made by the City Council. It comes down to money. The only use and tenant I find offensive is the Just Tire store. It's just not a good use to be located next to the remainder of the project. I don't think Just Tires should have a prime place at the gateway entrance into the City. I think a lot of existing tenants there should remain there. Let's talk about specifics. If we are going to build out this project in its entirety, it should be built in four phases. So, I am not proposing 800 units to be built at one time. 250 residential units in the first phase comprising 90,000 square feet. There is 170,000 square feet of retail right now in this first phase. I'm replacing it with more viable retail. In urban planning, you look for a good urban mix: such as an anchor, sub anchor, smaller shop space, in appropriate percentages and complimentary adjacent uses. You don't have it today. Not a single restaurant there.

Male Member of the Audience interrupts: King Kabob.

Bob Champion: Oh yes, that's right. I like King Kabob. Here's the beauty you don't understand. If we do this together, define this project area, what the project will become, you will have the opportunity to add controls that you wouldn't get with an individual developer if you want to enact specific improvements, we can do that now. If you want to take the loading docks which are exposed and incorporate them, so you won't see them, we can do that. Those are conditions that we can work on together to make the project better. You won't have the chance to do that unless you have created a forum such as this. We can talk about the tenants you want to see. The City Council wants to create vibrancy. You can't do that if you built the area out as 30 different projects. Regarding the comment about there being only one owner; what's the purpose? I am not proposing that I own everything. If we build the project in phases, I am open to have others own other phases. There are some real advantages to having one to four property owners, rather than 30 property owners that exist today as follows. 1. Cohesiveness of traffic mitigation measures: You have raised traffic issues over and over. Part of the reason is because there is no traffic plan covering all parking in the area. You have 30 walls separating the properties unless they go through the rear alley. That is why the alley is a freeway. 2. With one to three property owners you can enact rules and regulations that they must adhere to. If the project is built, those rules and regulations will be Codified on the land and be listed within its Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions. With 33 different property owners with different tenants you won't have the ability to do so, because they won't come to an agreement. As you said, only three property owners took advantage of the Façade Improvement Program to rehabilitate their buildings. In truth, everyone has self interest.

What is best for all of us and the greater good? To all the people who are living across the alley on Segrell, if you have the attitude of let's not do anything, then if you do nothing, you are making a bigger mistake because what's going to happen is something is going to eventually happen anyway in non-cohesive, piece-meal fashion. In this form and process your opinions and desires will be addressed, whereas if 30 different developments were to occur, they won't be. I have the ability to incorporate desirable features into the project. Regarding the 65 units per acre. I didn't grab that number out of the air -- it is from the City's Zoning Code. The problem is that since it is in the Code, other developers will want to try to maximize and build to its full capacity. The project as depicted is allowed by Code. There was a public vote that approved the 56 feet height limit. I didn't approve it. I was given guidelines by the City. I will go out on limb to say this is what I suspect you are all feeling -- it's not that Bob Champion is proposing a project that is too big, it's that the Code allowances are too big for the area. If so, then that's a different issue. With a larger single owner, you have a better chance getting these types of concerns addressed. "I don't want anyone looking in my backyard." Well at the December, 2006 meeting I was asked, can you create a buffer to the adjacent single family homes in your project? I came back with set-backs and tiered the buildings back. These kind of things happened as a result of your input. I'm not the devil. I am the agent of change, but I think I can create change for the good. That's what I do, I work for change. 3. Traffic; let's talk a minute about economics. This project is in a redevelopment area. The reason is, when a project is built in a redevelopment area, to the extent that it creates additional property taxes, your City gets a percentage of that increase in property taxes. Let's say it's 60%. Is that right Joe?

Joe Susca: Actually, the Agency receives 80% of the incremental increase in property taxes in this component area.

Bob: Okay, let's say 80% for purposes of illustrating an example. The next step is when that increased property tax increment is created by the project, it can be bonded to create funding now. It means the City can choose to use those bond revenues for off-site public improvements. A project creates a tremendous amount of dollars to fund other City services and infrastructure projects. The Sepulveda Streetscape Master Plan cost \$4 million, but wasn't implemented. Funds created by this project could pay for it. We talked about tentative approval of the creation of an extra southbound lane on Sepulveda. Its creation will be a substantial improvement on traffic. 4. Currently there are over 40 curb cuts, or driveways, going in and out of the development. This causes a traffic jam. In our project,

there will be four entrances that are signalized. The dwelling units will generate new vehicle trips. If this project mitigates those new vehicle trips, and addresses other concerns prior to the project being built, then that's a good thing. The City is going to make me do an Environmental Impact Report. We will hire a dozen consultants who work for the City to follow the required California Environmental Quality Act process, not for me, and they will analyze all of the impacts generated by the project. They will come back with list of impacts on traffic. A traffic study will be done by 3rd party traffic engineers. Here are the things that need to be done. I will give you the phone number of an official in Pasadena who can vouch for this process. Regarding view obstruction; The way the Zoning Code and General Plan are written, I can obstruct the view 100% if I chose to do it without the involvement of the Redevelopment Agency's input. I said I don't want to do one project, but create a master plan for the area. If you look at the building "fingers" (openings to courtyards that face the rear alley) that are on the upper floors, we have done this on purpose to create open space and introduce light into the courtyards. Someone said, "Well Bob, you didn't show us a direct view (in the photo mock-up renderings). You can't see anything. "Well you need perspective to show distance. The angle of the drawing wasn't done to trick anyone. The truth is the alley is 30 feet wide. This particular home is set 30 feet from the alley. The first three stories comprise 39 feet, which is better than a 56 feet high wall. In-between the fingers are 40 feet of open space so you are really looking back 120 additional feet. You have a 30 feet yard plus 30 feet alley. Then 39 feet high three story building and then the upper two floors are 120 feet away. We can do further refinements to make this better. That can happen through consensus development. We are not doing this in a vacuum. This is my third meeting. I have addressed some of the concerns, and I am sure some of the project will change. 5. Loss of tenants. I have said before, I have no problem reincorporating them back into the project. It is up to the City Council. The truth is these tenants have leases. When their leases expire, every one of those tenants will be faced with their landlords. When their lease is up, they will have their rents increased up to market rates. Some tenants are paying \$1 per square foot. Some are paying \$3 per square foot, which is closer to market rent. When you're favorite tenant's lease expires, and their rent goes up, and they will have to pay or leave the shop they occupy. But this is a Redevelopment Agency project, so we can help those tenants relocate back into the project. By state law the Redevelopment Agency pays reimbursement for relocation and loss of business goodwill because it's part of an Agency project. If a lease expires and the project doesn't happen, then they don't get any money from their landlord, because it's not an Agency project any longer. Let's focus on structuring a deal on how those tenants can

stay – we can use the Redevelopment Agency's powers and funds to do that. Regarding children and schools. If the CAC representative to check my references talks to the City of Burbank officials; they will confirm what kinds of people are buying those dwelling units. Less than 10 of those units have families at all. The average cost of the Burbank condos is \$600,000, with some as low as \$400,000. The people buying those condos are typically those people who work within the Burbank City limits so they can afford to live there and stop commuting. Regarding the impact on schools and services that will be analyzed as part of the Environmental Impact Report.

Male Audience Member interrupts: Who at the City does that?

Joe Susca: The Economic Development Department prepares economic impacts of a project and the Planning Division oversees environmental and other impacts. When the proper analysis and reports are generated, they will be made available for everyone to see. Regarding new traffic signals and other traffic mitigation measures – what will occur is we will see what is recommended for implementation through completion of the traffic study. Regarding the 56 feet height limit, as I understand it, the only architectural features allowed above 56 feet is architectural fenestrations such as an elevator tower, HVAC equipment, etc.

Laurel Gillette: An example of something that could be above 56 feet is if an elevator that goes above top floor, you'll need extra space above the roof line to be able to have the elevator stop on the roof.

Bob Champion: I am saying publicly that I am not building above 56 feet.

Chip Netzel from the audience interrupts: What happens if you change your mind?

Bob Champion: Then I won't be allowed to build the project. There will be a public hearing process to review and entitle the project. I am saying right now, I am not proposing anything above 56 feet. Regarding the Fire Station, I think that question has already been answered. Regarding overhead power/cable/telephone lines; these lines already exist. Regarding loading docks and children. Regarding shade and shadows studies. I didn't read that it in meeting notes that I said that I would bring shade and shadow studies to this meeting, but I will do so at the next meeting, and show shadows at different times of the day, including one from 8:00 a.m.

Dorothy Inman: I have to leave. This should be a shorter meeting. I

have to take my mother home. My last words again are that this project is too big.

Bob Champion: Only three more things. Regarding Solar energy, there hasn't been a mixed use project that I am aware of or my architectural team is aware of that has been LEED Certified.

Marianne Kim: You should explain LEED again.

Bob Champion: A discussion about LEED certification took place at the last meeting. It is a movement taking place in the USA, primarily in the office building market, in which developers are building with more environmental and sustainable impacts being addressed. They do things to those buildings to make them more energy efficient. There is a whole list of things you do to get LEED certified. Last question regarding the absence of analytical data. That is something I cannot really do, it is up to staff to prepare the analysis.

After Bob Champion finished answering concerns, Chair Allan Goldman invited any last questions from the audience to address Mr. Champion.

Allan Goldman: We have other items on the agenda. So we will limit the remaining questions to ten minutes.

Chip Netzel: Regarding the timeline. When is this going to be scheduled to go to the City Council?

Joe Susca: No date has been set. It is not scheduled at this point, so we have some flexibility. Once the CAC has concluded their consideration of the project, I will publicly announce the date of the Agency meeting in which the project will be considered either through letter or postcard to the adjacent neighborhoods as I have done so in the past.

Peter Messinger: Regarding who's going to go into new project. I've heard your comments regarding 30 curb cuts. I don't see how a few new signals will solve the existing or increased traffic impacts generated by this project.

Bob Champion: This is a comment, not a question. This ten minute period was meant for questions.

Male Audience Member: You did not answer the distance question from vehicles exiting the alley from the project. I commented that sometimes there are more than seven cars backed up in the alley

waiting to exit during rush hour periods, and they can't turn onto Sawtelle, creating traffic congestion.

Bob Champion: When a traffic study is done, we can look at that issue. For now here is list of possible solutions off the top of my head. We can create right turn only lanes, add speed bumps, or make the alley a one-way. There are a whole lot you can do when designing traffic flows for the project.

Male Audience Member: Is there Section 8, or low income housing in this project? You make us worry about another developer coming in and building to the 56 feet height limit, but I've never seen that occurring in the last 40 years here, so why would the City Council approve a project like that.

Bob Champion: There is no Section 8 housing in the project. Your City changed its Zoning Code to allow mixed use. This project is result of that change.

Resident on Segrell Way: As far as shade and shadow, I thought of possibly adding solar voltaic or solar heat and water. This development may block my access to the sun for this purpose.

Female Audience Member: How much parking do you have planned for customers and employees?

Bob Champion: One parking space per 1,000 square feet of commercial, If you have a sit down restaurant, it would be more like one parking space per 350 square feet. For a one bedroom condo, it would be 1 parking space, 2 bedroom, 2 parking spaces and so forth. Typically you build excess parking and can allocate them to the excess parking or have people buy parking for excess spots.

Female Audience Member: You mention a market, how many parking spaces will be created for that?

Bob Champion: For a 30,000 square foot market, 120 spaces.

Female Audience Member: I thought the alley will be eliminated.

Bob Champion: Not true.

Female Audience Member: What happened to the office space? Last time I saw the plans I thought there was an office building.

Bob Champion: I got rid of it because office space requires a lot of

parking and due to the exiting office space market.

Male Audience Member: Is it standard to scale back? When does commerce become more important than quality of life?

Bob Champion: I am interested in building a project. I am willing to work with the City Council and the CAC on a project that is viable. When we go to assemble the land, we must pay fair market value for it. What dictates fair market value of land for an appraiser is what has been sold in the surrounding area. If the Code allows 65 units to the acre and nearby someone built 65 units to the acre, then I need to pay the value of that land based upon it. It's hard to compare apples to apples. I built a project that was over 100 units to the acre in Gas Lamp District in San Diego. You can't operate in a vacuum and do nothing because market forces will continue to occur in this area. Already by doing nothing, you are making decisions that are negatively affecting the City. It is a balancing act where you have to accept a certain amount of negatives in exchange for the positives you want to get out of a project. To the extent you want me to build something less big; we will need to work out tradeoffs.

Allan Goldman: Last question.

Male Audience Member: You said the State won't allow you to pay less than fair market value. There is an implication that we won't be able to agree on a price. It sounds like you are going to take my property and the State says you can't pay less than the fair market value.

Bob Champion: What ends up happening with most property acquisition deals is that there is usually no eminent domain taking. Usually negotiations take place prior to that step and a price is agreed upon by both parties. When you sell your property, when you have the potential for eminent domain, the Redevelopment Agency has rules to give you incentives you normally wouldn't get if someone else bought the property, such as the ability to preserve existing property taxes when acquiring replacement property. I don't know the track record in the City, but my guess is that most time they haven't used eminent domain to acquire the land.

Allan Goldman: There was a question asked who we (the CAC) represent. We represent the entire community, including its residents, businesses and property owners. We will make up our minds when Ms. Kim comes back with references from Pasadena and Burbank. We will have a better understanding of what the impacts Champion Development has had upon those communities. Then

we'll continue to listen to what everyone has to say about density, height, etc. As far as the City Council's decision, we can't address that. But I am sure they will take everything said here into account. Thank you everyone for hanging in so late.

Marianne Kim: I think we've asked this question before. This is a question to City staff. In terms of loss of tenants, can you describe how you brought tenants back into other projects.

Joe Susca: I have been with the Redevelopment Agency for two years and in a few of my projects, I have successfully relocated the majority of those tenants. As far as those tenants who want to come back into my projects, none have, but those were individual choices, partially stemming from having to await completion of construction of the project. There are a number of incentives staff can work in harmony with a developer for a tenant to come back into the project if it is a use the neighborhood desires.

Loni Anderson: I know that one of our members is calling Pasadena and Burbank, but I would like to ask staff to get Ms. Kim to talk to a member of one of those neighboring community groups (who are affected by those projects).

Laura Stuart: I live at 11389 Segrell Way. Come by my house. Come see me. Write me notes and share with me your concerns and questions. We can sit there, or walk the streets if you like. I understand.

Allan Goldman: Joe, I believe some questions were asked of staff. Any more comments to make?

Joe Susca: I wanted to comment on public noticing. A notice was posted six days prior to the meeting, which I believe is more than the 72 hours required by the Brown Act, but we can do better. This meeting was also posted on the City's website. After the May 2nd meeting there hasn't been any other meetings discussing this project, and the next CAC meeting is on June 6, 2007 at the Rotunda Room in the Veterans Memorial Complex.

J. Marvin Campbell: Joe, isn't there a form on the website they can submit comments to?

Joe Susca: Yes, if the community would like to directly communicate with the CAC member, they can fill out the form on the web page. Also on the web page is the ability to be added to the e-mail distribution list used for public noticing that members of the audience

are encouraged to fill out. Regarding the distribution of flyers for prior meetings and their arriving two days late, I didn't distribute any flyers, so that must have been someone else.

Chip Netzel: I asked a question about the view preservation, and a similar question was asked about what Sunkist Park views would be toward the Crest mountains, and whether or not those views are in jeopardy of being taken away or not.

Carol Gross: I may be wrong, but there may be a view shed ordinance that applied to Culver Crest.

Gary Silbiger: Yes. It was limited and had to do with views on hilly areas, where residents who purchased homes with a view have those views protected.

Howard Lichtman: The ordinance that was passed relates to plant foliage of an adjacent home owner that may be trimmed as a result of view obstructions. It has to do with foliage, not building heights.

Allan Goldman: The next CAC meeting is scheduled to meet on June 6, 2007 at the Veterans Memorial Complex. Because the length of that meeting will probably be longer, I am going to ask the committee to have follow up with an additional meeting after that. That should be the fifth and final meeting as part of this review process. Everyone is curious as to where each committee member stands and wants to hear our opinions. At our next meeting we will have actual facts as to impacts of Champion Development's projects to other communities to aid us in our consideration of the project.

Asher Schechter: I will make the motion to have additional meeting on June the 27, 2007.

Laura Stuart. Culver Expo is on the 27th.

Allan Goldman: It ends at 7:00 p.m.

J. Marvin Campbell: I second the motion for June 27th.

Allan Goldman: All those in favor.

Vote: All Ayes.

Allan Goldman: Could staff secure a location for us and announce it at the June 6, 2007 meeting so there won't be any questions as to where it will be?

Joe Susca: Yes.

Adjournment A call for adjournment was made. Loni Anderson made the initial motion and J. Marvin Campbell seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEPULVEDA REDEVELOPMENT
CITIZENS ADVISORY CAC

DRAFT (UNADOPTED) MINUTES OF THE
JUNE 27, 2007 MEETING

Call to Order: The meeting of the Sepulveda Redevelopment Citizens Advisory CAC (the "CAC") was called to order by Allan Goldman, Chair at 7:45 p.m. at the El Marino Language School, 11450 Port Road.

Roll Call: Members present: Allan Goldman, Chair
Loni Anderson, Vice Chair
J. Marvin Campbell
James Jun
Howard Lichtman
Marianne Kim
Asher Schechter
Laura Stuart
Marla Osband

Excused Absence:

Staff Present: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director
Joe Susca, Redevelopment Project Manager
Todd Tipton, Redevelopment Administrator
John Fisanotti, Acting Redevelopment Administrator
Max Paetzold, Traffic Engineering Manager
Sherry Jordan, Senior City Planner
Carol Schwab, City Attorney
Jerry Fulwood, City Manager

Council Present: Alan Corlin, Mayor
Carol Gross, Vice Mayor
Gary Silbiger, Council Member
Scott Malsin, Council Member

Absent: Steven Rose (due to conflict of interest)

Development Team Present: Bob Champion, Champion Development Staff from KTG Y Group, Inc. Architects

Project Manager's Report: Allan Goldman: Requested a motion be made to accept the Project Manager's Report of public noticing.
Vice Chair Loni Anderson offered a motion and it was seconded by Laura Stuart.
Vote: All ayes.

Approval of Minutes: Marianne Kim motioned, and Marla Osband seconded the motion for approval of the minutes from the May 22, 2007 meeting.
Vote: All ayes.

Conceptual Plans Discussion: Allan Goldman stated that at this time we are going to move forward and invite Bob Champion up to discuss additional shade and shadows he has brought. Allan also introduced City staff present that evening, including Joe Susca, Project Manager for this project; Bob Champion developer, Todd Tipton Redevelopment Administrator; and Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director.

Bob Champion: At the last meeting, we were asked to do two things. One by the CAC and one by staff. We were asked to do more extensive shade studies. If you look on the right side wall, we've done more extensive shade studies of the project at any given time of the year both at 9 a.m. and 12 noon which shows the variations of the shade throughout the seasons. The other thing that we were asked to do was to go back by staff, and look at redoing a revised landscaping plan whereby we would have landscaping both on the west side of the alley and also, in the raised planter areas on the east side of the alley in order to diffuse the new building's view from the alley and residents on the west side of that alley and that rendering, I believe, is on the back wall. The third thing we were asked to do was to create a straight on perceptive view from the backyard of an adjacent Segrell house. People said they felt the prior perceptive we did didn't give as good a view of what the project would look like from the backyard of the adjacent residents. We did another rendering which shows a straight on view as if you are looking at the backyard looking straight at the building. I believe those three things are the things we were asked to bring to the meeting tonight. One final thing was that there were questions regarding the setback of the project. In the last meeting, I stated that I believe that our project exceeded the setback requirements set forth by the City. Although I said I wasn't positive about that but I would have our architects check. I believe on the back wall there is a schematic that shows the proposed project,

the alley, and the wall. It shows the line of where the project could have been built as it relates to the current Code and it shows where the project actually is in relationship to that line. I think you will all see when you look at that that the project is set back on the average, 8 to 10 feet further away from the setbacks that would normally be required by the City, meaning that the project exceeds the setbacks by that degree. If there are any questions that the CAC would like to ask me, I am more than happy to answer them.

Joe Susca: I want to mention that in addition to the agenda that is being passed out at the door when you came in; there are a number of additional documents, including one called "Frequently Asked Questions" that I would like the audience members to review. It is a lot of additional information and, indeed, they are frequently asked questions we thought would be useful information to everyone at this time.

CAC Member Comments: Allan Goldman: At this time, I would like to call upon CAC Member Marianne Kim to give her report on the background check that we have done on the other projects that Champion Development has built. I want to thank Marianne first of all as a volunteer as she took her own time and a lot of hours to perform this task. I know the CAC appreciates her time on the fact finding mission she did.

Marianne Kim: Basically, I checked out all three projects that Bob Champion had been involved in the recent past. These were his references. I did not really expect to see anything really terrible because these are his references. It is very rare that someone would give you bad references. It is still a good exercise in learning how these experiences he had gone through in the past with these other projects. I looked at three projects. One had to do with the Gas Lamp City Square, which is in San Diego, the Burbank Collection and the Pasadena Collection. I had a chance to look at the Gas Lamp City Square. The Gas Lamp is very close to the Convention Center, down the street from Petco Park. It is about 65,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space. It has four floors of condos and about 580 parking spaces. There are a lot of mixed use projects and it is very similar to different types of projects in that area. The Burbank Collection has about 180 condominiums. It is part of the Burbank Entertainment Village. I am not sure how many of you have been down to the Downtown Burbank area, but it has 40,000 square feet of retail shops, 180 condominiums and is part of Phase 2 for revitalization of the area. Phase 1 was the AMC Theater that was built. The Pasadena Collection is also a mixed use project. It has 72 condos and 20,000 square feet of retail and restaurants. It has office spaces and some lofts as well. It was one of the first mixed use

projects that Pasadena was involved with. I had several questions and these questions to ask that were already developed by the CAC before I went to them. One had to do with impact to City services. The housing development initially affecting the infrastructure for the community and specifically has to do with fire, police and those types of mitigation measures. A lot of these projects are in downtown areas and, as a result, the situation is a little different than what is going on over here on Sepulveda Boulevard. Their requirements are a little different and the setting is a little different. The Gas Lamp district is in a special downtown development zone. They have their own requirements. It is a very nice building. Bob Champion was required to install some amenities and improve sidewalks, and mitigate dust and noise pollution during construction. He had to play into a downtown feel, where downtown development zones that compliment fire, police, infrastructure and all those other things. It is not similar to here because we don't have a separate overlay zone, or separate development fee for specific impacts. He had to pay into a fund to mitigate the project's impacts. I think it was noted that it was required that everyone else didn't pay and he didn't pay for anything beyond what was required in the EIR. In Burbank, the extra burdens were taken on because of the additional residents and retail generated sufficient additional revenues for the City to be able to pay for the additional services necessary. One of the interesting things that happened in Burbank was that the city saw this as an opportunity to build some additional parking spaces and so they worked with Champion to do so. They paid for their portion of additional parking spaces themselves, but if they had constructed them alone, by themselves, it would have cost them more money. It shows the opportunity that if the city wants something they can work with the developer to implement it in a faster and less costly manner than if the city had done it themselves. In the Pasadena Collection, Champion was required to complete an EIR and traffic analysis. Pasadena requires a lot of things from its developers. They threw in everything they could plus the kitchen sink. One of the things Public Works required was to conduct a sewer study and upgrade the sewer system. Those were examples of what Champion paid for. They all said they were happy with the projects results.

The other question that everyone was concerned about was density. In Culver City, which is 65 units per acre and we wanted to know based on the impact of the project in their city did their city want to go forward with similar density levels. I think their dwelling units were pretty high because it is a downtown area. In the Gas Lamp area the buildings were tall. I wish I was able to show it to you on PowerPoint because you can see the giant buildings that are surrounding Champion's buildings. Building a very tall building with lots of

dwelling per acre is not as big an issue there because there are so many other buildings that are like that. In Burbank, the area was known for 58 units per acre which is lower than Culver City has. Burbank was interesting because they actually down zoned after the Champion project and they made a point that it did not have anything to do with the Champion project at all. They went from the 58 units per acre to 43 units per acre. The Council simply made a decision that they did not want to grow as fast. Pasadena was all over the place with their dwellings per acre. They were happy with what was produced in the end.

In terms of height, height is another concern that a lot of people have here. We asked the question what the city height limit is and did Champion build up to the height limit. In Culver City our height limit is 56 feet or five stories. We asked the question were they happy with this height limit. With Gas Lamp the height limit was 75 feet and they built about 68 feet. In all of these cases, they built to what the zoning allowed them to build to. With the Burbank Collection, Champion built 75 feet. Height is consistent with the surrounding buildings. There are no single family homes around the Burbank area or the Pasadena area. In Burbank the closest residential unit was a senior building and that was a high rise so they did not care that this project was tall. In Pasadena the project area was mostly commercial and the heights varied. Pasadena seems to be that their zoning and building requirements were all over the place. At one point you could have four different height limits. Champion built up to what zoning allowed. City staff mentioned that they were very happy with the height. Champion built a second four-story residential unit next door afterward.

A lot of people were concerned about property values and that is another question we asked about. We said members of the community, especially those that resided in single family homes, felt that their property values would decline, and what is your experience with this issue? In all three cases, they said both commercial and residential property around the area increased as a result of the development. We asked questions about displaced businesses. Some of these places don't track property values but based on their experiences property values increased. In a conversation with the Executive Director of the Downtown Business District in Long Beach, he stated their experience in the downtown Long Beach area is that property values and businesses around the development all improved as a result of the development because it brought additional foot traffic.

We asked the question is the developer paying for any of the

infrastructure improvements in the area. This would include street widening, traffic lights, sidewalks, trees, lighting etc. In the Gas Lamp area Champion paid for new sidewalks, trees, lighting around the public street area. Champion paid into a downtown development fee which was a clean and safe program that maintains and upkeeps the property. In Burbank, Champion resurfaced some adjacent streets and added pedestrian lights. In all these places, Champion did what the EIR required. They added landscape improvements also. With Pasadena, along with the sewer system, similarly they added sidewalk and trees which made the aesthetics around buildings much nicer. Average buyers for these types of projects, multi-dwelling units, tend to be single people, young married, no children, retirees, very few families, usually couples. This is difficult to tell with the Burbank Collection as they actually haven't completed construction yet.

We asked the question about the business partners. We wanted to know of any business partners or owners had worked with Champion and were involved in the new development. In Gas Lamp, it was one property Champion bought, the Goodwill building. It was in a blighted area and people were very happy to see them there. With the Burbank area it was a more complicated deal. Again, Champion bought the property from one property owner. AMC, the movie theater company, Champion bought the area to do a two phase building and they couldn't do the second phase so they sold it to Champion. In the Pasadena collection, they bought six to eight properties. None of those businesses actually returned to the building.

The last question had to do with displaced businesses. We asked if the closed businesses were asked to come back into the project after completion and did they have different rents as a result, and if not, did the City help with relocation expenses or anything like that. Gas Lamp, because there were no businesses there, it really didn't make a difference. You just have the Goodwill and they relocated from the property. In Burbank, it wasn't applicable. One thing the city did do in Burbank was, I don't know if we would do this in Culver City, but I am sure a lot of cities do this, is negotiate what types of businesses to bring in. They were concerned there were too many restaurants there so they worked with Champion on those issues. In Pasadena the city didn't help in bringing back the former tenants because it wasn't a redevelopment project. They were offered to come back but there was no requirement to make them come back or to make Champion provide additional incentives to bring them back. City staff expressed again a lot of happiness with the types of businesses that Champion brought in. It is hard again with these projects because they are so

different from what Champion is proposing here. At the same time, you have to look at process too.

What kind of developer is he -- is he responsive, does he work with the community and in all cases . . . in the back of my mind, is this is a job reference..... everybody I spoke to was thoroughly impressed and happy with the work that Champion produced for the city. With that I will conclude.

**Audience
Participation**

Allan Goldman: Marianne, thank you for your time on that. There were approximately 8 to 10 questions asked which the CAC proposed and those are the questions Marianne asked. We only had one person contact the cities and the developments. I also went to three developments to look and must concur with what Marianne said. Burbank is being built as we speak and if any where there was a variance probably allowed would be absolute what Culver City is because there you had a situation where the people are going to impact it are the people who are actually buying those condominiums because they are adjacent to ingress/egress to the AMC multiplex theater that is there. The concern there is just one there are no single family homes adjacent to that project. There is no residential area within blocks of that development. Pasadena is not quite that far away but it is also, and so is the Gas Lamp district, which is more a commercial area as Marianne explained. You have to understand that we did our homework on this; however, because of the projects that were built they do not necessarily relate 100 percent to what is going on here because they don't about an area like Sunkist Park so I want to make everyone aware of that. Once again, Marianne, thank you very much for your time because that was a lot of work.

Is there anything, Mr. Champion that you want to correct or say before turning this over to the CAC to ask Marianne questions since she spoke to the references?

Mr. Champion: I would just want to ask a few things and that is, number 1; all those projects that were described by the CAC are projects that did go through a process where there was community input involved. Different types of community groups than we are dealing with here but definitely we are known for being consensus developers. We go into areas where people want to see the movement. We work with the community to create those improvements and in all cases our track record has been successful. What wasn't mentioned is that the Pasadena project won what is called a Gold Nugget Award and voted to be the best mixed use project in the country for 2004. Our Gas Lamp project was the first mixed use project in Downtown San Diego which served as the

catalyst for the rebuilding of all the Downtown Gas Lamp area. Absolutely these are different projects and different areas and they relate differently but the one thing she did say that I am glad she said and I want to reiterate it is that in all cases property values around where we developed rose without exception. The reason why they rose is because we improved the community and when buyers of the homes perceive that they are moving into a community that is being improved they perceive that as having value. The final comment that I would like make is that in regards to this particular project I have never tried to imply that this project is like my other projects. What I did say is that every project that I do take on personally. I am the owner of my company. I have worked on my projects myself. I go to the community meetings. I take the input I take that input to express in terms of how the project changes over time to meet the consensus of the community and that's what I definitely am interested in trying to do here. Thank you.

Allan Goldman: Thank you. At this time before we go on to with audience participation does the CAC have questions of Marianne on her trip down to the three projects?

CAC Member: One question. I was just wondering for any of these projects were LEED certified, was there any degree of sustainability or design that looked at community conservation and the other question is to what degree were the projects pedestrian friendly and the overall feel of the projects -- were they residential or were they commercial feeling. What was the sense that you got.

Marianne Kim: The whole question of environmental sustainability didn't really come up. I think in a prior meeting here we did say there weren't any mixed-use LEED certified buildings in California yet. Your second question you asked was about pedestrian feel. All three projects were built in areas that were mixed use projects. They were built in downtown areas where they were trying to make an effort to be more pedestrian friendly and so, yes, you had nicer sidewalks, wider sidewalks, more plants, they were all very walkable. You had front shops in the beginning. That is how they were designed to be built.

Allan Goldman: The Burbank Collection is actually located within a pedestrian walkway. There won't be any vehicular traffic directly surrounding the site.

CAC Member: We have noticed that all the references were referring to projects that were not quite apples to apples like our case right here. Is there anything in this portfolio of work that you've perceive

that might be more relative to what we are going through now. Does anyone know if there is a more appropriate project located in our area by any other developer that might shed a little light on how the projects went and what the results were?

Marianne Kim: I think that one of the things I mentioned was what a responsive developer Bob is, and that is one of the things I talked to city staff about. Just because there weren't any single-family homes around those communities in those development areas doesn't mean that people were not participating in community meetings like this one. In Pasadena, in all those areas, there were people who were going to be affected by these projects who attended those meetings and asked specific types of mitigation and other items related their proposed development. In all cases, I think it kind of speaks to how you can work with a developer. Maybe not all those mitigations issues are going to pop up as an issue in this project. That's not the point; it's whether or not you can work with the person. The other issue had to do with whether or not Champion built a good building in the end. Did he build a good product? Again these are job references. Champion gave me three references for projects he did a good job on, and so in all those projects city staff was very happy with the projects that he delivered regarding their quality and success. It means he did a very good job. I think that is one thing we need to keep in mind. Then lastly, I think I gave some examples about how there were cases where the cities asked for certain things that wouldn't have normally appeared in the EIR, like the sewer upgrades in Pasadena or Burbank to ask him to build those extra parking spaces. Even though the city paid for it, they still asked him to build it. Those are areas where they were able to work out agreements with him. Whether it is in this project or another project I would like to see him as a developer.

CAC Member: Was there any provision made for continued community input during the actual building once the project began?

Marianne Kim: I don't think I can answer that question. My guess is that, maybe I'll defer to Bob Champion on this. My guess is that all the things that he would have done for the project were probably listed ahead of time, once you start the project it not like you're going to stop. I don't know if he is keeping a continued relationship with the community.

CAC Member: Thank you, Marianne, for making the calls and I think that what we are hearing is that you keep saying that this is like a job interview, that someone is going to give you the best references, and I think the folks here tonight want to hear what is comparable to their

situation. In other words, homeowners and I actually don't know, maybe Bob can speak on this. Whether there are any projects that he has had that might be comparable to ours to hear from those adjacent residents. Lets hear what they have to say. Also, if there was some community input I'd like to hear from those groups whether they were business groups or homeowners groups. I would actually like to get more in detail in references and I know this is not something you are going to respond to but just kind of opening up to the group here about trying to get a little more detail so that we can look at apples to apples, instead of apples to oranges, but that was a good review in terms of job references and what the other cities had to say. I hope that the city staff was happy with the projects but I want to hear what the residents around those projects had to say as well.

Marianne Kim: Let me quickly say this, I did ask a lot of city staff for community references as well, for information purposes community organizations. It is just that without single family homes around the area, they weren't as organized as some of you folks are around here. So again that doesn't mean that there weren't business groups and some community groups near the place that weren't interested in the project development and had their own concerns and issues that they brought forward to the city or developer – what I think is that in these particular projects there simply were not any community groups that city staff people could refer me to.

CAC Member: Actually I want to ask Bob a question regarding the Wilshire project -- is that up against the O'Malley Hall and was there community input on that project?

Allan Goldman: Bob, why don't you respond, but if you prefer, we can hold off all the answers from you till the end.

CAC Member: In the course of conversation, did anyone touch on the pros or cons of the process? Did they say anything to you that they felt good about the way it was handled or something that would indicate that they were comfortable with Mr. Champion's process and the city's processes?

Marianne Kim: We didn't really talk about the city's process as much. We did talk about how, I think I kind of mentioned this already in terms of the different types of Projects, what the different mitigations were and what aesthetic improvements that the cities wanted and put into the EIR so and said those are things that they had to work with Champion on. They had to negotiate back and forth and they found him responsive to their desires. I didn't get a lot of

negative comments and I said before why but I didn't so there is really nothing to report on that side.

Allan Goldman: Asher, please introduce yourself as you were not here for roll call. Introduce yourself and who you represent.

Asher Schechter: My name is Asher and I am the general manager of Westfield Fox Hills Shoppingtown in Culver City.

Allan Goldman: Okay, Bob, at this time I will pass the microphone onto you but the things that I think the people want to know about first of all is if you can give some input into the environmental impacts of the projects that you have done that we have mentioned. Did the residents continue their input once it had passed after the point where you were approved for the development?

Bob Champion: Am I supposed to remember all those at one time?

Allan Goldman: I'll repeat them.

Bob Champion: Let's take the first one. We had a community meeting here one or two times ago where we went through a whole education process of what LEED Certification is. It started in office buildings and has worked its way into residential now, but as of this moment, we don't know any mixed use projects that have been certified. We checked with the LEED council and there are no parameters yet in place for how to go about getting a mixed use project LEED certified. And that really brings up another point, which is that the community members have asked about looking for other similar examples like Culver City. One of the problems we are having doing that is mix uses; the concept of bringing work/live/play environment into our communities is a concept that started less than ten years ago. Our project in the Gas Lamp which we built in 1992 was the first in that area. Our project in Pasadena was the first in 2004. Now since we have finished building our project in Pasadena, Pasadena has had over 30 additional mixed use projects built. So every project is different and what you do is you try to take this process of gaining a community consensus of what you want to do and applying to an opportunity and making it successful. It is those procedures that you follow, those guidelines that you use, that make any project work. That is what we are trying to do here. In regards to my Brentwood project, this is built on Wilshire Boulevard and Bundy and is anchored by Ross Dress For Less and a Sav-On Drug Store. It was a vertical project, meaning that the retail stores are on the ground level and we actually built the parking and that structure up above the stores and that project is about 65 feet high. That project

actually abuts two apartment buildings that are typically two to three stories in height. In the Pasadena project, South Lake Avenue which is where our project is located is a commercial street that is surrounded by residential areas. When we went through our approvals for the Pasadena Collection, we actually worked with the South Lake Homeowners Association, the Madison Heights Homeowners Association and one other one that I can't remember because it was back in 2003. We had meetings not as big as these, but we had meetings with those homeowner groups when we went through our initial plan concepts, then our second concepts and then when we went through our final concepts. The difference between what was initially proposed and what was finally approved are two different things. I have said that all along regarding this project. When we approached this project, we were given an envelope. The envelope is what the City of Culver City's zoning and General Plan allow for this property and proposed development and meets those zoning requirements. That's what we proposed and I think there has been a lot of concession about the fact that what is allowed by Code which many of you do not believe is appropriate and that's not an issue I can address. That's what your Code says, and that's what I build too. So if there is an issue regarding what is appropriate, that's something for this community to decide should be built for the project. Do you have any other questions you would like to ask?

Allan Goldman: Not at this time, Bob. We will come in with questions after the audience participation. Joe at this time would you bring the microphone up to the podium. Before we start the audience participation, I do have quite a few cards people would like me to read into records which I will gladly do. Excuse me if I mess up your name to bad but I'm not sure if it is my eyes or your writing. Anyway, here we go.

Jane Glade: Why was only one firm chosen to submit plans for redevelopment? Other considerations in regards to redevelopment of Sepulveda Boulevard infrastructure, sewer, water, power, roadways, traffic control, and refuse.

Irene Guglielmino: Of the proposed redevelopment plan Mr. Champion is overbearing and not compatible with the existing houses and businesses in the area.

Joanne Morrissey: The proposed Champion project is not compatible with the neighborhood. All the other businesses along Sepulveda, Jefferson Boulevards are either one or two stories in height. Proposing a height of five stories is going to look terrible. It destroys the harmonious feel of the community. We all enjoy the

small town feel we have now.

Pauline Post: What is the rush? I have a feeling this development is being pushed through too fast. Meetings April 25, May 2, May 22 and June 6 was cancelled and tonight at El Marino. According to the statement by Joe Susca at the May 22nd meeting, the Exclusive Negotiations Agreement can be extended by staff up to six months so we may slow down to obtain additional input. Half the city doesn't know about this outrageous development.

Michelle Boatwright: We have been paying an 11 percent utility tax for many years. Far higher than any city of our size or larger. And yet when in 2004 a measure was put on the ballot to reduce those taxes to between 2 and 3 percent comparable to other cities our size the voters rejected the measure by 4 to 1. That's quite a vote of confidence in the City and please don't destroy the confidence by allowing this totally incompatible project to proceed.

Peggy Ishida: Just because eminent domain is legal, doesn't make it ethical or right. In its present context it's morally indefensible.

Beverly Weatherly: Mr. Champion has stated publicly that the South Sepulveda corridor is not pedestrian friendly. He is right. The air is filled with car, bus and truck fumes. If he gets to build his project, the traffic will become much worse. For him to suggest that if this area would lend itself to outdoor cafes and dining while a constant sea of metal spews noxious gases into the environment borders on the absurd. I dare say he won't be among the patrons putting their lungs in danger. In stark contrast the lovely outdoor eateries in our redeveloped downtown area which have a pleasing ambiance because that project had input and cooperation of residents and business owners and city officials.

Ginee Boatwright: Definition of progress. One, a movement toward a goal or to further a higher stage; two, developmental activity in science, technology, etc. especially with reference to the commercial opportunities created thereby or to the promotion of material wellbeing of the public to the goods, techniques or facilities created; three, advancement in general; four, I hope the development continues improvement; five, the development of an individual or society in a direction considered more superior to its previous level. The only thing beneficial about the Champion Sepulveda proposal is expected financial windfall that some city official anticipates. That does not offset the affected long time small businesses and the eradication of cooling breezes and privacy of the homes in the surrounding areas. The project is definitely not progress.

Tim Boatwright: I am not an activist by nature but when I feel threatened I will respond. I consider this project a threat. The residents to the east will lose their afternoon sun and also the westerly breezes that make air conditioning unnecessary in this area. A project of this size and scope is not compatible with the small town nature of the surrounding area and does not belong in Culver City.

Rosalind Bergstrom: I am 100 percent against the proposed project. There is too much traffic already. Also we like and go to the businesses that are already there.

Allan Goldman: That concludes the written public comment cards submitted.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: At this time I would like to call upon the following persons to speak. Nancy Joujon-Roche. We are going to try to keep this to three minutes.

Nancy Joujon-Roche: I specifically am directing these comments to the Redevelopment Agency, Members Malsin, Silbiger, Gross, Rose and Corlin. If you were to poll Culver City residents as to why they lived here, the majority of people would site our excellent Police Department, Fire Department and schools. They would undoubtedly also site Culver City's community feeling; its small town feeling. Well, anyone who drives down Sepulveda during rush hour experiences anything but a small town feeling. Gridlock is already alive and well in Culver City. Does anyone really want to provide a recipe to worsen to the point of being unmanageable? We have already seen the impact that Playa Vista has had on traffic in the Sepulveda corridor. We have yet to see the impact of Symantec once it's up and running. One can only imagine the nightmarish scenario that would occur should the ill-conceived Champion project materialize. Many people probably remember that 20 to 25 years ago the City was dealing with a proposal from Milton Berle to build a casino here. This is a very contentious issue because while the casino surely would have provided good revenue for the City, questions were raised about how it might affect the quality of life. What kind people it might draw to the area are very tangible issues. Paul Jacobs, who is I believe was mayor at the time, maybe just a city council member, but he made a statement that I thought hit the nail on the head. He said that the value of Culver City has to be measured in more than monetary terms. Truer words were never spoken and they are applicable now as two decades ago. I urge every member on the Redevelopment

Agency to keep Mr. Jacobs' words in mind and to realize who the people of Culver City are, and to remind you that you are all elected to represent those people who want to maintain the quality of life which has brought to; and kept us in; Culver City. Thank you.

Applause.

Ed Ryba: Good evening everybody. At previous meeting, someone brought up the subject of oil pipelines in the alley behind the proposed project and our homes. My bedroom is 50 feet away from your project, sir. Now at that meeting, a man by the name of Max Paetzold, a city consultant and former city employee, said there is no pipeline back there in the alley that is active anymore and that it's been steam cleaned and full of fiber optics now. That's true as far as it goes. However, I have right here a letter from the Exxon Mobile pipeline company that states that there is a sixteen inch high pressure 160 degree oil line in that alley which is very active. Furthermore, according to Dave Kingston of Exxon Mobile, this is the main feeder line between Exxon's Bakersfield oil pumping facility, their oil fields, and the big refinery on 190th Street down at Torrance. A funny thing that Mr. Paetzold didn't mention was that this pipeline pays \$1.2 million a year to Culver City just for being there. Now, Mr. Dave Kingston of Exxon Mobile as well as Jim Brannon of the Crimson Pipeline Company, told me that should this pipeline be disturbed or maybe undermined remember this entire city is built on beach sand. What happens when you dig beach sand? Remember trying to build sand castles. Ever try to dig dry beach sand. What happens? Okay, should that pipeline be disturbed or undermined as a result of digging underground parking or compacting soil, a breach of that pipeline would likely result and the entire area would be covered in hot carcinogenic flammable crude oil. Now most of the water heaters in our neighborhood are in the backyards facing that alley. There goes your ignition source and the town could catch fire before they could shut off the pipeline. Since we were not told anything about any of this and I had to make a few dozen phone calls to find out this information myself, which incidentally I have a hundred copies of this letter for anyone who would like to see it. What else are you not telling us about this project and what you have got up your sleeves? Mind your own citizens instead of catering to the wishes and whims of a rich out of town developer. Thank you.

Applause.

Jennifer Ryba: Thank you for this opportunity to talk to you again. As Mr. Champion has mentioned several times, it's not him we should be angry with. It's the City Council and the Redevelopment Agency, and

we are. Champion you are just doing your job. You are out to make a buck or maybe a lot of bucks. You are building to maximize the Code that exists and we understand that. So we are working to change the Code. That's already in process. We are wondering if this is something that has affected our neighborhood but this is also something that should be of concern to everybody else in Culver City because what's to stop the City Council or the Redevelopment Agency from going to any other neighborhood and saying oh your neighborhood is blighted. We're going to tear it down and start over. Our neighborhood is not blighted. I've lived in a blighted neighborhood. What they had was much higher density than we what we have. Probably not quite as high as you would like us to have. We had shops that did not have businesses in them, empty storefronts. We had prostitutes and their clients in our yards. We don't have that in Sunkist Park and we don't want it. You're out to make a buck. We're fighting to save our homes. The proposed project simply does not fit in Culver City. In this part of Culver City or any other part of Culver City. It's too dense, it's too tall. Again, we are working to change those so you can't do that. The traffic you keep promising us that you'll mitigate; I am really confused about how reducing the ingress and egress to 2 or 3 points is going to mitigate adding to the volume -- if you do the math what works out to about 16,000+ extra car trips a day and this is based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers estimates for 800+ condominiums plus over 200,000 square feet of retail. The project might be really nice some place else. It might be even some place I would like to shop, but I don't want to live next to it. I don't want to live in its shadow. Would you like to live in a shadow? Would you like to build this in your neighborhood? I don't think so. And finally, we are all focusing on the final outcome of this project. Though I have serious concerns about living in the shadow or next door to five plus years of ongoing demolition and construction. I am concerned about the noise and the vibration and the dust. I am concerned about what is going to be done with that dust. These buildings are 50 plus years old. I know and you know that they have asbestos and lead in there. I also don't know what's in the ground that's going to be disrupted and put into our air. My understanding is there used to be an airport in this area. What got put in the ground when that was there and it's still there and it's going to be disturbed and released so that we can breathe it. You talked about increased property values and I appreciate Miss Kim your doing all the research that you did and I also understand that your other projects have probably have raised property values in the area but again they weren't built right up against single family houses. I fail to understand how living in a shadow of this thing is going to increase my property values. I don't think it is. In fact, I have been told that they probably have dropped already just because this

thing is looming over us waiting to happen. If I were to put my house on the market right now, I'd have to disclose that this is going to be built or potentially could be built.

Allan Goldman: Jennifer, could you rap up please, you are exceeding the three minute limit.

Jennifer Ryba: Yeah, I would just like to finish by the drawings are really nice and it's a shame you couldn't bring a projector and show them so they were easily seen by everybody like we did at one of the other meetings. That was really nice.

Applause.

Paul Madison: Members of the City Council, members of the Citizens Advisory Committee, thank you for this opportunity and this forum. Thank you for listening. I am a homeowner near the development. I naturally want to see my property continue to grow in value and I am glad we are talking about developing along Sepulveda corridor because there are a lot of things that I would like to see changed along Sepulveda and I think a lot of the neighbors would like to see a lot of things changed. But almost the unanimity of the voices I have heard tonight is opposed to this project and I am particularly opposed to the smart growth that this project proposes. Smart growth threatens, I think, the Culver City's village. Culver City attracts new small businesses and homeowners, such as me, who fled from the dense congestion of Los Angeles. Too much. Too dense, too many cars, too much craziness and that's why we came here. That's what we are looking for when we moved into this community. Smart growth promises less congestion by packing people into denser areas near mass transit but the reality of this is that the people who are going to buy these condos are not going to be crossing the street to catch a bus at the Fox Hills Mall to get to their work and very few, if any, are going to be living or working in the businesses that are downstairs from them. The reality is that they are going to be driving cars and as Jennifer knows the estimate today that was published as 16,000 trips that are going to be made from this project every day. 16K trips in cars. Mixed use smart growth project of this size or even a quarter of this size belongs somewhere else that can handle the influx of traffic. I ask the CAC and the City Council to terminate the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement with Mr. Champion and to begin conversation with the residents and businesses along Sepulveda to determine what we as a community we want Sepulveda to look like in the future. Thank you.

Applause.

George Laase: On the City's website it shows the Sepulveda project is going to be built in the middle of a liquefaction zone that goes from Culver City all the way to the Pacific Ocean. We're in a drought now and the water table is probably very low but what would happen with such an immense project five stories high. What would happen during a serious wet season and when the big one hits?

Applause.

Mitch Means: I want to talk about the particular issue concerning property values. I am a little concerned and confused because my property values went up in the last ten years without this facility in my backyard. I am not going to readdress some of the reasons why we have but I am here on part of the Culver Alliance and we are a group of homeowners and residents and business owners who are trying to figure how we can get back on track with the City and the development and as such we have serious concerns about the proposed plans for the development and I invite anybody, if they have not already, to sign our petitions. We already have over a thousand people who have signed. I'll be in the back collecting signatures. We also have an online site where we have collected over 200. The thing I'd like to stress is I would like to read it to you. This is not just a Sunkist Park issue. Here are just a few comments that I brought down. My family owns and lives in lower Culver Crest. We are against development at this site based on increased population, traffic and the largeness of the buildings themselves. Please submit more plans from our homegrown citizenry. As a current renter and active voter, I urge the City to work more closely with residents and businesses before allowing large developments like this to go forward. Another one, please do not allow this intrusion in our town having lived in West L.A. all my life. I can tell you the worst blight on our city is the traffic congestion. Please I urge you to stop the proposed project.

Male audience member: Nobody is going to buy a house with a five story building behind it. We have a great state, we have an excellent Police Department, we have an excellent Fire Department, and we have a lot of good city officials. Why do you want to make more work for these people? If the city is going to have more revenue, than they can hire more people. Ladies and gentlemen, we don't need no five story building because no city official or city elected official they will vote this down because we live in the greatest country in the universe. We live in the U.S.A. and have voting rights. If one hundred percent of us are against this project, the City Officials will go against it too. Thank you!

Applause.

Allan Goldman: Chris Georges.

Chris Georges: I would like to thank the CAC and the members of the Redevelopment Agency for this opportunity. I will be brief. Most of you have heard where we stand. We own the CompUSA Center on Jefferson. We are opposed to the project as it is currently proposed primarily because the process that was used to arrive at it. I was reading through the Frequently Asked Questions on the website and came across question number 11 which says "As proposed the project is too big. Can't we start over again and begin a study process that involves visioning meetings where input from local community members is obtained so we may collectively reach a consensus for what the desired future is for this redevelopment site and its surround areas?" To which the answer is, if the Agency Board Members determine that with input obtained from the CAC meetings that the public would be better served through a study process, then it may be done. I think what has happened here in the process has been like the city has been presented with a multiple choice question. You wouldn't want this project to look like this, this or this. Pick A, B or C but really the choice is D, which is none of the above and I think we have to know that is a possibility as well. The issue is not with Mr. Champion. He is doing what he does. He is doing it exceptionally well. He always does and I find no fault with him. I am in the same business so I understand where he is coming from. I think that what it is that the validity of the project and a process by which it came into being. The tone of these meetings, just by the existence of the CAC, is the project as proposed is a done deal. It is not a done deal. At least I hope it's not. I would like to believe its not. I would like to believe this entire time that we all spent so many hours involved in hasn't been a mere exercise in futility. I would like to believe there is still an opportunity for the input of this group to affect the decision of the City Council and the Redevelopment Agency. I don't know if that's the case. I think the results will bear that out. The City Council and Redevelopment Agency are supposed to represent us. You can't twist the desires of the people of Culver City. They're not supposed to dictate to the people of Culver City; I'm not a voter so I can't speak to that. There are people in this room who are so this is really more about you than me. We just have the privilege of doing business here but I think the people of Culver City make their desires clear in all these meetings almost without exception. It's clear to me what the elected representative, what the choices of the elected representatives, should be. Whether that happens or not remains to be seen. As

John alluded to, and this is something that just came to me as I was sitting here, without exception when you think of the best parts of Culver City that have been redeveloped with a vision, you think about the Downtown area, you think about East Washington, you think about the Hayden Tract, you think about Helms Bakery. All of those involved existing buildings, every single one of them; they didn't tear down buildings and build new. They took what was there and they made improvements to them. Applause. All those projects reflected the character of Culver City. I first became involved in Culver City almost 30 years ago as a swimming coach with the swim team and Culver City hasn't changed that much in 30 years. It pretty much looks the same as it did and I think that's part of its charm. As somebody else pointed out, their property values have gone up because people want to live here. I think that this process can be started over from scratch. The result might come all the way back around. We might be going to Bob Champion at the end and, hey Bob, we want this other project. Can you do this but it will be a project that the City stakeholders, that's the voters, the business owners, property owners of the redevelopment area have a stake in. Thank you.

Applause.

Caroline Cicero: My name is Caroline Susirow. I am a ten year homeowner in Culver City. My kids go to school right here at El Marino Language School. This project affects people who live all over the city because this school is a commuter school. Everyone who drives their kids to school here, a few live in Sunkist Park and walk. First of all, I would commend the city on what you have down in downtown. As all of us have said many of believe it to be very successful. I did not support the current Sepulveda development as proposed. However, it is clear that there are some façade improvements that are needed. Many of us might disagree or agree on that but I have three main concerns. Traffic which has been addressed, housing and money. One thing that has not been mentioned in traffic. The City is proposing to open up a third lane on Sepulveda. That will cause the current traffic problems. That will solve the current traffic problems possibly. That is not going to mitigate any problems that will result from the 2,300 new parking spaces that are on the poster. I had to sit in back to look at the poster but I counted up the parking spaces. I don't know how many are at the commercial area now but I doubt its 2,300. Have any of you ever tried to cross Sepulveda on foot. Terrorizing, terrorizing. But I do support a more livable environment that focuses less on cars and more on livable streets or walkable community. These are current trends in planning. Smart growth is a current trend in planning as well

but we need to look at all the different kinds of trends and see what the best is. I am a little confused. I have been told by a CAC member and a City Councilmember tonight that is not a redevelopment project. That the City is not taking this land, these properties by eminent domain. I am wondering what is exactly going on. I think there are some things we don't know. Housing, I have some real issues about the redevelopment project areas and housing. The City is required by Redevelopment Law to provide low and moderate income housing. By law, 20 percent of all tax increment money from redevelopment project areas must be spent on low and moderate income housing. I have seen none in Culver City except for the two senior buildings. Many people balk at low and moderate income housing because they don't know what it means. Moderate income is up to 120 percent of the county's median income. That's about \$60,000. Okay, I know there are people in this room who can live off of \$60,000 and many of us do. So I don't know what was said in previous meetings about who is going to live in these apartments but the thing is that those residents aren't here tonight. So someone needs to speak from them and I am not sure where the City is, why the City has not fulfilled its legal obligation to provide the low and moderate income housing. They are opening the City up to lawsuits and we will hold them accountable. The other issue is money. The increased property tax revenue normally in a redevelopment project area, the redevelopment project can keep most of the money in its own coffers. I keep being told tonight that, earlier privately, that this is not a redevelopment project. Really, but I'm not sure what is really the case. We demand that there will be fees from any development here that will support our infrastructure and our schools because those two things are sorely needed improvement and there are many parents who are getting very, very active in the school setting. We are paying \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year in property taxes and we are not getting what we deserve as far as our schools. Thank you.

Applause.

David Lowpe: You are probably not going to hear about the same thing you've heard from me but basically one thing. I think the project on Sepulveda is too big and I think we all agree on that. It's just too much, too dense for such a small area. I think the stores on Sepulveda, some of them, could use a little bit of uplifting. Some of them it's already happened within the last ten years. Big Lots, Kinko's, where unfortunately CompUSA was and is no longer. Those buildings I see nothing wrong with them. My wife and I were eating, well shouldn't have eaten, at Del Taco today. She looked across the street and she looked at those buildings and she said "you know, I

don't really see anything with those buildings. Why are they going to knock them down? To me they look fine. There's lot more blighted areas in town that we can look at." My main thing is the traffic. I've lived on Culver Park Drive for 40 years and I've seen what happened with the traffic situation in the last 40 years. Over the last 14 years there has been a traffic mitigation survey ongoing for Culver Park Drive and for Segrell. Nothing has happened in 14 years. Mr. Champion says don't worry about the traffic. We've got that all taken care of. I don't care if they make Sepulveda 10 lanes wide through that corridor. When they get to that Marina freeway, it's back to four lanes. Unless they build a bridge over the freeway, which I don't see happening, you're going to have the same problems. We are also into only one and a half phases of Playa Vista done. Can you imagine when it's finished and we have two and a half northbound roads on this side of town. Lincoln, Sepulveda and little Centinela that handles 95 percent of the traffic north and southbound. It's not going to work and he can talk all night if he wants, to there is no way they are going to handle the traffic. Thank you very much.

Applause

Robin Reed: My name is Robin Reed and I am here for my mother, Esther Reid who this October 50 years on Segrell Way. When she purchased her house they were to build this great park across the street on Slauson. Well its been various things, Earl Schieb, some auto place where they put in alarms that would go off 500 times a day, now They play movies there on Friday nights. Have you been there? It is interesting. I don't know what it is but it's probably not what it is supposed to be on some nights. But is supposed to be a park when my parents bought their house. Instead it's the 405 and the I90 and my mom is 86 and she is looking across at the sign now and it's going to be a five story building. My dad always said that Culver City was the oasis surrounded by the cesspool that Los Angeles is and part of that is because Culver City is probably 90 percent single family ownership. Now the good thing is that Mr. Champion is going to build condos and not apartments. However, 400 to 800 condominiums with how many people going to live there and all of them will have a car. And we know they will because we are not pedestrian oriented. We are Californians. We drive cars. I don't care how many buses you drive down my street, I am taking my car. I don't care where the new transportation run from downtown L.A. through Exposition all the way to Santa Monica is going to go. I won't take it. I drive a car. I plan to drive a car. I bet everyone else plans to drive one too. You had the opportunity to do a multi-family project at the Studio Drive In and you didn't do it. Why not. All kinds of open land there. Could have built one. Looks bigger but you didn't

do it. Now you have decided this little area on Sepulveda Boulevard is going to handle all this traffic and all these people. That's interesting and you are calling it a blighted area. I have to get the definition of blighted for this area. I don't think there is an area in Culver City that is really blighted. I've seen some areas around. I am a commercial real estate appraiser and I have been on the other side of the situation helping some other cities. But it didn't impact my mother, who is livid by the way, and she's 86. She is sending me here to let you know about it because she is 86 and didn't feel like coming but if she did, whoa, the comments you be hearing now won't be as nice as the project is the comments I have been making. I have seen the Brea project which Mr. Champion didn't have anything to do with which had commercial development on the ground floor and upstairs it has condominiums and apartments and that really interesting at night when all the people run out of their condos and apartments and down to the retail and fast food. That's like only one block and it's not even very large. I can't imagine this in Culver City at night when you have 400 to 1,600 people living upstairs and they're all going to run downstairs and make a lot of noise. One thing I want to say is that a lot of other cities have a three story, 35 foot height limit. Maybe we should consider it. My dad worked against the project that you previously considered, several of them, the 10 story or 11 story, I can't remember, office building on the corner. That was changed to an 8 story one and I am sure that's why we now have the 5 story limit. When maybe it should be 3.

Applause.

Marta Zaragoza: Good evening. I do not live in this area. I live in East Culver City. I can bring you to memory. You don't have to wait for this to be built to know what's going to happen. It takes us 25 to 35 minutes to travel two blocks. If you live between Helms and La Cienega, right now on Washington Boulevard we can't get in or out of our streets because of what staff, the paid consultant they paid with our tax dollars, and the City planners or our Planning Commissioners, our City Council members approved. So if their lips are moving, they are lying. The other thing is take the time to go down between Washington Boulevard between Helms and La Cienega. It's a rollercoaster ride both sides. I am very happy Mr. Paetzold is here because he was employed during the time that the plans and the recuse and everything were done. You have to be very careful. Be careful who they appoint to these CACs. I commend some of you. You have remained objective but many of you have not. You are favoring this project. I would be very careful with the Planning Commissioners too. Just remember what happened with the Hayden Track. Remember they hired attorneys. They hired consultants and

they went through a lawsuit and it was reversed. So just because they go into exclusive negotiations doesn't mean its right. They are here to represent all of us. Not just developers or heavy dipper donors. It is your responsibility to hold them accountable and most of you are not. This room should be standing room only. The reason for that impacts whether you want part of it, all of it, or nothing. Your neighbors need to be more involved. The other thing eminent domain they are using that exclusively for areas in which they want to take over private property for their developers benefit. Had Mr. Champion, I don't blame you at all, you're in for it for the buck, and ... That's called the United States' capitalism. All of you are also If you want it. You will have to undermine your neighbors. Unfortunately he has to do it in order to get his project done. The other thing if you have forgotten for those of you who have mentioned the Expo, how long has that been coming before City Council, before the community and many of you had you supported it or not, we have just found out this year that there is high levels of arsenic in two parts of the proposed Expo in East Culver City. None of the members from Council ever told us that. If they didn't know, why didn't they know and if MTA knew, why didn't they dig that information out. But the last thing I would like to leave you with as far as the development beginning it doesn't always mean it is going to end that way and I have a project on Washington Boulevard between Cattaraugus and Hutchison. It started out with community involvement like Mr. Champion a developer that promises the world. It included many community meetings. We were at first not supportive and many of us supported because they made agreements in writing mind you. Half way down with the project it was sold and it was converted to condos and mixed use. Like I said before, if the lips are moving, don't trust them. Thank you.

Applause.

Paul Ehrlich: Good evening. My name is Paul Ehrlich and I have lived here in Sunkist Park for 30 years. I also worked for an organization called ISO and its been brought up and I just wanted to tell you what ISO is. As I said I have been working for many years. ISO basically tells the insurance companies the quality of the fire department, the sprinkler systems, code enforcement, hindrance, etc. etc. and they give the city and all communities in the United States a rating. There are tens of thousands of communities in the United States and of those there is only about 25 communities who have a Class 1 and Culver City is one of them. Applause. I had nothing to do with it because this is not my particular territory, but I do work for the organization. One of the person came up and said that if this project goes through it going to have all kinds of dire effects and one

of the dire effects is that he is making allegation that the rates would increase throughout the City because we would lose our Class 1 rating. It's more complicated than that because there are many factors that go into determining what a Class 1 rating is. It's the fire department, I'll break it down briefly, it's the number of vehicles we have, the location fire stations, the amount of training, how well the equipment is maintained as far as the waters concerned and it has to do with pressure, how much volumes, what our water supply is, where the hydrants are, the City wide alarm system, how good is the code and how well is it enforced. It is technically possible that a major project could have an affect on that rating except that in my opinion this project relative to the entire City and how much progress has been going in the City in my opinion you would have little if any effect. I just wanted to make that very clear. I hate to say it and I can't say for sure but I talked with ... privately outside and my guess is this is a little bit closer to the overstatement or even I'll say the red herring. I just want to make that clear.

Applause.

Madeline Ehrlich: I have lived in Sunkist Park for 32 years. Have certainly been married ... to the community. I have been to these meetings and I see people just come out as soon as we say change just pull up the blanket we don't want any change. No, I don't care what it is. We don't want any change. I think we do need some change here. I think that we need some improvement and, if Mr. Champion doesn't do it, okay, whose going to do it. Do you think that the man that came up here and said that from CompUSA that their going to come and build a one story building for you or two story. Folks, we live in a very high area, expensive area. We are close to the airport, we close to the beach, we have great schools, and we have great fire department. We have a lot of wonderful things in Culver City. Our land values have gone up, up, up. I have never seen my land values go down and I am telling you this is only land in a better place. I just heard tonight and if you think that Mr. Champion doesn't build it, we're going to get somebody here that's going to keep us looking like a country bumpkins. Well folks you are wrong. This is not going to happen. We are not going to keep Culver City with dirt roads. Not where it is situated. Okay. I understand tonight that the area 2 is right now in escrow with Mr. Hooman, or Mr. Hoonam , I know that man. ...Car dealership. Do you think he is going to buy that property and put five cars on it? Come on. Let's not fool ourselves. I look at some of the people that came up an spoke to you. I mean some of the stuff they said was totally in error. But you people said oh yeah its right, its right. I think you are pulling the wool over your eyes. So I think you need to look at this and look at some

good change and not just say well have over 200 signatures. Oh my goodness. Well there are 48,000 people in this city too. So I don't think 1,200 out of 48,000 is a great number and I certainly would not sign that petition. Thank you.

Peter Messinger: Good evening. My name is Peter Messinger. I am the owner of the Aquarium company. I wanted to talk to you about the small business owner that has been there for a long time. Started this store about 18 years ago, maybe a little bit longer. I was her second employee. I have worked in that location for 18 years, ever since it started. I finally took over the business from her about a year and six months ago and a month after I took over I got a letter saying that basically it's going to be redeveloped. If we were interested in being a developer which of course is ridiculous. So I have only owned the business for a year and a half. At the last meeting, Carol Gross brought up the fact that the business owners were offered Redevelopment money to remodel the outsides of the stores and most of them turned it down so there you have it and now we are going to come in and we're going to bulldoze all of you. My question is why Redevelopment money can't be used instead of hiring lawyers to force the businesses out, hire lawyers to get the business owners kicked out by eminent domain. Why can't this money be used in partnership with the building owners and the business owners to do what they tried to do a few years which is remodel the outsides of the store. I am sure a lot of business owners if we dodge that bullet that's coming right now are more than happy to step up to the plate and remodel the outsides of the stores, the parking lots, whatever else is needed. Basically what I am asking you is to be part of the redevelopment, not a victim of redevelopment. Thank you.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: That was the final card. At this time I would like a motion from the CAC to receive and file a petition that was handed to us. Moved by another CAC member, seconded by another CAC member Let us proceed. Thank you.

Mr. Champion, at this time before the CAC has their own thoughts and what not, would you like to respond to the audience, to the parts you can and maybe Joe from the City staff. I've written down some questions that more relate to you.

Bob Champion: A few ...comments from a few minutes ago, I told you all when I first came that I would be guided by your Redevelopment Agency to look at this Sepulveda corridor and figure out the best way to redevelop it. I was told to work within the confines of the existing

zoning that is in that corridor. Many of the comments that I am hearing tonight I really don't think relate to the project as much as they relate to the zoning that your city has approved for this area. I find myself in a difficult situation because the way that ... United States and this is a capitalistic society, but the way it works is that properties are always built to the highest and best use. And that highest and best use is based on what is allowed to be built on those properties. Given the zoning that exists in this corridor, I believe that I proposed a project to would confine to the parameters of the general plan that would adhere to all the zoning and would. I so believe that and I do believe that the area does need some change. I do believe that if left without a specific plan that what will happen is that you'll see spot development take place in your corridor that will not be consistent with a well planned development of it. I will use as an example when I met yesterday with Mr. Hooman, who is the gentleman who is in escrow to buy the property at the corner of Sepulveda, not Sepulveda, Slauson and Jefferson and what he is planning to propose is that he is planning to propose a three story 56 foot car dealership. He's got plans and he came to me to ask if I would incorporate those plans into the project that I am proposing. What I said to him who is what I've said to all of you is that is not my decision to make. That is the decision to be made by your Redevelopment Agency, by your City Council. But I will give you my opinion and that my opinion is that if you think that the plan development that I have proposed which would integrate pedestrian activity all on the street which would provide the dollars to be able to address a lot of the traffic issues that exist to build a infrastructure to create a pedestrian environment. I guarantee you that the kind of project that he proposes wouldn't do that. And that is just one property within this project area. Now multiple what he wants to do by 30 different properties and what you find you will find 30 different projects along this corridor without a cohesive plan, that all are within the existing general plan and zoning requirements for this City and don't achieve anything that you want to achieve. But I have heard loud and clear tonight is that everybody wants to preserve their quality of life. I mean that is literally what we are talking about. What I have said from the very beginning is I believe if you make no change you won't preserve your quality of life. Your quality of life will change. What I said is if we work together to create change that is a partnership which is really what these meetings have been about is to get your input and find a project that would work for community. You can assert control. As some of the CAC members said earlier when they were talking about checking my references, when cities and developers work together to create projects there are concessions that are create. There are exactments that are imposed on those developments and it's good. The reason why it's good is because

they use development as a way to address problems that you couldn't address otherwise. For example, we talked about the South Sepulveda plan for the redevelopment of the boulevard Culver Boulevard improvement plan which didn't happen because there weren't sufficient funds to do it. A project like what I am proposing could accomplish that. Could fund that kind of improvement. As well as many other community improvements that could take place. Why, because the project would create the tax base to do that. So I would just like to conclude by saying a few things. One is contrary to what somebody said, I am not in violation of any real estate license, and I don't have a real estate license. I'm not required to have a real estate license to be a real estate developer. Number two is I was invited to this City to look at this corridor and propose improvements to this particular corridor. It's not that I came here to be a robber baron and to steal your community. I participated in five of these meetings now which have been very vocal and I have responded to every question that has been asked. I have had a lot of assertions thrown at me that I haven't responded to. I have tried to demonstrate that I am very level headed, I am very common sense oriented. I am a consensus builder. I want to build projects that are embraced by the community and I want this project to be embraced by the community as well. I realize that I can't do it without you. What I've said to everybody over the last three or four meetings is this project is a proposal and its based on which a discussion can take place to figure out what is the appropriate development for this project area and once that's determined I believe you believe I have demonstrated and I think your CAC has done its research to confirm that I am the kind of developer that can do it. Get the job done and I have a lot of faith in the project. I am a believer in it and I would like to see it take place and I would like to be part of it. Thank you.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: Joe, could you speak to a couple of points that were directed to the City regarding the pipeline, one, and the person that was at an earlier meeting regarding low income housing and why, if it was not necessary for the City, included in this.

Bob Champion: Actually I am asked to address that because we're not proposing to develop any alley. So the pipeline in the alley is really .to what we are proposing to do.

CAC Okay, Chairman, addressing the questions about infrastructures or questions about infrastructure and some land use questions; I am going to try to answer those. Firstly regarding whether or not the City has the ability to absorb this kind of development. Any time a project

is built, it is a requirement under California law to comply with the law called a CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act. Any project that is submitted has to be reviewed and approved pursuant to that law. It must with a project of this size, it would be reviewed and an EIR would be prepared. When an EIR is prepared, one of the requirements is to look at all the infrastructure elements, of water, power, sewer, utilities, and schools. If a project is going to create significant effect under the law, then it's required to mitigate the problem to a level of insignificance. If you can't do that, it can't be approved. So the short answer is that the project must comport to CEQA if the project will exceed the ability of the city to city systems to support the project that it cannot be approved under CEQA. So that is the first answer in respect to infrastructure. The next question had to do with liquefaction zone and in order for a project of this size to be built, it would be required to, the owner would be required and the developer would be required to prepare a geotechnical study. That geotechnical study establishes design criteria for the project. If the project is not designed pursuant to that geotechnical study, it will not be permitted. The City will not issue a building permit unless the project is demonstrated to be designed in accordance with the soils for the area. So the short answer is that whether or not it is in a liquefaction zone, it has to be designed to accommodate development and you can build wet sandy soils or even build in granite and whatever the soil is you have to design for and you have be able to design a building that will be supported by the soil and with the foundation to accommodate it. So that was the second question about liquefaction. There was a question about land use with respect to mixed use developments. There was an assertion that mixed use development is not permitted and in fact the City adopted a mixed use development ordinance that does allow mixed use development and this project if it was recommended by approval by the CAC and it was recommended for consideration by the Agency, then they would have to comport with the land use regulations and mixed use development is permitted. So I think, Chairman, those were all the land use or development related issues that were a question.

Chip Netzel: Thank you for allowing me to do that. I apologize for not having the card turned in. I want to encourage the City Council Redevelopment Agency I know you are going to be talking about the land use regulations coming up and I think that is critical but don't just talk about it. Make the changes that this community needs, not just about this project 65 units per acre needs to be brought down. Parking requirements need to be looked at, building heights, all those factors. I know the Planning Commission has started that process but it would be a shame to move this project forward as that discussion is just beginning. So however we have to go about putting this project

on hold in whatever form or fashion while this discussion is going on about land use regulations, I think that would be a smart thing to do. References. I didn't really hear much about how traffic congestion impacted those areas that you checked on the references. That would have been a great question to ask, how's your quality of life, how's the traffic. I think those are great questions. Don't look at just Champion projects. Go find projects that are similar in size, 12 ½ acres, 800 residential units, and 25,000 square feet of retail. Go find projects like that. It doesn't have to just be a Champion project. Go ask those city staff members, ask the residents of those areas. How's your quality of life. I really would like to hear tonight, I have asked this question before, you've been through many meetings now and you've all patiently sat through everything everybody had to say, but I would like to know tonight I don't know when we get to hear this, where do each of you stand on this project. We've been waiting and waiting. I will give credit to Mr. Schechter. Right from the very first meeting, you said you'd put your hand up if you had your chance to ... You said that from the very first meeting and I give you credit. I give you credit and I don't necessarily agree with it but you liked what you saw and you raised your hand so I know where you stand but I'd like to know where the rest of the CAC stands. You are working on behalf of us and this is our fifth meeting. I think it's pretty clear where the community stands so I hope that you will have heard that and make that a basis for your thinking. Fox Hills Mall development, Symantec, Playa Vista, the new Radisson office tower that's being proposed 13 story office tower, the whoops factor keep that in mind I think that's critical. I don't want anybody to come back later and say whoops. You know there is so much going on. We didn't think it through and whoops you can't get from here to there. Those things haven't even materialized yet. We can barely get there now. Whoops. I think that would be the worst work for me to hear later on and I think it's critical that we stop and really think about this. Mr. Champion mentioned a master plan. I agree with you 100 percent. Stop this process and actually go through a master planning process for this project area. It hasn't been done. We just jumped right in and here are the boards. Here are pictures, here's your project but we don't have a master plan. I think that's a heck of an idea. Let's stop this right now. Put a master plan together and funny I will say that there are City Council candidates sitting in the room tonight and you know who you are. Keep in mind what you have heard. Whether you are maybe a candidate sitting up here or whether you are sitting in the audience, please listen to what you have heard from the community. If this project is still ongoing, it needs approvals. We will remember. We won't forget. Okay, thank you very much.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: At this point, it is time for the CAC to roll up their sleeves and do some dirty work. What I would like to do is have each of us ask the tough questions that need to be asked so that we can begin the process of making the decision as to where we do stand on this proposal. If we can do that, this CAC whether we can do that tonight, or whether or not we will ask the tough questions and if we are not satisfied with the answers, to come back for one more meeting to solidify our points and then make a decision. But at this point I would like to start with the CAC. We will stand with Mr. Schechter at the end there. If you have any questions, then Mr. Champion, if you want instead of waiting to the end you can answer the questions per member.

Asher Schechter: I think, give and take one of the important factors that has been raised on one occasion is traffic congestion on the commercial and residential streets. I think the group here is looking for something more succinct in regards what will be done to stem the flow of traffic into the residential neighborhoods. People who will be shopping and living in the complex would feel the flow of traffic on Sepulveda. I think it would behoove go ahead with something concrete. A direction to look forward to justify the expansion project.

A resident said, before I say anything else, I have to say there are a lot of people who asked a lot questions tonight and they didn't stay to hear the answers. That just perpetrates a lot of misconceptions that are going on and that bother me a lot. I wrote down a bunch of questions. I live right here. I am very concerned about population density. I am very concerned, my main point, I am very concerned about the local business owners. I frequent them and I am concerned about what is going to happen there. I'm still listening to what is going on. I am for a lot of it. I'm against a lot of it. I cannot unequivocally say to you, Chip, or anybody else in the room that I am definitely for the project. I can't say I am against it either. I still feel I need to hear more. I think that we need to get to a point where we can say all right. At the turn of the last century, there were lots of mixed use communities. You know, people would live above a store and the whole community would be there. It was wonderful and terrific and we went away from that. We went to our suburban areas which is good too. I not saying any of it am bad but I think that we need to look to the future and say what is going to work. Now here in Culver City, but for us, for the City, but for us as individuals. I don't feel that by closing our eyes and saying you know what let's leave it the way it is. That's going to work either. Unfortunately, I can't give you a definite I'm for it or against it because I am still investigating. I'm still learning. I've learned a awful lot. I would also like know the date of

that letter from Exxon Mobile. June 8, 2007,.are we allowed to have a copy I am very concerned about a lot of the comments made tonight, and I think a lot of them are just coming from not necessarily what was being said but how it was perceived. I think that is a lot of our problems. What is going on with some of these meetings? We are perceiving things the way we want to hear from rather than what is actually being said. I think that is a problem as well.

As a resident I actually have a few questions for staff and one of them is somebody mentioned that this is cash for the city but I don't know if that is necessarily true. In talking to some of the other cities that I have worked with, these development projects and in working with Champion, someone said quite frankly in reality property taxes never pay for all the city services that are required. I know the City will hopefully will make some money from the retail business that comes in but I am not exactly sure how much of a financial burden or financial benefit is going to be proposed for the City. I think that kind of stuff is going to be out later on as they do more studies about this project. Another thing that needs to be is a specific plan, a DFD, comprehensive plan, or overlay zone plan in that area and if it did in the past has it expired. I need a little bit more clarity on that for myself. If it does, what does it say and, if not, are some of these guidelines going to be prepared for this area. Are we looking at doing any of those items that I mentioned for this area? What is the process for making that happen and what are the considerations for making that happen. What is the timeline? Those are the kinds of things I need answers, and I would recommend we meet again because I feel that are a lot that folks have said. Some of the things have been repeated. We've heard some of the responses. I really don't about. A lot of the meetings, those are some things were important to me because the City is beginning to look at zoning and some of these issues. It will impact not only this development but developments in all parts of Culver City. So it is important to have understandings about these things and how it may relate to this specific project. Is a construction management planning a requirement or an optional? Other than that, I think some of my colleagues have voiced some of the same concerns and thoughts I have. We're kind of giving our opinions here tonight as well. I have spoken to some people in the community who are for the project. Some of those folks are not willing to come up and speak before a crowd of folks who are against the project. Even those people say this project seems too big. That would be my feeling. If the project isn't going to be something that's going to be modified in scope than I would have to say no to this. If it is going to be modified, is CAC going to continue to review the project and the modifications. That would be my preference if the City is going to go forward. Also, the

traffic. I know this is something you have to look at.. If the traffic is going to be remedied, the traffic is a problem. I know that is part of the process. You are going to review traffic. I wouldn't approve the project if it was going to be a horrendous traffic impact and I think from what I have heard from staff you're in agreement on that, anyway I will pass it along. Those were my questions.

An audience member stated is there a specific plan or some other developments program for the process that would apply, or that does apply to this property. The answer is the existing zoning on the site is the zoning ordinance guides to development of the property. Not a specific plan. It is important to note the specific plan could be developed for the area. It was developed, that an ordinance, that's its own special zoning. That would apply to the property. You asked about the timing. Generally a specific plan takes nine months to a year, sometimes longer, to adopt. It involves a thorough study of the existing land use, you look at not just the property, but the area around it and you come up with area wide recommendations. There is a streetscape plan that was prepared for the area that could be incorporated into a specific plan. There are also is traffic work that has been done immediately behind this project site that also could one of the technical studies to be folded into a specific plan. You have already done some basic ground work to do a specific plan if that's what you want to do. The process takes about nine months to a year. A specific plan could be developed but there is nothing except the existing zoning ordinance that applies to the property right now. You asked about other options. Well, specific plan or a plan development for the project site could be looked at as an option as opposed to just simply dealing with the zoning envelope. The next question you asked about is construction management. Is the construction management plan required? Well the short answer is if the project of this scale is proposed then it would be a condition of approval, and I am confident we would incorporate that as a condition of approval as has been done with large scale projects. It isn't a requirement other than through the discretionary process. You asked about the review of the modification to the project. I think that what has to happen there has to be some disposition from the CAC, and then the Agency will make a determination about how to go forward. After that the decisions about the project and how it will be developed would have to be resolved. So the CAC wouldn't necessarily be involved in any further modifications but it certainly could be. Lastly, you asked about traffic volume and traffic review. As part of the environmental review analysis, the City has to look at traffic. If the traffic problems cannot mitigated to a level of insignificance, then the City cannot approve the project. That is a requirement under CEQA. So I think those were all the questions you asked.

An audience member commented, based on what you said, then I would support looking at developing a specific plan for the area.

An audience member said I am here because my wife was sick of hearing me complain about all this random development. I have learned a lot over the past few months. I share everyone here's concerns regarding congestion, density, heights of this project, but I really think that something needs to be done because it is just not good the way it is now. Not good for the City. Anyway if the density, something needs to be done, deep down I agree with everything that was said here tonight. Deep down I want no change. Most people here want to change. But that's just not realistic. I am from Little Rock, Arkansas, and every time I go home every year another thousand miles of forest has been mowed down and shopping centers and they learned how to do that here. So we need to stop that and the fact that you are all involved and we all here because we care. I am proud to be neighbors with you folks because if we turn our back, change will occur so we have to stay involved. We can mold this thing where it will be a good thing. We can control this thing. We really can and just remember that. Every time you start blaming the City, the City is just a reflection of us. So you can't just blame the City because we couldn't. If we all stay involved. (Question from audience) As far as the business owners, I agreed, I don't see how bringing in change is going to help change anything. I don't want a Ross, I don't want a Starbucks, I don't want a Gap, I don't want any chain that there is another store within 10 miles of Culver City because nobody is going to Culver City to go to Gap. There shouldn't be any chain in Fox Hills Mall. It's all real simple stuff. I think they should go around and a bunch of the businesses in the strip malls now, you know Giovanni's has been in a strip center for 12 years. If we could lure Giovanni's and places like that instead of chains. If we did this right, it could be a really good thing. But we all have to stand tall and I intend to stick around and at the first meeting I told Chip Netzel exactly how I felt about this. I don't why he stands up there and asking because I told him at the first meeting. (In response to question from audience) Too tall, too dense. Also Chip doesn't like the way I drop my kid off at school. I want you to know, Chip, that I will pull over in the teacher's parking lot now. Is that okay. Anyway I won't waste any more of your time. I just want you to know I am one of you, I am with you. We're not I am not getting checks from anybody and I'm just here because my wife sent me.

An audience member said I am actually very glad to finally be able to say everything that has been pent up inside me. I've been put behind this desk thinking when I first started that I have some great things to

do with this whole thing. It's been frustrating because I think I never had, I don't know every names on this board to tell you the truth, and it's frustrating from the standpoint as the lone property owner business run person here, I know Champion is not able to speak for legal reasons. I believe a lot why we are here is because of us. I represent this group and the fortunate thing is that hopefully that is a process and this will come down to what it is we need to get down to. The unfortunate thing is I believe as a property owner that eminent domain or really everything we have done so far bypass what I represent and I am not here to sell my property. I am not here to get rid of my business in the same building. I have heard comments that we're going to win either way. To tell you the truth eminent domain I am going to get their fair market value. When the property owner wants to sell their business or their property, they'll get that fair market value at any time they want to get out. I don't think we gain by being pushed out now or in two years because truthfully I think my property is more valuable sold separately. There is a lot of stuff going around everywhere else and I believe it's a good spot to do business, to have tenants, to have do all the things I want to do. So I don't think it is correct to say we that we win. I am ashamed to say I haven't canvassed 100 percent of those property owners to tell you what they all feel. But the ones I have canvassed all feel "no" we're not here to sell. So we can look at all the drawings. I passed on comments because, you know what, I am sure that they can be beautiful, I am sure this Champion is going to do a great job. I actually respect all the stuff he does. I think it's great. I wish I was in his shoes sometimes. But from the standpoint of someone whose angered in this spot you all want to change, I feel a lot of empathy and sympathy because I do believe change has to happen. I don't want to be a property owner where people don't like to look at our buildings or want you come in to the stores or anything like that. I think that is an issue. But having someone come in and tell me they are going to take away my property is not where I am here at this standpoint. I believe that this is not the right way. This is incorrect. Eminent domain, if you are going to do it, bring it on now because I am not quite sure any property owner at this point is going to just lay down and say, there give me fair market value and I win. That's not what we hear at this point. Thank you.

Applause.

A audience member said, ,first of all, I think that Bob Champion has been a great asset to our area because he's gotten us all to think about what our neighborhood is and what our neighborhood could be. I think his presentations for the most part are exciting, and I think his presentations for the most part are exciting and they are clear and

they are giving us a lot of information. When I look at the latest boards that show like what the morning shadow conditions are going to be for all the homes along Segrell Way, I have real concerns,, and I have concerns about being one of those homeowners being in their backyard and looking at a building that is very tall. It maybe more appropriate for other areas if there were apartment buildings along Segrell Way. It maybe would be a different story. It just feels like their too tall and too much is being lost, and the neighborhood is being hurt. I guess my other concern I'd really tried to grasp the idea of mixed use and I know in some areas it may be a great thing. I have concerns about having condominiums on Sepulveda Boulevard above retail businesses for our particular area. My preference would be to explore the idea of either doing a major renovation of what's there or looking at doing a retail project that's lower in scale and is not as impactful. I know in the past Culver City has conducted visioning workshops and one thing that may be really good for our area is to do that so that somebody could mediate it, and the community can create a vision and look at what the possibilities are for our neighborhood and add that develop a system...That's my feedback.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: before we continue, I would like a motion from the CAC to receive and file the letter that we received from the Exxon Mobile Corporation.

Moved by a CAC member and, seconded by a CAC member. All in favor.

Thank you.

Let me tell everyone here that they understand and my CAC as well why we are here. The CAC's job is not to approve or disapprove this project. It says here when we filled out the forms to do this, and let me read it to you, is that if you are selected to become a member you'll be asked to attend meetings on an needed basis in regard to redevelopment to provide staff, the Agency and Champion critical advise on proposed design, review the traffic study, and it's recommendations and to discuss business tenants for the redevelopment. As a CAC member, you will represent a cross section of the community and become an important voice in the redevelopment. CAC meetings will typically be held on weeknights and will require about per month from each member. Therefore, what I am saying is that we will have input into what it is that we feel should or should not be built. We are not going to vote on whether the project will go forward or not because that is not our mission. It

goes on to say that the redevelopment goal is to develop a cohesive plan for redevelopment of the site and it will include housing, office, which has been cancelled, and retail/restaurant components. Some of the objectives of the redevelopment include resolution of the traffic problem along the alleyway that runs adjacent to Segrell Way. To build desirable public amenities and enhance economic development and to employ good urban design and land use policies to create a unique sense of place in the community. That said, my concerns are the following. One is density. We have all heard to high, too much. The Planning Commission is already looking at reducing both those numbers, the height limit and the density number. I have heard numbers anywhere 40, 65 units, I have heard numbers anywhere from 40 to 45...The cohesive plan, my question to the cohesive plan and to the staff and to the City, is how is Hooman automotive agency to enter the cohesive for development plan phase 1, phase 2, phase 3, phase 4 without any mention of a possible automotive agency. I think that needs to be addressed as we go on with this. To Bob, you said at the last meeting from the minutes the project I propose won't be built. The project that will be built, if at all, will be based on your input. A project that is best for the community as a whole, not just Sunkist Park. I am not in the building business. I cannot tell you what size project would be feasible because I don't have the economics of scale to do so. I can't figure out mathematically that if the project is five stories, the first story being retail, that leaves four stories of condominiums. There are 800 units. Well it doesn't take a math genius to figure out that is 200 units per floor for the whole project. So if we eliminate one floor, we are down to 600 units. If we eliminate two floors, we down to 400 units. At what point will the project no longer be feasible from an economic point of view from the Champion's development point to continue with the project. These are the answers I think we need before we can actually as a community decide what is right for us. If anybody is really interested in the Sepulveda Boulevard façade program that took place about 15 years ago, I guess it is now, that the building on the east side of Sepulveda that was owned by Albert Vera, the Serrento Market building, was the first one to go under the façade program. Joseph Sherwood was owner of the building at 5427 and 5429 Sepulveda which housed a medical building and Culver City Industrial Hardware and at that point in time was owned by myself. I, as a tenant, went to the City and asked if I could spend my money to change the façade of the building because I did not like the way it looked. Mr. Sherwood and I met. He said to me it wouldn't be feasible for him economically to do it for the rent I was paying. But long story short, the of the City, I believe Miriam Mack at that time was the project chair over that, we convince the City and Mr. Sherwood that even though I did not own the property that I would be allowed to remodel it. He then went

ahead and remodeled the upper half of the building which was a medical building. Since then, the other projects that were redone their's as well as the Big Lots property was also redone. If a façade program is feasible, then obviously we should look at that also. I am not sure if that is going to be enough but that's another point. I guess my questions are before can continue we need some direction in terms of what we are really looking at because we know it's not going to be five stories and we know it's not going to be 800 units and for us to sit here and hypothetically vote, not for or against, but on guidelines. Are these going to be our guidelines? Is this our responsibility or, if we vote and it is not feasible, then you have to tell us from the City point of view or from the developer point of view that, you know what, this is no longer the project that can happen. So, Bob, my question to you sir, is are you ready or what point would you be ready to say we have to roll up our sleeves a really do the crunching the numbers and what it is we're going to do.

Bob Champion: I have been sitting here for the last three hours, yes we all have, I have been very swayed by many of the comments you have all made tonight and I have been sitting here thinking that the question just asked to me was probably going to get asked. In trying to figure out what I thought was the most candid and fair response that I give to it. Here goes. As I said earlier, the value of property is determined by what can be built on it and the values that you have seen occur in this City are the results of the planning that is taking place to guide how those properties have been developed. A few years back your city made the policy decisions that it wanted to promote mixed use. Although I was not there at the time that it made that policy decision, being a proponent of mixed use I believe they probably concluded as many cities and communities across the country that making our communities a more vital, more pedestrian oriented, creating the same kind of mixed uses that occurred a century ago, was a good thing. I do believe that. In regards to your question, you presently have zoning in that area that allows mixed use of 56 feet, but within 56 feet someone can build a five story project that is within the envelope of what is allowed. When I was in the task of looking at proposing how to change the Sepulveda corridor, I worked within that existing envelope because I knew anything less would not be competitive of what could happen if there were multiple projects if they were independently initiated on the corridor. Meaning that in order for any project that I proposed to be economically viable, it had to be comparative what any other person could develop on a property at the same time. Now tonight, what I have been hearing is, or what I would like to think I hear, is that there hasn't been so much an attack on my attributes as a developer, or for that matter, the merits of my project as much it is as what my project

represents. Which is what is the maximum that is allowed in current zoning for this area. So in answer to your question, if the current zoning stays in place the way it is, the only project that would be viable is one that is built to the envelope allowed by the zoning because the way it works in real estate is that everyone always builds to the highest and best use and the highest and best use is what's allowed. Someone made a suggestion earlier tonight on your board that perhaps the issue is not the project but the issue the zoning and perhaps there should be a new look at what the zoning is allowed, not necessarily on just the Sepulveda corridor but throughout the your city and perhaps certain areas should be more dense and certain areas should less dense. If those discussions resulted in a policy decision, that resulted in an overall amendment to your zoning that changed what the envelope that's approved that can be built on property, at that point what would happen is the highest and best use of that property would be whatever the maximum envelope is of that revised zoning. So in other words, if right now we are proposing a five story project because that is what is allowed, but the zoning for the area was to change and that four story building was the maximum allowed, then in that event financially it would have the same chance of being feasible as if it were five story. In other words, what I am saying and the same thing I have said in the last three meetings, I feel like I am not so much defending my project that I have proposed as much I am defending the zoning that you have all approved. I find myself in the position of being asked to advocate a zoning when simply I am just responding to the policies that your city has. I have tried my best to design the project that meets that policy and from my very first meeting I have said I don't intend to develop a project that has variances or asks for exceptions to what is allowed. I plan to play within the rule book. I think when you're looking for a developer you want someone who has the capacity to figure out how many projects work and at the same time balance the economic feasibility of that project with what the community needs are. I think that that's what I have done in the past. So in conclusion to responding to your questions, I think really it's a matter of public policy and what you as a community decide is the zoning you want for your city and for specific areas like the South Sepulveda corridor. Then it's private enterprises response to create projects within that envelope that are viable and successful in your community. Thank you. Applause.

Allan Goldman: At this point I would like to hear from the members of the CAC in terms of whether they want to create motion tonight in regards to this matter or do they want time to do some more research and have another meeting.

As a CAC member I would like to recommend we have another meeting. I'll second that. Stated a CAC member.

A CAC member asks these questions, What you think we'll accomplish at the next meeting?. What do you think we're going to hear at the next meeting that we haven't heard tonight that we can't make a motion tonight?

(Talking back and forth from audience and CAC) It's my understanding that this CAC is supposed to be going forward even after we have come up with a decision tonight or next week or whatever. As the project needs it, so this won't be over so we are going to have other meetings anyway. I don't see any reason why we can't come up with something tonight but my personal feeling is that everyone of us has said something about density, traffic, mitigation. We might not all agree on whether the project should go ahead or not. Those are the issues that we have all sort of zeroed in on.

Allan Goldman: Just to repeat, it's not our motion to proceed or to halt this project. Our goal is to create the mitigation to make the project feasible so anybody at this end feel one way or another in terms of motion versus another meeting.

Laura Stuart: I have been thinking about a motion that we could do that in an advisory position motion to advise Redevelopment Agency that we believe we need to return to the beginning with a new study, new community input and a study of the zoning laws. Because what I am hearing is that it's too big and as I hear from Bob Champion and it makes sense. We build to the envelope because the next guy is going to build to the envelope. So I think we should entertain the motion to ask the Redevelopment Agency to explore the zoning laws and go forward with exploration of development on Sepulveda Boulevard with that in mind. I don't know whether or not that means they say to us we'll stop while we re-explore zoning or we continue with our meetings. So, it isn't quite formed but

A CAC member makes the motion that we propose that the City prepare a specific plan for the region. Applause. A specific plan for the region which is exactly what you just said.

The motion is that we ask the City to make a specific plan for this region.

An audience member stated to the Chair, just as a point of clarification, you would be making a motion to do a special study or

specific plan for this particular area and not the region. It would be for the West Washington area or Sepulveda area as well?

Allan Goldman: Laura would like add her comments.

Laura Stuart: I would like to add that we have a conditional consent that if Champion does mitigate the traffic, designated school, police, fire concerns that we have that we can continue working with him on this project.

Allan Goldman: We would need reform the motion.

Laura Stuart: That's not what the intention of my motion was. I think that when staff talks about the possibility of doing a specific plan nine months to a year, this is what I am hearing, that folks in the audience want to have but they want to look at the entire development and my recommendation would be to suggest a specific plan.

Carol Schwab: I am Carol Schwab, the City Attorney. You just had two motions on the floor and Allan Goldman said there was not a motion from Laura. But now she's asked you to amend your's to include

Allan Goldman: We had a motion and a second on the first motion to have another meeting. Is there any other further discussion.

The Chair said I would like to rescind my motion for the additional info.

The Chair said, If we in fact go ahead with the motion that is on the floor now, and Redevelopment Agency meets and decides that they are changing the zoning laws whatever, this project would have to fall under the new zoning. Correct. Not the current zoning.

The audience member said That's correct.

The CAC member said okay, so no matter when our recommendations go to the Council, they will have to keep within those guidelines and understand that within the next six months or something like that the zoning could change, or the height levels could be change or whatever decisions could be made. Am I correct to that? Okay.

A CAC member; said one thing that should be looked at is that Hoonan is in the middle of purchasing this property. Is there going to be a problem that he is purchasing it under the condition that he is

able to do something and that all the sudden he is told he's not able to and what about other properties that come up for sale in the meantime. How's the project protected or how people are made aware that there is a pending specific plan which may change the zoning. (Audience commenting but cannot understand)

Allan Goldman: Does the City want to respond to that.

Joe Susca: On the Hooman purchase of the property, certainly through the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement that we have with Champion we have defined a specific area in which he is to study the feasibility of a redevelopment project. As you can imagine, he had a certain set of existing property owners going into the process and it appears we have one being replaced that is currently in escrow to acquire that property. It doesn't diminish the oversight of that particular parcel from Champion's purview or the review of that site as a collective CAC. It's true that if existing property owners want to improve or sell their property during this process, nothing in the law would prohibit them from doing so.

Allan Goldman: Thank you Joe. We still have a motion and a second on the floor. Once again, could you please repeat your motion?

An audience member said that the Citizens Advisory CAC suggest, advise that the City prepare a specific plan for the Sepulveda development area.

Allan Goldman: Motion and second. Is there any further discussion.

Laura Stuart: I just think it's too narrow because it doesn't really have any defined timeframes. We have some really important issues going on in this community and if a developer such as Champion is willing to work within the parameters, the new parameter, with this community, I think we should give that an opportunity. I think the motion is a little narrow.

CAC member agreed with Laura. I think that by just saying that we should advise the Redevelopment Agency to develop a specific plan that for the area, we are effectively tabling this project and we're now working with the developer to make recommendations to make it more of what the community wants or what some members of the community want.

Allan Goldman: Is there any other further discussion on the motion.

CAC member said I disagree. I don't think that we're saying that this

developer could be part of this. I think it's saying let's take a look at the area and make a plan. Be specific about what the community wants here.

Applause.

Allan Goldman: Does the CAC feel comfortable with a vote or would you like to take a break and think about this for a moment. At this point I will call for a vote. All those in favor of the motion. Ayes,
No Opposed Abstain

The motion is to go ahead and suggest formation of a specific plan.

CAC member stated, It is my understanding that when the City Council gets whatever input we going to get, they could choose to do whatever they want. They could choose to table, whatever they decide to do, okay. But us saying let's go back to square one, I don't feel it's going to accomplish anything because the City going to do that again. They'll have the same impact. I think what we need to do is to give more specific guidelines of exactly which direction we're going and I don't know exactly how to put it but I think that if we make as broad as you're doing at this point, I think we need to pull it in a little bit somehow.

CAC member, the reason I made this motion was based on what Sol Blumenfeld said. The groundwork has been laid. A lot of the work has already been done for the specific plan. They studied land use area recommendations. This will incorporate everything. I am not a planner. I don't want to be specific because the City has already done a lot of this work. That's what he said tonight. It seems like this would allow us to have more specific guidelines which is exactly what you just said for this area and that's why I made this motion.

Comments made in the background.

CAC member would it be helpful if there was discussion with Sol Blumenfeld about what exactly a specific plan is? Would that be of help because we haven't really talked much about that?

Sol Blumenfeld: I am going to stand up because sitting at this table is tough. Okay, let's briefly say what's a specific plan is, a specific plan is an ordinance just like a zoning ordinance, and it can supersede a zoning for the land so communities often get together, and they do specific plans or cities get together to do specific plans because they want to enact very specific rules that will guide land use and development in an area. So specific plans are written all the time and

they are meant to provide very specific legislation to guide development. So what does that mean for this project? Well, it means they also tend to involve more than just a particular project. They involve larger areas; that's why they are called specific plans. So it is important to recognize that if you do a plan that's typically more than just this project site. It usually is. So you could enact at the time you put together all the developments standards, not guidelines, which are more voluntary. You could come out with specific regulations with a specific plan that would lay out the height, the bulk and the size, and the open space, and all the other regulations that would guide the use and the development of the property. They could be more restrictive, but they could be less restrictive. The process is a public process. You go through normally having some workshops and you have some public hearings. The hearings, the Planning Commission, and then the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Council and then the City Council enacts the specific plan to new law to guide land use in the area. So that's the process and that could very well work in this area. As was mentioned by Ms. Anderson, there has been some work done already in the area. I have only worked in the City a month, but I am aware of some of work that has gone on. There is a streetscape master plan that was prepared for Sepulveda which could be incorporated in the specific plan. There is a little bit of market study work done that is not very old and you probably still have some shelf life to it. There is traffic work that was done for the Sunkist area that could be incorporated in this specific plan. So there really are components that could be used to prepare a specific plan. You have some of the pieces. So does that answer your question?

Carol Gross: Could I add a postscript to it. Potentially in the process of preparing a specific plan, you can prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the specific plan that addresses the numbers of units, and traffic and all of those other things. So, then if you move forward with a particular project, Champion or anybody else, pretty much the Environmental Impact Report its all laid out there. This process is kind of a way to move forward with a project by looking at and refining what size, what design, and what can make sense there.

Allan Goldman: We have a motion, we have a second. Is there any further discussion. Seeing no further discussion, Allan asks that a vote be taken by his fellow CAC members to "recommend to the Agency that they consider completion of a Specific Plan for the project area."

Vote: All Ayes. The unanimous motion carries.

Adjournment A call for adjournment was made by Allan Goldman, seconded by Loni Anderson.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

**TERMINATION OF
EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT
AND RELEASE**

THIS **TERMINATION OF EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT AND RELEASE** (this “**Termination and Release**”) is entered into by and between the **CULVER CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**, a public body, corporate and politic (“**Agency**”), and **CHAMPION REALTY, LTD.**, a California limited partnership (the “**Developer**”). Agency and Developer are sometimes hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Parties**.”

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Termination and Release:

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2006, Developer and Agency executed that certain Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (the “**Agreement**”).

WHEREAS, on January 31, 2007, Agency and Developer executed Amendment No. 1 to the ENA, pursuant to which the due date for the Conceptual Plans and other documents was extended to March 15, 2007 (the “**First Amendment**”).

WHEREAS, the Agreement, as amended by the First Amendment, shall be referred to herein as the “**ENA**.”

WHEREAS, as a result of concerns voiced by the community and the Sepulveda Citizen’s Advisory Committee and other reasons encountered during the performance of the ENA, the parties have mutually agreed that the ENA be terminated.

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2007, the Agency Board approved this Termination and Release.

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing Recitals, the Agency and Developer mutually agree as follows:

Accuracy of Recitals; Defined Terms. The Parties acknowledge the accuracy of the foregoing Recitals, which are incorporated herein by this reference. Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the ENA.

Termination. The Parties agree and acknowledge that the ENA is hereby terminated, and therefore is of no further force and effect.

Release. Developer hereby forever releases and discharges the Agency and the City of Culver City (“City”), and their respective successors, representatives, agents, officers and employees, and the Agency hereby forever releases and discharges Developer and its respective successors, representatives, agents, officers and employees, and Developer and Agency each forever waives any claim against the foregoing parties, from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, costs, expenses, actions and causes of

action of every nature, character and description, known or unknown, which Developer or Agency now owns or holds, or has at any time heretofore owned or held, or may at any time own or hold, by reason of any matter, cause or thing whatsoever occurred, done, omitted or suffered to be done in connection with the ENA and/or the termination thereof.

a. **Awareness of Civil Code Section 1542.** Developer and Agency expressly acknowledge that each is familiar with and has read the provisions of California Civil Code Section 1542, that reads: "A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of the executed release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his settlement with the debtor."

b. **Waiver of Civil Code Section 1542.** It is expressly stated by Developer and Agency, that each intends, by executing this Termination and Release, to fully and forever release any and all claims against the Agency and the City and their respective successors, representatives, agents, officers and employees, or against the Developer and its respective successors, representatives, agents, officers and employees, respectively; including not only those claims presently known to or suspected by them, but those claims that are unknown to and unsuspected by them, including claims that have not and may not have arisen as of the execution of this Termination and Release. Developer and Agency further expressly acknowledge that each has been fully advised of the purpose and effect of Civil Code Section 1542 by counsel, and of the effects and consequences of the waiver of the same. Having been so advised, and with full knowledge and understanding of the consequences, Developer expressly waives and relinquishes all rights and benefits afforded it by Civil Code Section 1542.

BY SIGNING THIS TERMINATION AND RELEASE, DEVELOPER AND AGENCY HEREBY WAIVE THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 1542 SOLELY IN CONNECTION WITH THE MATTERS WHICH ARE THE SUBJECT OF THE FOREGOING WAIVERS AND RELEASES.

**CHAMPION REALTY, LTD.,
a California limited partnership**

Dated: _____

By: _____
Robert Champion, President

**CULVER CITY REDEVELOPMENT
AGENCY**

Dated: _____

By: _____
Jerry B. Fulwood, Executive Director

c. **General.** Developer and Agency have carefully read the contents of this

Release and have executed this Termination and Release with full knowledge and upon independent advice from counsel. Developer and Agency have freely signed this Termination and Release without relying on any agreement, promise, statement or representation by or on behalf of the Agency, the City, Developer or their respective officers, employees, agents or representatives.

The provisions of this Termination and Release shall be binding upon Developer and Agency and their respective successors and assigns and shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

Captions. The captions appearing in this Termination and Release are for convenience only and are not a part of this Termination and Release and do not in any way limit, amplify, define, construe, or describe the scope or intent of the terms or provisions of this Termination and Release.

Counterparts. This Termination and Release may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute but one and the same document.

Effective Date. The effective date of this Termination and Release is the date it is signed on behalf of both the Agency and Developer.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Agency and Developer have executed this Termination and Release as of the dates set forth below:

**CULVER CITY REDEVELOPMENT
AGENCY**

Dated: _____

By: _____
Jerry B. Fulwood, Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
Agency Counsel

**CHAMPION REALTY, LTD.,
a California limited partnership**

Dated: _____

By: _____
Robert Champion, President