TASK 3: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

FOCUSED STUDY OF REDEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

CLARION

1700 Broadway, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80231
303.830.2890
www.clarionassociates.com

WARONZOF · ASSOCIATES
land economics
12200 West Olympic Boulevard
Suite 480
Los Angeles, CA 90064
www.waronzof.com

March 13, 2006

FINAL REPORT FOR THE SAN DIEGO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Table of Contents

A. INTRODUCTION 1

GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW 1
GENERAL CONCLUSION 2
DEFINITIONS OF SUCCESS 2
Why Define "Success"? 2
Basis of Definition 3
The Two Dimensions of Success 3

B. IDENTIFYING BEST PRACTICES 5

INTRODUCTION 5
GENERAL 5
Guidelines for Compliance Audits 5
Recent Performance Audit of Los Angeles Redevelopment Agency 6
Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies 6
Evolving Accountability Standards 7
IDENTIFIED BEST PRACTICES 8
Best Practices: Project Selection and Prioritization 8
Best Practices: Public Involvement and Communications 8
Best Practices: Agency Leadership, Staffing, and Training 9
Best Practices: Sound Management Practices 9

C. MOVING TOWARD BEST PRACTICES—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION 11

INTRODUCTION 11
PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION—RECOMMENDATIONS 11
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION—RECOMMENDATIONS 17
AGENCY LEADERSHIP, STAFFING, AND TRAINING—RECOMMENDATIONS 25
SOUND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES—RECOMMENDATIONS 32

D. CONCLUSION 39

E. PERSONS INTERVIEWED 41

F. GENERAL REFERENCE AND RESOURCES 45

FINAL REPORT: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

A. Introduction

General Project Overview

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego is currently evaluating its organizational structure and is considering alternative approaches to enhancing its administration and implementation of redevelopment activities. As part of this evaluation, the Redevelopment Agency retained the consultant team of Clarion Associates and Waronzof Associates in December 2005 to prepare a focused study of management practices and lessons learned from two existing redevelopment projects - the Metro Center Project and the Las Americas Project. This focused study is intended to be used by the Agency as part of its evaluation of overall administrative practices and organizational structure.

The consultants kicked off the focused study with review of the two case study project records and an intensive round of interviews in San Diego during mid-December 2005. The consultants interviewed Agency staff, other city staff, City Council members, project area committee (PAC) members, neighborhood and citizen representatives, project sponsors, other participating/financing partners, project developers and project consultants. Specific areas of focus included: internal project management practices, Agency cooperation with City departments and with other stakeholders, and the Agency's public outreach efforts for the two case study projects.

Following the interviews and document review, Clarion/Waronzof drafted three "Task Reports" for the Agency staff. The Task 1 Report contains "definitions of success" (restated in Part 3, below) to guide the evaluation of the Agency's performance. After establishing these benchmarks for success, the consultants evaluated the Agency's performance against these benchmarks in the Task 2 Report. The evaluation examined how the Agency performed specifically in the two case study projects, Las Americas and Metro Center, and how the Agency performed generally in its overall administration of redevelopment activities.

The report that follows here is the final Task 3 Report, which looks to the future. Based on the areas of weakness identified in the Task 2 Report, the consultants generated the following recommendations for improving the administration and implementation of redevelopment activities. This report is intended to be a starting point for change in certain discrete areas of the Agency's operations.

General Conclusion

The Clarion/Waronzof team concludes that, overall, the San Diego Redevelopment Agency (SDRA) is performing its basic functions well. Its projects reflect a solid track record of financial success, and the completed projects are generally popular with the citizens of San Diego. To underscore these successes, recent accomplishments at the Agency during the past five years have occurred despite significant leadership transitions in the Agency and despite apparent staffing shortages.

At the same time, there are areas of weakness – particularly in public outreach and communication and internal Agency management and efficiency. In addition, two themes recur in our assessment of the Agency's weakest practice areas. One is the relative lack of specific written standards, procedures, and criteria to guide the Agency in its day-to-day activities, including financial underwriting, public outreach, records management, and internal evaluation. This gap in management practice leads to inconsistent implementation and administrative practices, less public transparency, and ineffective post-project analysis.

Second is the strong public perception of the Agency as a predominantly "reactive" force in terms of "getting redevelopment done" in San Diego. In other words, the Agency is rarely perceived within redevelopment circles or citywide as championing projects or aggressively seeking to solve longstanding neighborhood problems. While this perception may not be accurate, there is a clear disconnect between the Agency's perception of itself and the views held by the Agency's various stakeholders and partners.

However, specific steps can be taken to improve performance in these areas, and in some cases the SDRA is already moving to do so. As a fundamentally sound redevelopment agency, we recommend that the Agency focus on improving performance in those discrete areas that will make the most difference to project performance and public understanding of the Agency. The details of our recommendations are set forth in the remainder of this Final Report.

Definitions of Success

A study of performance must be related to some benchmark of success. In order to establish a benchmark for SDRA performance, the consultants developed draft Definitions of Success and then refined those definitions in response to comments received. The resulting Definitions of Success are set forth below.

Why Define "Success"?

Defining "success" in plain English is important because it provides a gauge for measuring Agency performance. Although broadly worded, the definitions of success presented here are precise enough to provide 'big picture" benchmarks for evaluating the Agency's achievements in terms of project specific impacts and overall Agency effectiveness and efficiency. The definitions of success established in this task become the foundation of our project scorecards and ultimately our assessments of project performance in our Case Study Evaluation and this Final Report.

Basis of Definition

Success should be measured in relation to Agency goals, expectations of the public and other redevelopment participants, and requirements under California redevelopment law. Because the Agency does not have its own mission statement, "success" should be judged based in part on the extent to which the Agency helps achieve the mission of its parent department, the Community and Economic Development Department. "Success" for each of the two redevelopment projects (Las Americas and Metro Center) also should be evaluated based on the goals identified in the San Ysidro and City Heights Redevelopment Plans, respectively. Finally, "success" should include those objectives identified by the Agency for purposes of this study of Best Management Practices.

The Two Dimensions of Success

Success should be measured both in terms of (1) its impact on the Quality of Life for the people and businesses of San Diego, and (2) whether the Agency Operations are effective and efficient.

Quality of Life (Economic and Physical Impacts)

- Removing Blight: Projects should address both the physical and economic causes of blight, as defined in California statutes.

- Improve Economic and Physical Conditions: Projects should result in substantial economic development for the city and raise the quality of its physical environmental, as authorized by California law.

- Revitalize Neighborhoods: Redevelopment agency activities should revitalize neighborhoods and provide an environment for the social, economic, and psychological growth of well-being of the city's residents, as authorized by California redevelopment law.

Agency Operations (Effectiveness and Efficiency)

- Project Rationale (Selection and Prioritization): Projects should be selected and prioritized through a process that respects the wishes of the public while ensuring that redevelopment funds are used efficiently and maximize the likelihood of success in achieving Quality of Life goals.

- Regulatory Compliance: Projects and Agency actions must comply with all relevant redevelopment law and local regulatory requirements.

- Timing of Project Approval and Completion: Projects should be reviewed, approved, and completed in the least possible time consistent with requirements of California law and an effective public involvement process.

- Sound Management Practices: The Agency should leverage staff, financial, and technical resources efficiently and effectively from project design through implementation and monitoring.

- Public Participation and Communication: The Agency should ensure that its procedures and communications allow and encourage participation by all members of the public; that the Agency conveys clear, consistent, and accurate messages to the public throughout project selection, design, and implementation; and that the Agency's procedures allow meaningful incorporation of reasonable public desires into project design and prioritization.

- Coordination with Other Agencies and Project Participants: The Agency should ensure projects proceed expeditiously and efficiently by working effectively with all other relevant agencies and project participants.

B. Identifying Best Practices

Introduction

This section of the Final Report identifies "best practices" for redevelopment agencies gleaned from independent industry sources, as well as from best practices research conducted by the consultant team in 2005 for another assignment. Our previous research involved determining practices in Long Beach, Sacramento, Oakland, Pasadena, and Portland, Oregon through a combination of document review and interviewing key staff and management.

We expanded the best practices research for the current assignment by reviewing practices by redevelopment agencies in several large cites, namely Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, DC, again interviewing key staff, and reviewing appropriate documents. In addition, we also extended our research beyond just redevelopment agencies because we felt that in certain areas even the "best" redevelopment agencies do not follow what we consider to be widely-accepted business best practices.

The independent sources, which are well known to redevelopment professionals in California, include the California State Controller's *Guidelines for Compliance Audits of California Redevelopment Agencies* and those *Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies* published by the California Debt Advisory Committee almost ten years ago. Since those sources of guidance are publicly available, we do not repeat them in their entirety in this document. In addition, the SDRA prepares annual compliance documentation, and this focused study effort was not designed to audit their work.

Instead, this document focuses on best practices in those areas where the focused study effort has identified significant questions about the Agency's performance. In order to remain focused on key areas for improvement, we will review only those best practices related to those service areas.

General

Guidelines for Compliance Audits

SDRA must comply with those Guidelines for Compliance Audits of California Redevelopment Agencies published by the California State Controller November 1998 (Guidelines).[1] The Guidelines establish minimum levels of performance in the areas of:

- Financial Disclosure and Reporting;
- Affordable Housing;
- Five-Year Implementation Plans;

[1] Proposed revisions to the Guidelines have been in the works since 2004, but have not been officially promulgated by the State Controller's office to date. A draft of the revised guidelines is available through the California Redevelopment Association's website at: http://www.calredevelop.org/Leg/2004DraftGuidelines%20_3_.pdf.

- Redevelopment Plans;
- Public Notification; and
- Conflicts of Interest.

Confirming compliance with each of these guidelines would require a full performance audit, which is beyond the scope of this focused study. However, no issues regarding the SDRA's compliance with minimum statutory requirements and with the Guidelines surfaced during our two case study evaluations. It appears, for example, that the SDRA has adequately documented the process of preparing the Redevelopment Plans and Five-Year Implementation Plans for the two project areas evaluated. Similarly, it appears that the Agency has maintained fairly complete files covering public notifications required by law, as well as financial disclosures and reporting required by law (although general information and records on project performance could be improved in several ways, as detailed below). Nonetheless, this Final Report cannot make any definitive statement about the Agency's overall compliance or noncompliance with the Guidelines.

Recent Performance Audit of Los Angeles Redevelopment Agency

In the fall of 2004, the City Auditor of Los Angeles completed a three-part performance audit of the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA/LA). The three portions of the CRA audit covered (a) loan underwriting practices, (b) development loans and developer subsidies, and (c) disposition of real estate. That highly publicized audit has resulted in broad-based re-evaluation of management practices in the CRA/LA.

As mentioned above, this study is not an audit for compliance or a full performance audit, but rather a focused inquiry into the SDRA's performance and effectiveness in the context of only two case study projects. Based on information gathered both about the Agency generally and about the two case studies specifically, we have, however, incorporated questions related to the Agency's effectiveness and efficiency in the following areas: (a) project selection and prioritization; (b) use of consulting resources, (c) time required for project design and implementation; and (d) records management. Many of these topics are covered in the CRA/LA audit, and several of the audit suggestions have been incorporated into our recommended best practices. Nevertheless, it would be wise for the SDRA to review the three Los Angeles CRA audit reports to confirm that the Agency does not suffer from the same weaknesses.

Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies

Finally, the SDRA should aspire to meet those *Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies*, published by the California Debt Advisory Committee in April 1995. Although this guidance document is somewhat dated, it is clearly based on redevelopment practices following California's adoption of AB 1290, and many of its recommendations remain valid today. A full list of recommendations from this document is attached as Appendix A to this report, but we have referenced some of the more relevant recommendations in the sections addressing specific practices below.

Evolving Accountability Standards

Our primary basis for establishing best practices appropriate for the SDRA are the foregoing California reference materials; our analysis of SDRA and of five comparison cities the consultants surveyed during 2005 and three more surveyed in 2006; and our more general knowledge of industry practices nationally. Nonetheless, any discussion of best practices for organizational performance today must also reflect emerging private- and public-sector standards beyond the specific redevelopment context, particularly in the realm of financial accountability.

In the private sector, a series of high-profile corporate scandals led to passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley ("SOX") legislation, which seeks to protect investors by improving the accuracy and reliability of corporate disclosures. Although SOX pertains only to publicly-traded companies, comparable requirements are being adopted by many non-profit organizations, as boards of directors demand greater accountability. At the same time, shareholders have become increasingly powerful and demand greater transparency and financial disclosure from companies.

Similarly, the combination of strained government budgets and greater voter skepticism about the effectiveness of government programs has imposed a greater level of scrutiny on the public sector. Legislation protecting whistleblowers has increased transparency. Federal and international donor programs traditionally have required a much higher degree of reporting and program justification, but now these standards are increasingly being extended to other levels of government.

We recognize that these financial accountability standards have not been widely adopted by redevelopment agencies, either in California or elsewhere. Thus, we do not present these standards as accepted "best practices" in the following discussion; nor do we rate the SDRA against this standard. It is notable, however, that the City of San Diego established in 2004 a "Disclosure Practices Working Group," which is charged with developing standardized financial disclosure policies to ensure the city's compliance with federal and state securities regulations. The Working Group meets regularly to review all city disclosure documents, including SDRA's financial disclosure documents. This is an important step that mirrors the SOX-borne practices in play at private corporations.

Nevertheless, the SDRA should recognize that accountability standards are broadening in scope beyond purely *financial* accountability and a higher public standard – in the broadest meaning of the term "accountability" – might soon be required, either formally by state regulation, or less formally when demanded by the public. Already, recent changes in California's redevelopment laws have begun to capture this growing movement for improved public accountability – beyond purely financial disclosure: Annual redevelopment agency budgets must now specifically include "an examination of the previous year's achievements *and a comparison of the achievements with the goals of the previous year's work program*." California Health and Safety Code, Section 33606(e), emphasis added. Accordingly, it would be wise for the Agency to conform to at least the spirit, if not the actual letter, of these emerging accountability standards in all of its operations and communications.

Identified Best Practices

In this section, we present a compilation of best management practices based on the sources described above. A full description of each of the best practices, and how the San Diego Redevelopment's performance compares to each practice, follows in Part C of this Final Report.

Best Practices: Project Selection and Prioritization

1. *Adopt an Agency-Specific Mission Statement to Drive Agency Actions.*
2. *Develop Specific, Measurable Redevelopment Goals that Relate to the Agency's Mission.*
3. *Prioritize Agency Goals to Balance Economic/Financial Returns and Social Benefits.*
4. *Evaluate Prospective Projects Relative to Achieving Identified Goals and Priorities.*
5. *Implement Project-Level Investment Policies.*

Best Practices: Public Involvement and Communications

6. *Ask Members of the Immigrant Community How to Reach Out and Engage People in Redevelopment Activities.*
7. *Create a Formal Public Information Policy and Program Specific to the Redevelopment Agency.*
8. *Create Project-Specific Public Participation Plans.*
9. *Offer Public Education about Redevelopment.*
10. *Mediate Disputes Between Community Groups to Avoid Partisan Politics.*
11. *Consider Additional Funding for Essential Resources and Staff.*
12. *Build Strong Relationships Between the Public and Project Managers.*
13. *Maintain Strong Relationships Among the PACs, Agency Management, and the Agency Board (City Council).*
14. *Clarify and Support the Role of the PAC as Community Representatives.*
15. *Seek Broad Public Involvement Beyond PACs.*
16. *Create Welcoming Forums for Public Input.*

Best Practices: Agency Leadership, Staffing, and Training

17. *Install Strong Leadership and "Big Picture" Vision at the Agency's Helm.*

18. *With Strong Leadership, Explore a More Proactive Approach to Redevelopment.*

19. *Agency Leadership Should Set Clear Management Goals.*

20. *Build Appropriate Staff Expertise.*

21. *Lay The Groundwork for Staffing Increases or Reorganization.*

22. *Propose Alternative Hiring Practices for the Agency.*

23. *More Effectively Employ Outside Consultants.*

24. *Keep Lines of Communication Open Between Agency Management and In-Line Staff.*

Best Practices: Sound Management Practices

25. *Manage Proactively to Build on Streamlining Successes and to Avoid Project Time Delays.*

26. *Centralize Records Management and Project Tracking to Achieve Better Continuity, Reliability, and Transparency.*

27. *Create an Adequate Data Collection and Consistent Project Reporting System.*

28. *Implement Consistent Procedures and Methodologies for Measuring Project and Program Success.*

29. *Strive to Improve Inter-Departmental Coordination and Communication.*

30. *Use Negotiations with Developers and Other Partners to Achieve Desired Community Benefits.*

C. Moving Toward Best Practices—Recommendations for Action

"The danger of misalignment of mission, vision, and goals increases as you create additional structural, procedural, and communication barriers."[2]

Introduction

This section of our Final Report builds on our previous findings and identified best practices, and offers more specific recommendations for policy changes or specific actions that could significantly improve the Agency's effectiveness, efficiency, and relationship with the citizens of San Diego. Like our case study evaluations, and the identification of best practices in Part B above, the specific recommendations contained in this section for how to improve redevelopment in San Diego are also anchored in the Definitions of Success stated in Part A of this report.

The recommendations for specific actions that we believe would improve the effectiveness or efficiency of redevelopment in San Diego necessarily focus on SDRA as the central agent of local redevelopment activity. However, we recognize that other stakeholders play important roles in local development outcomes. There are several areas in which it will take the cooperation or support of other stakeholders – such as the Mayor and City Council, other city departments and agencies, and the PACs – to improve performance.

The recommendations are made in the following four major topic areas previously identified in the conclusion to our Case Studies Evaluation Report and in the best practices identified in Part B above:

1. Project Selection and Prioritization
2. Public Involvement and Communications
3. Agency Leadership, Staffing, and Training
4. Sound Management Practices.

Project Selection and Prioritization—Recommendations

There seems to be a widespread perception in the community that the Agency does not have a formal, organized process for selecting projects or any objective criteria for screening selected projects. Instead, many stakeholders believe the Agency's decisions are largely political or, in many cases, arbitrary or haphazard.

[2] Source: City of Chula Vista, California; City Manager's Report on Formation of 501(c) Corporation to Manage Redevelopment Activities (2004).

While our review of Agency projects represented a decidedly limited, and perhaps unrepresentative, sample of projects, in our opinion this perception of politically-motivated project selection seems overstated. Nonetheless, the Agency's lack of established procedures for identifying, vetting and selecting projects undoubtedly leaves the Agency exposed to such contentions. Moreover, the Agency's failure to clearly tie selected projects to identified goals underscores the public uncertainty. Thus, the community cannot understand the Agency's basis for selecting one project over another.

Accordingly, we recommend the following best practices for San Diego:

1. Adopt an Agency-Specific Mission Statement to Drive Agency Actions. Every organization needs a set of fundamental principles to drive operations and focus resources. SDRA's parent organization has a clear mission statement, which we reference in our Definition of Success. But SDRA needs its own, unique statement to reflect the particular objectives of redevelopment.

    - The Agency's motto of "*Revitalizing Neighborhoods and Improving Economic Conditions in San Diego*" is too brief and general for this purpose.
    - The mission statement should then become the reference point for developing Agency goals and priorities; the success of agency activities then should be measured against the extent to which projects serve to fulfill the mission.

2. Develop Specific, Measurable Redevelopment Goals that Relate to the Agency's Mission. Goals are the tangible reflections of the Agency's overall objectives. To be meaningful, the goals must be most specific and measurable, so that progress toward achieving the goals can be measured.

    - An excellent example is the City of Oakland's "10K Housing Initiative." In the fall of 1999, Mayor Jerry Brown proposed a four-year goal of attracting 10,000 new residents to downtown Oakland as a way to revitalize the physical, economic, and cultural environment of the area. According to City estimates, accommodating 10,000 new residents will require the construction of approximately 6,000 new units on as many as 30 to 40 city blocks. The City established a specific website for this initiative (http://www.oaklandnet.com/10k-a/overview.cfm) that not only outlines the goal but also reports on its progress.
    - The City of Oakland moved to performance-based budgeting several years ago (as Long Beach is now doing), and the Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency (CEDA) is held to the same requirements of performance measures as all other City agencies. Our review of categories relevant to CEDA, and to the Redevelopment Division in particular, shows a mixture of both input measures (e.g., how many loans were placed?) and output measures (e.g., how many jobs were created?). Although the number of measures for CEDA has been limited so far, this performance measurement is a very positive step forward in accountability.

- As another example, the following goals drove the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency's (CRA/LA) most recent two budgeting cycles. Although perhaps less measurable, they are nonetheless clear and specific:
  - Projects should be catalytic in order to build a momentum in a community that is carried forward by others with less need over time for Agency financial participation.
  - Projects should serve to increase the resources available to the community in order for redevelopment program to become self-funding and self-sustaining over time.
  - Projects should have a visible, physical impact that demonstrates sustainable improvement to the quality of life of residents, business operators, property owners, and other stakeholders.

3. Prioritize Agency Goals to Balance Economic/Financial Returns and Social Benefits. Because of (a) term-limits for local elected officials, (b) the rising importance of neighborhood groups in California politics, and (c) the serious fiscal constraints on California cities, there is significant pressure to use redevelopment funds to pay for neighborhood infrastructure and public works projects. In general, California cities are responding to these pressures by redirecting some redevelopment funds towards neighborhood public works projects, and several of the comparison cities mentioned that this has resulted in greater politicization of redevelopment decisions.

   There is clear evidence from the current Implementation Plan for City Heights that a detailed project area revenue analysis was performed, and priority goals were set. However, the City Heights Implementation Plan also outlines nearly 71 projects or programs, with no linkage to anticipated revenues. In addition, the Implementation Plan sets forth nearly 109 desired outcomes from the myriad projects and programs, and less than half of these outcomes describe a project that will deliver a quantifiable economic return. In order for redevelopment efforts to remain sustainable, the SDRA must continually balance the demand for non-economic neighborhood infrastructure projects with projects that will generate steady streams of tax increment.

   - *Clarify Criteria for Funding Infrastructure and Public Facility Projects*. Many of the Agency's current goals, as reflected in the Five-Year Implementation Plans, call for extensive amount of expensive infrastructure improvements. Such improvements can be important in fostering community redevelopment. The SDRA should clarify its criteria for funding infrastructure and public facilities (i.e., clarify when they will be funded as stand-alone projects, as opposed to elements of a broader redevelopment project), and should clearly identify the priority of infrastructure and public facility projects in relation to direct job- or revenue-generating activities.
   - *Execute the Selection and Prioritization Policy*. SDRA should develop and execute a policy for prioritizing projects by including in staff

reports of potential projects an evaluation of how well each proposed project meets the policy criteria, and by suggesting a priority order for selecting and implementing the proposed projects.

- CRA/LA provides an excellent example, with an annual statement of priorities, both internal (agency operations) and external (community goals). As highlighted on the agency webpage (http://www.crala.org/internet-site/About/management_priorities.cfm): "The CRA/LA has identified a number of important management initiatives and policies that we intend to pursue this year in addition to our priority development projects. These management initiatives are derived from the CRA/LA's overall mission and reflect Agency-wide issues that impact redevelopment activities throughout our seven regions." Among the priorities cited for this year are:
    1. Working to Eliminate Homelessness in Los Angeles
    2. Developing Affordable Housing
    3. Resolving Legal Challenges to Redevelopment Activities
    4. Creating a Long Range Financial Plan
    5. Revitalizing the Los Angeles River

  For each priority area, the Agency provides a clear justification for the priority placement, and then identifies tangible steps for achieving the goal. In this way, all stakeholders and agency partners are aware of CRA/LA's plans for the year.
- Another best practice comes from Portland, where developing and prioritizing the PDC budget is very much a community effort. In January 2005, PDC budget staff visited every urban renewal advisory committee (or appropriate budget committee) in the 11 active urban renewal areas. Each year more projects are proposed than can be supported through available funds, so the projects must be prioritized. PDC's directors of Housing, Development, and Economic Development make the initial prioritization, and then this work is presented to the community for their input and recommendations. The public can make their preferences known via a "PDC Project Ranking Form" (attached to this Final Report as Appendix B), which lists 14 major programs and asks participants to rank them in order. Stakeholder recommendations are then discussed by the PDC directors and the executive leadership as part of the final decision making process. Final funding decisions are made by comparing projects and programs against specific weighted criteria including whether or not projects/programs meet citywide and urban renewal area goals, whether there are current legal commitments to the projects, the expected catalytic strength of the project, and whether PDC could complete the project within an expected timeframe.

4. **Evaluate Prospective Projects Relative to Achieving Identified Goals and Priorities.** Review of the Implementation Plans for the San Ysidro Project Area and the City Heights Project Areas indicate detailed documentation of many community and stakeholder goals, along with some general organization and

prioritization of these goals. However, little was done to link broadly worded community goals to actionable project outcomes with realistic timeframes.

- *The Implementation Plan should Set Clear and Actionable Priorities for Project Area Redevelopment Efforts*. In our interviews, project managers from both LBRA and the CRA/LA mentioned the value of a vigorous implementation plan process as a way of developing a common community vision and setting clear and specific community priorities. Project managers from both redevelopment agencies noted that an implementation plan that sets priorities is effective in managing stakeholder expectations about what redevelopment efforts can be achieved in any five-year period. Because a clear and precise implementation plan is often the product of broad community consensus, these project managers also noted that the goals expressed in the implementation plan can also be an effective negotiating tool, as the document becomes a strong voice for the community.
- *Consider the Use of Community Impact Reports as Part of Project Evaluation*. Community Impact Reports provide objective analyses of more qualitative social and socioeconomic project impacts, and can complement the more quantitative analyses of a prospective project's economic impacts. This is sometimes referred to as the "double bottom line," in which both financial and social returns on investment are calculated. A Community Impact Report often evaluates project impacts in terms of job quality, fiscal impacts on the community's existing economic base, affordable housing, smart growth, and delivery/quality of neighborhood services.
- *Evaluate Preferred Programs for Economic Feasibility*. Once clear redevelopment priorities have been established and projects/programs have been developed, a preliminary cost budget should be developed and compared against the projected project area budget.

5. Implement a Project-Level Investment Policy. Although the SDRA generally achieves good leverage on its investments, the Agency does not appear to have a basis for evaluating the collective financial impact of individual project commitments. A project level investment policy would allow the SDRA to select projects that maximize the generation of tax increment within the context of broader Agency goals. The investment policy should be tied to overall financial goals set by the SDRA Board.

- *Cover Key Investment Topics*. The elements of this policy, which could vary by project type, location, or other factors, might include:
  - Minimum leverage threshold – the maximum share of total costs that would be incurred by SDRA;
  - Target investment return – desired financial returns to SDRA relative to SDRA's investment;
  - Target public benefits – desired financial and other economic returns to City relative to SDRA's investment;

- Grants versus loan – when should SDRA provide outright grants and when should repayment be expected; and
- Investment ceiling – maximum amount SDRA would invest in any one project or Project Area.

Adopting these policies would also encourage other desirable outcomes. For example, the minimum leverage threshold would encourage SDRA to aggressively pursue other public and foundation funding sources to supplement scarce Agency funds. The target returns should encourage the Agency to pursue catalytic and financially feasible projects. The "grant versus loan" policy could help ensure that projects are not over-subsidized and that the Agency shares appropriately in very successful projects. Finally, the investment ceiling would encourage the Agency to spread its resources and not focus too much on any one project or area.

- *Design the Policy to Help Choose Among Investment Alternatives*. The investment policy should provide a "screen" that would help the SDRA make judgments about different investment alternatives. This would increase the efficiency of project evaluation, and help set expectations when negotiating with project stakeholders.
- An example of one approach to implementing this recommended best practice comes from Los Angeles. In response to city audits completed during 2004, the CRA/LA instituted several policies and practices to rationalize and standardize its operation and management. Of particular relevance is the city's new (draft) "Commercial/ Industrial Underwriting and Administrative Procedures." The guidelines' stated intent is "to reflect the Agency's objectives and to set forth prudent underwriting practices so that the maximum public benefit is derived from the use of any public funds." The standards will "provide the Agency with a framework for evaluating project proposals" and are to be "used as an operational process, an analysis tool for quantifying a project's financial characteristics, and to determine if financial assistance or other forms of Agency involvement are warranted."
    - The guidelines clearly state the general criteria all developers must meet to warrant Agency financial assistance: capacity to complete the project, credit-worthiness, and the provision of public benefits consistent with Agency objectives and/or the project area redevelopment plan.
    - The guidelines clearly state and detail the procedures for evaluating proposals and determining whether Agency financial assistance is warranted. The procedures, which are to be followed in all cases, describe a five-step process: (1) Initial Review; (2) Application Processing; (3) Negotiation, Evaluation and Structuring; (4) Drafting of Agreements; and (5) Asset Management. Each step is described as to its purpose, the information required from the applicant, identification of the Agency decision-maker, the process required to complete the step, and required documentation of the step's findings.

- The guidelines include minimum underwriting criteria to assess the proposed project's land acquisition costs, labor policies, overall financial feasibility (including analysis of the project's development costs, financing/income measures, and return measures), the developer's financial capability, and the public benefit.
- The guidelines typically require written evaluation for each step of the process, culminating in a "summary report" detailing the Agency's findings and recommendations, and a written "term sheet" outlining the structure and terms of any proposed agreement between the developer and the Agency. All this provides a disciplined and standardized record keeping system for all redevelopment project applications.

Public Participation and Communication—Recommendations

This practice area focuses on the SDRA's ability to communicate to the public information about redevelopment in general, as well as information about specific projects that are proposed or under construction. It also addresses the quality of the SDRA's efforts to actively involve members of the public in specific redevelopment activities, including but not limited to engaging project area committees (PACs) to the extent possible.

Based on our case study evaluation and industry best practices, we conclude that there is still room for San Diego's improvement across virtually all the individual indicators of success in this very important area. Too often, public outreach stops with the PACs and fails to reach other members of the affected and interested public. The SDRA's public involvement efforts are particularly lacking in those redevelopment areas that do not have PACs in place, or where questions exist whether the PACs are fairly representative of an area's diverse interests.

However, even in the face of these findings, all interested persons must acknowledge the very real tension between the public's demand for transparency (given the significant public monies at play) and a redevelopment process that often demands flexibility and speed to avoid lost opportunities and to minimize the developer's exposure to risk. This trade-off requires the Agency and the City's leaders to strike a careful balance between a more streamlined procedure and a more transparent process. The following best practices are offered for the Agency's consideration with this important caveat in mind:

6. **Ask Members of the Immigrant Community How to Reach Out and Engage People In Redevelopment Activities.** Convene a focus group of ethnically diverse residents in SDRA project areas for the purpose of studying and making recommendations regarding SDRA outreach to immigrant populations. Not unlike other "gateway" communities, San Diego is struggling as a city to engage its diverse immigrant population in public/civic participation initiatives. We recommend that the SDRA convene a focus group of diverse neighborhood representatives for the purpose of advising the Agency with respect to public outreach/participation initiatives. The challenges in each of the projects areas might be unique enough to warrant a focus group within each redevelopment project area. The particular demographics trends and community resources will influence the type of

outreach/participation program that is most appropriate. The results of the focus study should inform the Agency's public information program as well as its project-specific public participation plans.

7. **Create a More Extensive Public Information Policy and Program Specific to the Redevelopment Agency.** Currently, public information and participation is primarily conducted by project managers on a case-by-case basis and two public information officers (one staff and one consultant). The public information officers not only serve SDRA, but two other distinct Divisions within the Community and Economic Development Department.[3]. There is a fundamental communications plan specific to the SDRA in place, but it is not well-publicized nor consistently executed.

   Some staff are frustrated that there is insufficient staff and resources to implement components of the communications plan. Because public perception of redevelopment activities can be strongly influenced by publicity surrounding projects, the Agency should proactively publicize the goals and results of redevelopment activities to the public on a consistent and on-going basis..

   - The Agency should broadly communicate the need for public participation in redevelopment project areas in order to inspire public participation. Equally as important, the Agency should communicate how public participation can lead to meaningful change. Publicizing Agency successes achieved with the help of community volunteers will encourage project and program support.
   - Public information should be provided in multiple languages depending on the needs of the individual project areas. The Agency will fail to reach large sectors of the community until additional resources are devoted to this end. Given the diverse and rapidly-changing profile of communities like City Heights, the Agency should take steps to identify which languages are most common in the community and consistently offer translations in these languages at important public meetings, in its written communications, and public announcements.
   - The Agency website will play an increasingly important role in communicating information as the internet becomes readily accessible by all sectors of the community. Especially important is reporting on major projects and initiatives. One example is in Sacramento, where SHRA publishes a series of one-page project profiles, explaining each project and documenting its success. An example from Sacramento's website is attached as Appendix C to this Final Report. The website is: http://www.shra.org/Content/CommunityDevelopment/RedevWorks/RedevAreas.htm.
     - The Agency also should provide website translations (or at least a link to a website translator such as

[3] In contrast, Centre City Development Corporation maintains a dedicated staff of eight and a formal budget to carry out its public communication plan.

http://babelfish.altavista.com) so that non-English-speaking members of the community have equal access to the same information as English-speaking members.

- Consistent and regular sources of information about redevelopment activities should be disseminated. The Agency should consider resurrecting its Agency newsletter (on-line and/or hard copies) or contributing regularly to a City publication. For example, Casa Familiar's monthly newsletter, *Fronteras/Borders* is a good model. It is published in English and in Spanish. It provides information about the importance of public participation in San Ysidro, opportunities to participate, the recent successes of community groups, and the achievements of individual citizens.
- The Agency should create a network of community organizations with which to regularly communicate redevelopment announcements, events, opportunities and successes. In addition to the existing contacts cited by City staff—local newspapers, civic groups, government agencies, public access television—the list of contacts should include immigrant service providers that have relationships and access to some of the hard-to-reach sectors of the San Diego community. The focus group discussed above should provide some insight as to supplemental contacts to put on a network list.
- In comparison, cities with more extensive public information programs, conduct community charrettes, speakers' bureaus, mass mailings, press releases, ground-breaking and project opening ceremonies, neighborhood "meet and greet" events, extended office hours, slogan contests, town hall forums, agency participation in community events and festivals, annual reports for public consumption, local media advertising for meetings and events, and press briefings.

8. Create Project-Specific Public Participation Plans. At the very outset of individual projects, the Agency should develop individual plans for obtaining public input and building public support for redevelopment initiatives. The most significant redevelopment initiatives often take place in poor neighborhoods with high immigrant and minority populations. Studies show that mobilizing the effective participation of the poor in community groups is a difficult task.[4] However, extensive, creative, and persistent outreach is essential to generate participation by a reasonable cross-section of the community. Individual plans should contemplate, at a minimum, the following topics: The most productive way to utilize the PAC and other community groups; the level and source of public interest in projects; appropriate junctures for public input; and potential sources of opposition to the project.

[4] *See e.g.,* "Kernels of Democracy" by Ken Thompson, Jeffery Berry, Kent Portney (Lincoln Filene Center at Tufts University, 1994), available at http://www.cpn.org/topics/community/kernels.html. The authors studied successful participation programs in five American cities: Birmingham, Dayton, Portland, San Antonio and St. Paul.

- Even when the Agency finds itself reacting to developer-initiated projects, it is still important to consult with PACs and other community groups at the outset of a project for input regarding the community value of the proposed project. Pursuing projects that have not been endorsed by these groups discourages their participation in the design and development of projects. It also fosters public sentiment that the real decisions about project selection are made behind closed doors.
- Project-specific participation plans should create regular opportunity for two-way communication to occur between the Agency and the public. To that end, the Agency should consider: interactive web site features such as the "citizen blogs" used by the Portland Development Corporation (http://pdxcityclub.typepad.com/citizenblog/2006); coffee hours at different neighborhood locations within project areas at key stages in the project; community surveys; etc.
- Continue to encourage public participation by celebrating project milestones with volunteers and publicizing these events. Community recognition is an inexpensive way to show appreciation for public participation.
- Measure the success of project-specific public participation efforts by tracking Agency efforts (e.g. mailings, translators) and the number of attendees at meetings, new volunteers, new PAC candidates, etc.
- Include press releases about specific projects on the SDRA web site rather than the CEDD web site.

9. Offer Public Education about Redevelopment. The Agency cannot expect members of the community to participate in redevelopment activities without first increasing community understanding of fundamental concepts such as "tax increment" and "project area committee." The barriers to civic participation in immigrant neighborhoods are likely cultural as well as lingual. Newcomers may be entirely unfamiliar with "public participation" and other ideals common in democratic countries. One option is to participate in the City's Speakers' Bureau program, offer evening classes in redevelopment project areas, and create a curriculum in conjunction with other community development agencies. Some model programs are described below.

- Consider conducting a community or even city-wide survey of what city residents know /think about the SDRA's contributions to "quality of life" in San Diego.[5]

[5] In 2001, the Portland Development Commission (PDC) did this by hiring CFM Research to conduct a survey of opinions about urban renewal and the PDC. The survey results show that the public has a fairly favorable view of urban renewal, but very little specific knowledge about the PDC, how it functions, and what it has accomplished. Forty-seven percent of the respondents had a favorable view of the agency, while 21 percent had an unfavorable view. Another 32 percent were not sure what they thought about the agency. Sixty-eight percent of those surveyed had either a very favorable or somewhat favorable opinion of urban renewal. However, the survey also revealed a lack of specific knowledge about PDC and its projects. Forty-three percent of those surveyed could not name or refused to name a specific project completed by PDC.

- San Diego County funds a program organized by Casa Familiar called "Sin Limite/Unlimited." This program consists of monthly meetings designed to teach and empower area residents in terms of how they can take action to improve and change their community. It might serve as an educational outreach model. Monthly workshops with residents touch upon themes such as: urban design, process, leadership, community organization, and home-buying. For example, the January 2005 meeting focused on the value of community participation and project updates on four San Ysidro Community Development projects. See Appendix D for a history of Sin Limite's workshops.
- Offer application workshops to assist immigrants with land use, grant/loan and PAC candidate application forms.
- Encourage the City of San Diego to consider initiating a program to build immigrant civic capacity. The Central Valley Partnership is an excellent model for this type of initiative.[6] The Partnership sponsors immigrant classes about community education, citizenship, economic development, immigrant rights, cultural expression, and the creation of more responsive institutions. See Appendix E to this Final Report.

10. Mediate Disputes Between Community Groups and Avoid Partisan Politics. While public controversy over project selection is typically unavoidable and even healthy, deep-seated hostility between community factions will make it difficult if not impossible for the Agency to successfully advance redevelopment projects. Agency projects should be sustainable independent of partisan groups and candidates.

    - While alliances with community groups and leaders can lead to community support for projects (e.g., Las Americas in San Ysidro), dependency on the backing of any one group can also be detrimental. Public participation programs should focus participation efforts on community issues and projects, and not individual organizations or political leaders. The Agency should strive to renew previously damaged relationships and create new ties to the communities in which they operate.
    - Likewise, the Agency should attempt to mediate disputes between community groups over redevelopment to prevent community division. Greater effort and leadership is needed in the San Ysidro project area so that opportunities for redevelopment projects are not defeated by political discord (as was the case with the grant-funding for the library component of Las Americas). Agency project managers should embrace the role of "mediator" and seek to rally the community around the goals of redevelopment. Project managers should strive to

[6] The Central Valley Partnership was founded in 1996 by the James Irvine Foundation. The Partnership engages citizens, immigrants, and native-born Americans in community building issues of concern in California's Central Valley. *See http://www.citizenship.net/can/index.shtm*

amicably mediate the disputes that arise between group leaders without "playing favorites" or "taking sides."

11. **Consider Additional Funding for Essential Resources and Staff.** The success of the Agency's public participation will depend on adequate staffing and resources.[7] This Agency is admittedly "reactive" in its public communication efforts and believes that this mode of operation is the result of a shortage of staff and resources. The public information officers and staff in place today have good ideas about how to bolster the Agency's image in the community and drum-up support for redevelopment projects. Some of these efforts will require additional resources (e.g., newsletter distribution), while others will only require some creativity and priority. Current staff recognizes that the Agency should be more proactive in establishing good relationships and a positive reputation in project areas before opposition to specific projects arises. With the City under new leadership, the Agency should pursue a "fresh start" and devote necessary funds toward rebuilding the public trust in redevelopment and City officials.

12. **Build Strong Relationships Between the Public and Project Managers.** Good communications between staff and the public are essential in order for staff to understand the needs of the community and for the community to understand the Agency's goals, as well as the legal and financial constraints under which the SDRA operates. Currently, SDRA project managers attend all PAC meetings in City Heights and planning group meetings in San Ysidro. These meetings are typically held once a month. Staff has also made an effort to build relationships with business associations in San Ysidro.

    - Although meeting attendance is time-consuming, it is the best way for project managers to create a presence in project areas and keep their finger on the pulse of the community. Again, this is a proactive effort to keep abreast of community issues and maintain a public dialogue. Members of the public are much more likely to attend meetings organized by SDRA if SDRA project managers, in turn, regularly attend meetings organized by others in the community; it's a two-way street.
    - Project managers should attend community meetings other than just PAC and planning group meeting meetings—especially those at which some new community contacts can be made. More regular attendance at community events is especially important in San Ysidro, which is geographically remote from the rest of the city and where many residents feel forgotten. In Portland, urban renewal project managers typically have four to five meetings per month with constituents.
    - Continue to use bilingual project managers or other bilingual project team members to assist with public meetings and other

[7] Some strong city participation programs across the nation are fueled by up to 10 city workers devoted to public communication/outreach for each 100,000 city residents. (Thompson, Berry, and Portney, 13). This statistic relates to city-wide participation plans and not the staffing of any one city agency. We did not have access to the information to determine how San Diego compares to this benchmark, but it might be an interesting exercise for city staff to calculate how San Diego compares.

communication efforts in San Ysidro and Barrio Logan project areas. Consider additional project areas where this practice would help the Agency develop better community relations.

- Give hiring preference to project manager candidates with previously-established connections to San Diego communities.
- If the Agency is going to continue relying on project managers for project-specific outreach, then training is absolutely necessary. The Agency should educate project managers about the intricacies of public outreach efforts and train them to think systematically through the desired outcome and the process to achieve it. The Agency and/or CED Department's public information officers may want to create a "how to" manual for this training purpose. See Appendix F for an excerpt from the Portland PDC's public participation manual.

13. Maintain Strong Relationships among the PACs, Agency Management, and the Agency Board (City Council). PACs and other community organizations must feel that policy and decision-makers are listening to their preferences and, when projects do not go smoothly, trying to address their concerns. In cities with successful public participation plans, staff or appointed liaisons serve as intermediaries between the PACs/public and Agency leadership.

    - The Agency should continue monthly meetings with the PAC chairs. This interaction allows the Agency to stay on top of the issues concerning the PACs.
    - In an effort to appear transparent to PACs and others, the Board might consider rotating the location of some regularly-scheduled SDRA Board meetings to different forums within different project areas. Also, consider holding some SDRA Board meetings in the evening, and some in the morning, to allow broader citizen participation.

14. Clarify and Support the Role of the PAC as Community Representatives. SDRA should make the most productive use of PACs by clarifying their mission and role in project area redevelopment activities. SDRA should also help PACs achieve their mission by providing relevant training. SDRA should take steps to ensure that PACs are truly representative of the communities that they serve and not dominated by a few voices.

    - To the extent feasible, the Agency should supply PAC members with complete information and explanation (e.g., project area budgets), which they need to meaningfully participate in project selection and initiation.
    - Despite concerted efforts, if Agency outreach efforts for PAC elections are not yielding diverse representation, consider alternative types of

PAC formation with respect to elected versus appointed representatives.[8] Many cities are moving towards either:

- o A hybrid committee composed of elected and appointed seats (e.g., Oakland) ; or
- o A committee composed of all or predominantly appointed seats (e.g., Portland).

- Section 306 of Resolution No. 292185 allows the Agency to translate notices and announcements in any languages (other than English) that the Agency deems necessary. Given the great number of languages spoken by the residents of the City Heights community, it may be advisable to translate announcements and notices to other languages in addition to English and Spanish. From interviews, we learned that immigrants from East Asia, Africa (especially Somalia), and Latin America constitute large segments of the City population.
- The statutorily required life of the PAC is only three years and thereafter the Agency can disband the PAC. When feasible, the Agency should demonstrate greater commitment to funding and maintaining the PACs after their three-year period is over, so that PACs do not feel vulnerable to dissolution for failure to support proposed projects. Community members are less likely to volunteer their free time with a group that has no real influence, sustainability, or independence. There are also administrative costs associated with annual extensions and PAC elections that the Agency Board should consider in revisiting the role and duration of elected PACs.
- The Agency regulates the composition of PACs and seeks thereby to obtain a diverse representation of community stakeholders. For the City Heights PAC, eight out of twenty total seats are designated resident seats (four home owners and four tenants), and there are also three other seats where their requirements include the seat holder to be project area residents. SDRA should review housing statistics to determine what percentage of project area residents are renting their homes and verify that this demographic is adequately represented on the PACs. It may be that seats in the "owner-occupant" category claim a disproportionate number of PAC seats.

15. Seek Broad Public Involvement Beyond PACs. Because some citizens do not have the time to serve on PACs (and on occasion some PACs can become obstructionist), the Agency should ensure that public notification and involvement efforts do not rely solely on PACs, but also include other neighborhood organizations and reach out to individual residents.

- Although the support of formalized organizations is very important, the will of the PAC may not always represent the will of the community. The Agency should find ways to reach out to other segments of the

[8] In the most recent City Heights PAC election, the Agency mailed approximately 28,000 election notices and project area maps to all resident-owner occupants, property owners, tenants, businesses, and community organizations. The mailings were printed in English and Spanish.

community (beyond the PAC and formal planning groups) in order to obtain feedback about the needs of the community and desired redevelopment projects. As seen with the Metro Villas component of the Metro Center case study project, support from other members of the public may justify an Agency decision to pursue a project that is not overwhelmingly supported by PACs and/or planning groups.

- Research and maintain accurate demographic information about project area populations. In order to identify and solicit input from under-represented sectors of the community (particularly in project areas heavily influenced by immigration), project managers and public information officers should devote time and resources for community reconnaissance work. This reconnaissance should aim to identify under-represented groups and creative ways to reach them, solicit their input, and encourage their participation in redevelopment activities.

16. Create Welcoming Forums for Public Input. The Agency should strive to create forums for public input that are comfortable and welcoming to diverse members of the community.

    - The Agency should consider innovative ways to structure public meetings in order to obtain feedback from people who do not speak English and people who may be intimidated by public-speaking.
    - Allowing for anonymous written comments through translators might also encourage feedback from members of the wider community.
    - Keep rules of operation informal so that people can join and leave easily and casually give comments throughout. Keep a portion of the meeting open to issues, questions, and concerns that individual attendees want to raise.

Agency Leadership, Staffing, and Training—Recommendations

The Agency has suffered, to an unfortunate degree, from turnover at its most senior ranks. This has been compounded by the City's recent political turmoil, which has deprived the Agency of both a consistent vision and strong advocates. At the same time, compounding the lack of consistent political direction, the Agency is subject to the City's hiring and discretionary spending freezes and to arcane City hiring procedures. These administrative City procedures and policies significantly restrict the Agency's ability to adequately hire and train staff. Addressing these constraints will require coordinated Agency action with the highest levels of the City's political structure, which may be difficult to achieve given the ongoing fiscal crisis and tumult following the change in governance. Nonetheless, we offer the following best practices for the SDRA to consider:

17. Install Strong Leadership and "Big Picture" Vision at the Agency's Helm. The restructuring of the city's government and the current director and deputy director vacancies in the Redevelopment Division provide an opportunity to reshape the Agency. With the new Mayor's emphasis on public accountability, government efficiency, and smart growth, new Agency leaders should be well schooled in the

nuances of redevelopment practice, display proven competence in administration and management, and prove a champion of the city's "big picture" planning and good governance goals and objectives.

18. With Strong Leadership, Explore a More Proactive Approach to Redevelopment. The idea for each of the two case study projects came from their respective developers. While the Agency certainly played an extensive and valuable role in seeing these two projects through to successful completion, in both these cases the Agency played a "reactive" versus "proactive" role in the initial formation and shaping of the project idea. This seems to be a common Agency role, at least according to most of the persons we interviewed.

    - Using the formal Requests for Proposal process to scope and control project initiation and implementation is the more typical practice among California redevelopment agencies. The 2004 CRA/LA audit team found that RFPs were used as the primary vehicle for generating redevelopment project ideas for the majority of California redevelopment agencies surveyed. (The Los Angeles CRA, it should be noted, did not at that time use RFPs as its primary vehicle for generating projects.) The advantages of defining a project's scope and selecting the developer include assuring stronger ties to community-held planning and redevelopment goals. Accordingly, we recommend that the SDRA consider moving to more proactive model by relying primarily on RFPs for project initiation and implementation.

19. Agency Leadership Should Set Clear Management Goals. In addition to establishing project development priorities, the Agency should establish and clearly articulate management goals and objective – achievable in both the short- and long-run. Management goals and objectives should focus on administrative priorities, which might include staff hiring, training, and mentoring; preparation of internal procedural manuals and guidelines; improved and consistent internal communication; and creation of a centralized records management system.

20. Build Appropriate Staff Expertise. There appears to be an uneven level of specialized redevelopment expertise among the Agency's project management staff. While some project managers have been at the Agency long enough to gain required experience and expertise in facilitating certain, highly complex financing deals (e.g., affordable housing), other project managers and staff have not, and still lack the necessary skill sets, such as a solid grounding in financial underwriting and debt management, to tackle such assignments.

SDRA must ensure that every project has the appropriate subject matter experts to prepare estimates and review consultant reports. Such expertise is essential for reliable financial projections and effective negotiating with private parties. This expertise needs to include, at a minimum: (1) *Engineering* – to ensure that infrastructure requirements are appropriate; (2) *Financial/Appraisal* – to review deal terms, acquisition costs, etc.; (3) *Cost Estimating* – to ensure that individual project costs are properly estimated; (4) *Budget* – to ensure that all relevant cost categories are included; and (5) *Legal* – to ensure regulatory compliance and to review all contract/agreement terms.

The Agency should address missing or spotty skill sets among the project management staff through targeted training, new hires, staffing reorganization, additional outsourcing (or solicited "second opinions" from trusted advisors), or a combination of some or all of these actions. Although more expensive in the short term, such investments can be invaluable in terms of saved project costs and more informed decision making.

- *Provide Expanded Training in Related Disciplines for Project Managers.* SDRA should ensure that all current and future project managers are cross-trained in the disciplines essential to successful project implementation, including real estate development and finance, architecture, business, construction, urban planning, and public outreach/facilitation. SDRA should take full advantage of "in-house" expertise within the Agency, CCDC, and SEDC, as well as in other city departments.
    - The Agency is already taking steps to this end. After a city-imposed moratorium during the last five years, Agency management plans to send staff to professional training and conferences again this year. The Agency also intends to reinstate its past practice of hosting guest lecturers drawn from the ranks of its consultants and other departments and agencies, including the CCDC.
- *Better Equip Project Managers to Scrutinize Developers' Financial Information.* SDRA project managers typically work closely with outside financial consultants to regularly test a private developer's financial pro forma and ensure the project stays on track. This capability should be strengthened in-house through specialized real estate finance qualifications for project manager positions or supplemental staff training. While reliance on outside financial consultants is typical practice among many redevelopment agencies, the reliance should be reduced by Agency managers who possess the skills to critically scrutinize and probe consultants' work to ensure the Agency's interests are advanced to the extent possible.
- *Consider Centralizing Some Critical Knowledge Functions Within the Agency.* The Agency should consider staffing changes or reorganization to centralize knowledge and enable greater staff training/education from a single source of expertise. For example, the Agency might centralize financial underwriting expertise and finance

activities into a small number of dedicated, skilled staff persons rather than building such skills in all project management staff. CRA/LA recently took this step when it created a new "capital finance group" within its staff to centralize responsibility for such financing, including multi-family housing bonds, parking revenue bonds, and other financing supported in part by site-specific revenue sources.

- *Develop Standard Loan Underwriting Policies and Contract Procedures.* Accountability flows from a clear understanding of what the policies, objectives, rules, criteria, and process are. Without this basic understanding, and everybody acting under this same understanding, it is impossible to hold persons accountable for any potential missteps or even abuse. The Agency should establish loan underwriting policies and standardized contract procedures and language for Agency staff to follow and implement.
    - The Agency, working in collaboration with the San Diego Housing Commission, recently developed policies and procedures for the city's NOFA for New Affordable Housing program. The policies and procedures include minimum requirements for project location and site development, affordability, leveraging NOFA funds, accessibility, and financial assumptions. In addition, the NOFA policies include a standardized review process and a specific checklist of selection criteria. The NOFA model can be viewed an excellent template to expand this practice to all types of redevelopment projects,
    - The Los Angeles CRA offers another approach for SDRA to model. The CRA/LA is following up on the 2004 Audit recommendation that the CRA hire a loan underwriting director who would be required to develop sound standard loan underwriting policies and procedures to be followed uniformly by all the CRA loan underwriters. Furthermore, this director would be responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance by all loan underwriters with these standard policies and procedures. The director would also be required to establish an independent loan committee that would review each and every loan to be made by the CRA. This individual's performance would be measured by his/her ability to implement and monitor sound, standard loan underwriting criteria and improve the quality of the CRA's loan portfolio.

21. **Lay the Groundwork for Staffing Increases or Reorganization.** While well beyond the scope of our focused study, the consultant team was struck by the apparent slimness of current professional/administrative staffing levels at SDRA. The following table provides some perspective on the Redevelopment Division's staffing level compared to other, large-city redevelopment agencies.

As shown in the table, SDRA's Redevelopment Division staffing (19.1 FTEs for the current fiscal year) trails in absolute numbers the total staffing levels in Los Angeles (228), San Francisco (104), and Long Beach (23) – the three largest comparison cities – as well as San Diego's CCDC (46.9). Even when the Redevelopment Division staff is combined with the CCDC and SEDC staffing levels for a truer "city-wide" staffing picture, the total combined number of professional and administrative staff – 85 FTEs – is still less than Los Angeles (228) and San Francisco (104), although more than the amount of comparable staff at Long Beach's redevelopment agency.

Moreover, the Redevelopment Division employs less staff per 100,000 residents (1.5 FTEs per 100,000 residents) than all the comparison cities and well below CCDC at 3.7 FTEs per 100,000 residents. However, when Redevelopment Division staffing is combined with CCDC and SEDC staffing levels, San Diego is closer to the other cities. Finally, when viewed compared to the amount of redevelopment project area acreage under its jurisdiction, the San Diego Redevelopment Division again measures short in staffing compared to its sister agencies: 2.9 FTEs per 1,000 project area acres versus 32.6 staff persons for CCDC and 13.3 FTEs for SEDC, and similarly considerably less than the two other largest cities in the state: Los Angeles (10.1 FTEs per 1,000 acres) and San Francisco (62.5 FTEs per 1,000 acres).

Despite the relatively lower absolute numbers of staff persons at work in the SDRA, the Agency has succeeded in a multitude of significant redevelopment efforts during the past five years, including the two case study projects of Metro Center and Las Americas. While our survey measures only one dimension of the staffing issue at SDRA, and does not speak directly to the quality of staff performance at the Agency, it at least suggests further analysis and study is warranted. The Agency's apparent understaffing seems to contribute to the leadership, management, and training concerns highlighted during our case study evaluation.

To follow up on this point, as well as other issues identified in the course of this focused study, the SDRA might consider the usefulness of a full-scale performance audit of the Redevelopment Division, with a focus particularly on staff and other resource economy and efficiency issues.

City	Total Population (2003) [3]	Total # of FTEs (Current FY) [1]	Total FTE per 100,000 Population	Total Gross Acreage In Redevelopment Project Areas (FY 2003-04) [2]	Total FTE per 1,000 acres of Project Area	Total Agency Revenues (FY 2003-04) [2]	Total FTE per $1,000,000 of Revenues
Long Beach	475,460	Admin: 13 Prof'l: 10 Total: 23	4.84	17,067	1.35	$44,056,917	0.52
Los Angeles	3,819,951	Admin: 63 Prof'l: 76 Total: 228 (includes management)	5.97	22,610	10.08	$170,027,000	1.34
Oakland	398,844	Admin: 5 Prof'l: 27.8 Total: 32.8	8.224	14,899	2.201	$67,145,922	0.488
San Diego-- Redev. Division	**1,266,753**	**Admin: 3.1 Prof'l: 16 Total: 19.10**	**1.508**	**6,643**	**2.875**	**$16,868,326**	**1.132**
San Diego— CCDC	1,266,753	Admin: 9 Prof'l: 35.9 Total: 46.9	3.702	1,440	32.569	$70,865,001	0.662
San Diego— SEDC	1,266,753	Admin: 3 Prof'l: 11 Total: 14.0	1.11	1,055	13.27	$4,866,759	2.88
All San Diego Agencies	**1,266,753**	**Admin: 15.1 Profl: 62.9 Total: 78**	**6.16**	**9,138**	**8.54**	**$92,600,086**	**0.84**
San Francisco	751,682	Admin: 24 Prof'l: 80 Total: 104	13.84	1,663	62.54	$120,980,908	0.86

Notes regarding information sources:

1. Staff members at the corresponding Redevelopment agencies.
2. State of California's Community Redevelopment Agencies Annual Report (for fiscal year ended June 30, 2004), produced by Steve Westly, California State Controller, 2005.
3. Unless otherwise specified, source is http://www.citypopulation.de/USA-California.html and reflects 2003 data.

22. Propose Alternative Hiring Practices for the Agency. Agency leadership should explore the possibility of suggesting targeted revisions to the Civil Service Commission's current, often arcane hiring policies and practices that have consistently hamstrung Agency staffing efforts. This may well be an impossible task, particularly in the short-run when the Civil Service Commission will likely be preoccupied with staffing needs in the wake of the governance change. Current Agency hiring practices may ultimately have to be addressed through the ongoing discussions regarding the Agency's overall organization and place in the City's larger governance structure. However, if the Agency leadership believes a dialogue with the Civil Service Commission may be fruitful, topics that should be addressed include:

- Changes to the classification of redevelopment staff positions (currently professional positions in the Redevelopment Division are classified under the more generic "community development" category rather than a more specialized "redevelopment" category); and
- Changes to the way the City's human resources department currently advertises open redevelopment positions to enable the Agency to reach a broader and more specialized applicant pool (e.g., posting open positions for hire on specialized redevelopment or urban planning websites).

23. More Effectively Employ Outside Consultants. While SDRA has successfully relied on outside consultants for financial underwriting, legal, and property acquisition services, there appears to be room for more effective use of SDRA's resources in this regard. We suggest that SDRA's management develop a survey form (similar to a Management Letter from an audit firm) that should be completed by each consultant after each assignment. In this way, the consultants can provide suggestions for improvement to help SDRA maximize the benefits from its use of external consultants.

24. Keep Lines of Communication Open Between Agency Management and In-Line Staff. Although intra-Agency communication has improved during the past few years, the current void in Agency leadership and the opportunity to "start fresh" after current reorganization efforts are complete, compel this rather obvious recommendation regarding internal communications. The Agency suffers when its leadership fails to communicate with the project staff manning the front lines – failures that often are demoralizing for the in-line staff. To avoid this, particularly as a new leadership regime settles in, we recommend the following actions:

- Project-level staff and Agency management should meet regularly to ensure management is aware of significant project-specific matters and staff members are reaffirmed in their direction and approach. These types of meetings should typically occur monthly, and the agenda should also leave room to discuss and educate staff about "big picture" issues, such that these meetings become the favored forum to share knowledge about project management, legal issues, public outreach approaches, and other broader topics of relevance.
- We recommend weekly or bi-weekly project status reports and briefings between a project manager and his/her supervising Redevelopment Coordinator. These meetings might be based on the Redevelopment Coordinator's review of the project manager's regularly submitted project area status reports.
- We recommend weekly or bi-weekly project and management status meetings between all the Community Development Coordinators and the Agency Directors.

Sound Management Practices—Recommendations

San Diego could not have completed its long list of successful redevelopment projects if the SDRA did not have generally effective staff and management practices in place. However, recent management turnover and staff shortages have taken their toll on the Agency's more recent ability to execute its mandate and to effectively administrate its day-to-day operations. A long-standing lack of Agency-wide policies, procedures, and standards for project and project-area management has compounded the problems. In sum, our focused study indicates the capacity to improve Agency performance in a number of administrative and internal management areas:

(1) Project Timing and Phasing;
(2) Recordkeeping and Project Tracking;
(3) Project Reporting and Evaluation; and
(4) Inter-Agency Cooperation.

Beyond any structural changes to redevelopment to address administrative issues, smaller-scale operational and internal management changes in the SDRA and its partners may be just as effective to improving the performance of redevelopment in San Diego. Several of the cities that Clarion/Waronzof surveyed in 2005 emphasized that their successes have been the result of continuous improvements in operations and learning from mistakes, rather than from any one dramatic change in the city's approach to redevelopment. The recommendations below address areas in which SDRA's performance can similarly be further honed and improved.

25. Manage Pro-Actively to Build on Streamlining Successes and to Avoid Project Time Delays. The case study and stakeholder interview process produced several insights as to the causes of both timing successes and delays, and the SDRA should act pro-actively to duplicate the successes and avoid similar delays in future projects.

- *Learn from Past Project Successes.* The Metro Center case study project in particular provides several lessons for successful project timing and phasing, some of which have already been turned into standardized practice at the SDRA. These "success" lessons from Metro Center include:
  - Continuous communications and coordination with the applicable council district office throughout project scoping, negotiations, and approval.
  - Standardized use of DSD's "preliminary review" process.
  - Insistence upon complete, fully documented, "quality" applications. The Agency should process developer/borrower loan and permit applications only when the Agency project manager or other appropriate reviewer deems such applications "complete."
  - When there is more than one community group or committee in play with vested interests in a specific redevelopment project (e.g.,

a PAC plus a community planning board), employ the Metro Center "joint design review subcommittee" model to expedite public review.

  - Weekly project team meetings attended by Agency project managers, the developer(s), and the developer's partners and consultants. These meetings keep lines of communication open, and ensure the Agency is kept abreast of any project issues and concerns.

- *Learn from Past Project Delays*. Institute post-project analysis of project timing, clearly identifying where the process was most efficient and where delays occurred, if any, as well as each instance where performance diverged from previously adopted timelines.
- *Communicate Responses to Timing Delays*. Following analysis of project timing delays, SDRA should share the results, as well as the Agency's proposed response to the delays, with the Agency Board, the PACs, and the public. Where the Agency identifies recurring causes of project delay, it should develop an internal management strategy to anticipate and avoid those types of delays in the future, if possible.
- *Adjust Future Project Timelines*. Based on past performance, SDRA should refine its future timelines to ensure that anticipated times for each step reflect "reasonably expected" versus "hoped for" timeframes.
- *Explore Expanding "Expedited" Status for High-Priority Redevelopment Projects*. The San Diego City Council allows, by ordinance, an expedited development approval process for a small handful of select projects, including affordable housing projects and sustainable projects, but not including redevelopment projects in general. We encourage Agency leadership to reopen discussions with council members and DSD leadership to allow expedited development approval processing for additional types of high-priority redevelopment projects. As with other expedited projects, redevelopment project applicants choosing the expedited review route should be charged fees that fully recover the cost of the service.
- *Ensure Adequate Agency Staff to Handle Project Load*. SDRA should ensure adequate agency staffing resources prior to taking on new projects. Based on experience with successful past projects, each SDRA project area "team" should be staffed with a minimum of one overall project area manager, one assistant project manager assigned to the day-to-day management of each project, and one research associate to support all senior team members.
- *Educate Public About Reasonable Expectations.* PACs and the public should be educated about the realities of redevelopment project design and financing, realistic timeframes for completion, and the fact that delays often occur due to causes that could not have been foreseen. This is particularly true if the Agency is working in a project area, such as Barrio Logan, with an inherently weak economic base,

or with an applicant/developer without significant experience in the specific type of project needed.

26. **Centralize Records Management and Project Tracking to Achieve Better Continuity, Reliability, and Transparency.** Public accountability is critical to San Diego at this point in its political history. Formal records are essential to the transparency, continuity, and reliability of government programs and processes. As more government work is conducted electronically, the resulting records need to remain accessible and authentic. Today, electronic records must serve our cities' business, evidentiary, and historical needs, and all public organizations require new concepts, tools, and strategies to create and manage them. The SDRA must enter the 21st Century and develop a more systematic, sophisticated method for standardized recordkeeping and information-sharing. The following recommendations can help move the SDRA toward this best practice:

- *Invest in a Centralized Project Management and Tracking System.* Research available project management and scheduling software packages, and invest in a centralized project management system with standardized recordkeeping; real-time, on-line project tracking; and intra-Agency and inter-department information-sharing elements. This may dovetail with public outreach and communication goals if some portion of a centralized project management/tracking system could be configured for public consumption through the Agency's website.
- *Maintain Standardized Project Records to Allow Smooth Transitions When Staffing Changes*. Staffing turnover is an unavoidable fact in governmental agencies. Changes in SDRA project management and staffing mid-stream through a project may be unavoidable, but more systematic staff record-keeping and project status reporting would help ease the transition and provide new staff with the necessary information to more quickly come up to speed. See additional recommendations, below, regarding centralized records management systems.
- *Standardize Record Keeping Practices and Create a Centralized Recordkeeping System*. SDRA does not at this time have standardized record keeping policies or standards for its project managers. Currently, project files are typically found in individual project manager offices; the individual managers are free to maintain the files (or not) at their convenience, and to employ record keeping approaches primarily of their own devise. SDRA should institute a comprehensive records management policy and develop specific guidelines and rules that address, among other things:
    - Requiring all key document (e.g., copies of E.N.A., DDA, owner participation agreements, leases, and other similar contracts and agreements) to be combined in one file and centrally located;
    - Proper creation, maintenance, and retention of public records;
    - A centralized file inventory and file retrieval system (e.g., sign-out system); and

- Standardized project file content.

The Agency must provide consistent project manager and staff training in proper record keeping according to the adopted policies and practices.

27. Create an Adequate Data Collection and Consistent Project Reporting System. The Agency should employ a variety of data collection, management, and/or accounting practices to regularly evaluate whether on-going and completed projects achieve their stated objectives and estimated impacts over time (including blight reduction, economic development, job creation, and tax base strengthening). Data must be available in a timely fashion to the public and to policy and decision-makers to assure transparency and public accountability. The Agency should be consistently collecting and monitoring data to keep track of how effective its redevelopment efforts are in achieving a project area's goals and objectives.

    - The Agency may team with other City departments or divisions to undertake data collection and reporting, such as Planning and/or Development Services. Indeed, the capabilities for data collection and analysis probably already exist in these other departments and divisions; duplication of efforts should be avoided to the maximum extent possible. Alternately, the Agency might consider partnership with a local university/college to prepare these types of regular project tracking and monitoring reports.

28. Implement Consistent Procedures and Methodologies for Measuring Project and Program Success. Understanding the economic benefits and financial impacts of its investments and projects is essential for a multitude of SDRA functions. By carefully tracking project economics and finances over time, the Agency can use this feedback from past projects to improve its planning and estimating of future projects. Finally, and most importantly, cost-benefit analysis is essential for informed decision making. The SDRA does not have a formal review and monitoring system in place to track project progress against benchmarks over time. Because of staff reductions, some project evaluation measures have been sacrificed, although the Agency does try to measure actual performance in job creation for both construction and permanent jobs. Only when the Agency fully understands the likely impacts of its investments and plans can the City Council and other decision makers allocate funds strategically.

    - *Institute a Program of Post-Completion Project Assessments*. The SDRA should institute a policy of conducting periodic post-completion project assessments, as is standard in most private- and public-sector development settings. At a minimum, the analyses should track ongoing SDRA costs, revenues that accrue to both the Agency as well as to City coffers, and economic indicators such as property values, retail sales, jobs (by type), business formations, and the like. Social benefits also should be quantified, though in many cases these assessments will be more subjective. For future investment decisions, net present value calculations of past projects also should be

undertaken (and updated periodically as new information becomes available) to compare financial returns to the original Agency investments and ongoing expenses.

- *Require Reporting of Job Number and Quality Data*. Job creation is fundamental to redevelopment, and not all jobs are alike. Citizens are increasingly concerned about the quality of jobs created, not just the number. Since detailed job creation data requires primary data collection, the SDRA should include in its DDAs as a requirement that its developer partners collect this information from their tenants.
- *Consider Performance-Based Budgeting.* As noted previously, we see great value in performance-based budget, such as is now practiced in the cities of Oakland and Long Beach. This discipline forces agencies to regularly take stock of their progress and to institute changes where they fall short.
- *Consider Annual Performance Scorecards for Public Consumption.* Another best practice comes from the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA), which annually publishes a scorecard that rates agency performance on each of its major goals. For each goal, the agency asks and answers three questions: (1) How is progress measured?;(2) Why is this important?; and (3) How are we doing? Such scorecards help target agency efforts and resources to the priority areas, and also provide vital benchmarks of agency performance for assessing the effectiveness of their efforts.

29. Strive to Improve Inter-Departmental Coordination and Communication. Many redevelopment projects will require the coordinated efforts of multiple departments or agencies. The SDRA should strive for continuous improvement in inter-departmental working relationships, and should create new procedures to address any delays experienced in prior projects.

- *Insist Upon Early Participation and Review by the Planning Department and Development Services Department.* The Agency should bring Planning and DSD project managers into redevelopment conceptual planning efforts and specific project scoping as early as possible. While openness to unplanned opportunities is neither bad nor inappropriate, the process of redevelopment would be improved if the Planning Department were directly involved from the time these opportunities are first discovered or initiated through their completion. Both Planning and DSD add important value to the project vetting and scoping process by bringing to the table very different perspectives than the Agency's regarding a project's viability, feasibility, and consistency with city and community planning goals and objectives.
    - It appears early Planning and DSD participation and review have recently become more common, but the Agency should strive to ensure this best practice is consistently implemented in every redevelopment project. The Agency must also make it standard operating practice to take advantage of DSD's pre-

application "check-in meetings" and "preliminary review" steps with a developer applicant, as applicable.

- *Model Inter-Departmental Coordination and Communication from the Top Down.* The Director of the Redevelopment Agency should maintain open and inclusive lines of communication with his/her counterparts at Planning and DSD, as well as at CCDC and SEDC. Regular, director-level meetings may be a valuable vehicle to this end, and one that other cities have used to great effect. These channels should be used in the near-term to promote better coordination between the related departments/divisions, and to explore continued efforts to streamline redevelopment project review.
- *Evaluate the Relative Advantages/Disadvantages of Using the City's Real Estate Assets Department on a Regular Basis.* The Agency has not taken a consistent stance on whether to regularly use the Real Estate Assets Department to negotiate property acquisitions and/or provide relocation assistance for redevelopment projects. While property acquisition by the Assets Department is relatively time-consuming, and therefore may justify use of outside services in many cases, the Department's relocation service/benefits division is apparently well respected. In any case, the Agency should weigh the relative advantages and disadvantages of in-house versus outside services, and determine a consistent policy for employing the Real Estate Assets Department in redevelopment projects.

30. Use Negotiations with Developers and other Partners to Achieve Desired Community Benefits.

- *Continue to Use Profit Recapture Clauses in Negotiated Documents.* The Agency has increasingly moved towards DDAs that allow the Agency to recapture a portion of project profits if returns exceed defined thresholds. In addition to potentially generating revenue for the SDRA, these provisions also act as a hedge against subsidy calculations that were inadvertently generous to the developer. SEDC has been implementing upside recapture provisions for some time, and should make this a standardized best practice.
- *Consider Including Community Benefit Agreements with Project Approvals to Hold Developers Accountable to Identified Community Goals and Priorities.* More and more communities are using "Community Benefit Agreements" to link promised community benefits to the developer's obligations. These Agreements are legally binding contracts between developers and community groups that delineate specific project benefits that the developer will provide as part of the project.
    - The City of Denver, Colorado, redevelopment agency recently facilitated the negotiation and execution of a Community Benefit Agreement between the city's master developer for redevelopment of a 50-acre contaminated industrial site adjacent to Denver's new light-rail line and a coalition of

neighborhood community groups and affordable housing organizations. The "CBA" holds the developer accountable to deliver, among other things, a minimum 20% affordable housing units (double Denver's minimum 10% inclusionary requirement), a minimum number of permanent "living wage" jobs, and job quality standards for construction contractors.

D. Conclusion

As we noted in our introduction, the Clarion/Waronzof team has determined that, overall, the San Diego Redevelopment Agency (SDRA) is performing its basic functions well. Especially impressive is the Agency's solid performance despite significant leadership transitions in the Agency and among the highest elected positions in the City government, and despite apparent staffing shortages. In fact, SDRA is regarded by many of its peers and partners as a "model" redevelopment agency, with an enviable record of success.

Nonetheless, the charge was not to develop a balanced of scorecard on all aspects of Agency performance, but rather to identify opportunities for improvement. Thus our work products – particularly this Final Report – focus much more on finding areas of weakness than on applauding the Agency on the many functions in which it excels.

Accordingly, we indeed have found that the Agency could improve its performance in several areas, with public outreach/communication and internal Agency management/efficiency requiring the greatest attention. In this report we have endeavored to concentrate on the practical steps the Agency could take that would yield the greatest impact on service delivery and public perception of the Agency.

Some of our recommendations will be easier to adopt and implement than others, and, admittedly, a few may well be quite challenging to advance. However, the timing for transforming the Agency is especially appropriate now, given the change in City leadership and the Mayor's theme of focusing on transparency and public accountability in City governance.

Which leads to our final observation and recommendation: efforts to improve Agency performance must be conducted in a collaborative environment – both within the Agency and with the Agency's partners and stakeholders. Two-way communication will be essential for gaining the trust and support of the staff who work for the Agency and the external parties who work with the Agency. The experience of many other cities demonstrates that meaningful, positive change is not only possible, but more successful when the public and Agency staff feel they are part of the solution.

E. Persons Interviewed

SAN DIEGO STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

- Jim Varnadore, City Heights Project Area Committee (PAC)
- Michael Sprague, City Heights PAC
- David Nelson, City Heights PAC
- David Flores, Casa Familiar
- Andrea Skorepa, Casa Familiar
- Steve Otto, San Ysidro Business Improvement District
- Michael Freedman , San Ysidro Planning Group
- Jennifer Goudeau, Barob Group
- Ana Molina-Rodriguez, Council Representative, City Council District #8
- Steve Russell, formerly with City Council District #3 Office
- Joe La Breche, San Diego Revitalization Corporation
- Charles Davis, Consultant to SDRC
- Rich Juarez, Consultant to SDRC
- Lina Ericcson, former SDRC Legal Advisor
- Jay Powell, City Heights Community Development Corporation (CDC)
- Pat Getzel, Independent Financial Consultant for CDC
- Barry Schultz, Independent Financial Consultant for CDC
- Matt Jumper, San Diego Interfaith Housing Foundation
- Pasquale Ioele, Land Grant Development
- Bruce Shepard, attorney for Land Grant Development
- J.C. Richards, JER Partners
- Gerrry Trimble, KMA Associates
- Linnie Gavino, KMA Associates

- Eric Nasland, Studio E Architect
- Bob Sargeant, Parsons Engineering

CITY OF SAN DIEGO STAFF INTERVIEWS

- Debra Fischle-Faulk, Acting Director Community and Economic Development Department
- Maureen Ostrye, Acting Deputy Director, SDRA (San Diego)
- Jim LoBue, Community Development Coordinator, SDRA
- Robert Chavez, Project Manager, SDRA
- Robert Kennedy, Project Manager, SDRA
- Pat Hightman, former SDRA Assistant Executive Director and Project Manager
- Hank Cunningham, (Former) SDRA Assistant Executive Director
- Kevin Sullivan, City Planning Department, liaison for SDRA
- Theresa Millete, City Planning Department
- Jeff Peterson, Development Services Department
- Jeanette Temple, Development Services Department
- Eric Symons, Public Information Officer, CEDD
- Doug Humphreys, Deputy City Attorney
- Glenn Wasserman, outside Legal Counsel for Agency
- Jack Farris, Real Estate Assets Department and formerly with the San Diego Housing Commission
- Lane MacKenzie, Real Estate Assets Department

INTERVIEWEES FROM OUTSIDE SAN DIEGO

- Mike Grisso, South of Market Project Manager, SFRA (San Francisco)
- Kevin Warner, Development Director, National Capital Revitalization Corporation (and formerly with SFRA)
- Susan Totaro, Project Manager, Harbor Redevelopment Area, CRA/LA (Los Angeles)
- Ann Moore, Executive Director, SHRA (Sacramento)

- Lisa Bates, Community Development Director, SHRA (Sacramento)
- Dan Bobrowski, Development Services Director, SHRA (Sacramento)
- Tricia Stewart, Redevelopment Planner, SHRA (Sacramento)
- John Andrews, Redevelopment Manager, PCDC (Pasadena)
- Richard Bruckner, Director of Planning and Development, PCDC (Pasadena)
- Gregory Hunter, Assistant to the Director (Oakland)
- Jay Musante, Urban Economic Analyst, CEDA (Oakland)
- Cheryl L. Twete, Interim Director of Development, PDC (Portland)
- Julie Rawls (Portland) Public Affairs Communications Coordinator, PDC (Portland)
- John Southgate, Development Manager, PDC (Portland)
- Avis Vidal, Professor and Director of the Urban Planning Program, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI
- Noemi Emeric, Project Manager, Brownfields Program, US EPA

F. General Reference and Resources

- CRA/LA, Management Priorities, available at http://www.crala.org/Internet-site/About/management_priorities.cfm
- CRA/LA, "Commercial/Industrial Underwriting Guidelines and Administrative Procedures", September 29, 2005 Draft.
- CRA/LA, "Loan Monitoring Administrative Procedures", effective November 15, 2005.
- California Debt Advisory Committee, Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies, April 1995.
- National Immigration Forum, "Civic participation Organizations", available at http://communityresourcesbank.org.
- Ken Thompson, Jeffrey Berry, Kent Portney, "Kernels of Democracy" (Lincoln Filene Center at Tufts University, 1994), available at http://www.cpn.org/topics/community/kernels.html.
- Youth, Families & Community Work Group, University of California Cooperative Extension, "Learning from Latino Community Efforts", September 24, 2003.
- The Carnegie Corporation of New York, "The House We All Live In: A Report on Immigrant Civic integration", 2003.
- Portland Development Commission: Governance, Structure and Process, City Club of Portland Bulletin (vol. 85, no. 34), January 21, 2005.
- CRA 1998 Relocation Workshop
- "Property Rights, Takings and Exactions," UCLA Extension Public Policy Program, November 5, 1999
- "Planning and Zoning: Law and Practice," UCLA Extension Public Policy Program, September 24, 1999
- Community Redevelopment Law of the State of California as of January 1, 2005
- The Future of the Center, Reason Public Policy Institute, November 11, 1999
- Redevelopment Plan Adoption and Amendment Processes, Redevelopment Institute, 1999
- CRA – 1998 Residential Redevelopment Seminar
- CRA – 1998 Relocation Workshop
- CRA – California Affordable Housing Handbook, Strategies for Planning and Development

- CRA – Introduction to Redevelopment, First Edition
- Moody's Municipal Credit Report – California Tax Allocation Bonds, February 1996
- CRA – Legal Clinic on AB 1290, "Community Redevelopment Law Reform Act of 1993"
- General Insurance, Eleventh Edition, David L. Bickelhaupt

APPENDICES

FINAL REPORT FOR THE SAN DIEGO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA DEBT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, RECOMMENDED PRACTICES FOR CALIFORNIA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES, APRIL 1995. 3

APPENDIX B: PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION BUDGET PRIORITIES (INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS) RANKING FORM 7

APPENDIX C: PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MANUAL (EXCERPT) 11

APPENDIX D: SACRAMENTO REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROFILE FOR MCCLELLAN MILITARY BASE CONVERSION PROJECT 15

APPENDIX E: SAN YSIDRO *SIN LIMITES/UNLIMITED*: HISTORY OF PRESENTATIONS 17

APPENDIX F: CENTRAL VALLEY PARTNERSHIP: CIVIC ACTION NETWORK 21

Appendices

Appendix A
California Debt Advisory Committee, Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies, April 1995.

Appendix B
Portland Development Corporation Budget Priorities (Infrastructure Investments) Ranking Form

Appendix C
Portland Development Corporation Public Participation Manual (Excerpt)

Appendix D
Sacrament Redevelopment Project Profile for McClellan Military Base Conversion Project

Appendix E
San Ysidro *Sin Limites/Unlimited*: History of Presentations

Appendix F
Central Valley Partnership for Citizenship: Civic Action Network

Appendix A: California Debt Advisory Committee, Recommended Practices for California Redevelopment Agencies, April 1995.

- Recommended Practices for Redevelopment Agency Management
    - Adapt private development management techniques
    - Redevelopment agencies should adapt successful private real estate development management techniques to fit public development circumstances.
    - Conduct strategic planning
    - RDAs should conduct strategic planning on a periodic basis to provide long-term direction to projects and programs.
    - Monitor the local real estate market
    - RDAs should track basic market indicators such as vacancy rates, absorption rates, and rents/sale prices to assess project feasibility and improve tax increment forecasts.
    - Evaluate project and program performance
    - RDAs should incorporate performance evaluation on an on-going basis into their activities and programs.
    - Communicate results to the public
    - RDAs need to effectively communicate the results of their actions to the public and key constituencies to encourage project and program support as well as change community perceptions.

- Recommended Practices for Economic Development
    - Participate in local economic development
    - RDAs should become full participants in a city, county, or region's economic development planning and programming efforts.
    - Develop an appropriate mix of strategies
    - RDAs should develop an appropriate mix of business retention, attraction, and development strategies to meet the needs of the local economy.
    - Streamline regulations and permitting procedures
    - RDAs should encourage or coordinate efforts to streamline local government regulations and permitting procedures to improve the business climate in their project areas.
    - Conduct Business Outreach and Promotion
    - RDAs should conduct active business outreach and promotional programs to assist project area businesses.
    - Incorporate job training and social services programming
    - RDAs should recognize that sometimes social problems constitute a major barrier to economic development and should incorporate social service programming into their project planning, as appropriate.
    - Maximize financial assistance
    - RDAs should maximize their financial resources by structuring financial assistance with repayment features, terms and conditions stipulating other actions, or by combining RDA funds with other private and public sources of funds.

- Recommended Practices for Commercial and Neighborhood Revitalization
    - Develop market-driven strategies and projects
    - RDAs should develop market-driven strategies and projects by conducting market feasibility studies, identifying barriers, setting realistic goals, building community support, and marketing effectively.
    - Create a sense of place
    - RDAs should encourage the design of attractive places, including preservation of historic assets, to build a sense of identity in the project area.
    - Advocate for improved public services
    - RDAs should take a leadership role in improving public service delivery to commercial and residential neighborhoods by establishing cooperative relationships with local service providers.
    - Target RDA problem-solving assistance
    - RDAs should respond to solve problems and assist the private market in development activity when needed.

- Recommended Practices for Affordable Housing Production
    - Assess project area housing needs
    - RDAs should participate in community-wide affordable housing needs assessments to identify specific affordable housing needs within project areas, and formulate housing strategies that meet those needs.
    - Develop expertise in new forms of housing
    - RDAs should develop expertise in new forms of affordable housing with integrated social services. This expertise should emphasize both effective forms of service delivery and control of development and operating costs.
    - Maximize the effectiveness of RDA housing investment
    - RDAs should maximize the effectiveness of their investment in affordable housing production in partnership with others.

- Recommended Practices for Debt and Financial Management
    - Formulate a debt management policy statement
    - RDAs should formulate a debt management policy statement to concisely state the goals and objectives of the RDA. The debt management policy should also describe how the RDA intends to bridge the gap between the financing needs of long-term redevelopment plans and the on-going use of limited financial resources.
    - Establish criteria for prioritizing project area expenditures
    - The debt management policy should prioritize project area expenditures or provide guidelines for conducting this prioritization on a regular basis.

- Provide guidelines for debt issuance
- The debt management policy should provide guidelines for the process of debt issuance and general criteria for issuance of debt. These should be closely followed whenever new debt issuance is being contemplated.
- Require a staff evaluation report for each debt issuance
- The debt management policy should include a requirement that a staff evaluation report be completed prior to the issuance of any debt.
- Review financial situation and debt policy
- The debt management policy should state when and the extent to which a debt capacity analysis will be conducted and reported, and how often the policy should be revised.

- Implementing a Financial Management Program
    - Conduct annual analysis of debt capacity
    - RDAs should conduct an annual analysis of debt capacity to monitor future potential resources for continued project area plan implementation.
    - Adopt an investment policy
    - Redevelopment agencies should adopt an investment policy to guide their investment activities.
    - Monitor the tax base
    - RDA staff should closely monitor the tax base within each of its project areas to obtain early warning signals of declining property values.
    - Disclose financial data to the secondary market
    - RDAs should generate concise, readable presentations of financial data for disclosure to the secondary market.

Appendix B: Portland Development Corporation Budget Priorities (Infrastructure Investments) Ranking Form

PDC Budget Priorities (Infrastructure Investments)

Please rank the following PDC programs/priorities from 1 to 14 with 1 being the highest priority and 14 being the lowest priority.

No.	Program/Priority	Ranking
1	Provide Homeowner Repair Loans and Lead Based Paint Abatement Grants.	
2	Provide Funding, Technical Assistance and Other Incentives for Homeownership Development and Homebuyer Assistance Programs, including First-Time and Minority Homebuyers.	
3	Provide Funding and Other Incentives for New Affordable Rental Housing Units throughout the City.	
4	Provide Funding to Preserve Existing and Develop New Low Income Rental Housing (0-30% Median Family Income. For a family of four 30% MFI = $20,350. A single person = $14,250)	
5	New and Renovated Parks, Green spaces, Greenway and Trails	
6	Provide Property and Business Owners Storefront Grants to reduce blight	
7	Preservation, Renovation and Seismic Upgrades to Historically Significant Structures	
8	Support for New Commercial and Mixed-Use Development	
9	Neighborhood Commercial Area Revitalization (including streetscape improvements).	
10	Development that enhances Downtown Vitality	
11	Increase family wage jobs by providing economic development loans and support to businesses (including small businesses and start-ups) willing to expand/stay within the City.	
12	Increase family wage jobs by recruiting sustainable and targeted industries for location in the City.	
13	Funding for Transportation Improvements (streets, streetcar, light rail, etc)	
14	Funding for Environmental Enhancements (brownfields, floodplain, storm water, etc.)	

Category Descriptions

1	***Provide Homeowner Repair Loans and Lead Based Paint Abatement Grants:*** Low interest, deferred payment home repair loans for homeowners with 0-80% median family income (MFI). Federal lead based paint abatement grants to homeowners with 0-80% MFI, and children in household six years old and under.
2	***Provide Funding, Technical Assistance and Other Incentives for Homeownership Development and Homebuyer Assistance Programs, including First-Time and Minority Homebuyers:*** Includes gap financing for projects with affordable homeownership components. Also includes homebuyer assistance tools such as the new interest rate buy down program called "Jump Start." Assistance tools also include existing programs such as the shared appreciation mortgage (SAM) program that provides a no-payment second mortgage for the down payment assistance, federal and state homebuyer lending programs, and Portland Community Land Trust program grants.
3	***Provide Funding and Other Incentives for New Affordable Rental Housing Units throughout the City:*** Gap financing to developers and non-profit organizations that increase the city's stock of affordable (0-80% median family income) rental housing units. Sources of funding include federal Community Development Block Grant and HOME Partnership resources. Incentives include 10-year tax abatements to reduce rental rates, and encourage high density development near mass transit hubs (e.g. Light Rail).
4	**Provide Funding to Preserve Existing and Develop New Low Income Rental Housing (0-30% Median Family Income. For a family of four 30% MFI = $20,350. A single person = $14,250):** Gap financing to developers and non-profit organizations to rehabilitate or build replacement units to preserve expiring section-8 low income units. In accordance with the City's Central City No Net Loss Housing policy. Also development of permanent supportive housing, tied to social service delivery, for the chronically homeless in support of the City's Initiative to End Homelessness.
5	***New and Renovated Parks, Green spaces, Greenway and Trails:*** In cooperation with the Parks Bureau and other partners, provide funding for the purchase of land and the construction of new and renovated improvements for parks, green spaces, greenway and trails.
6	***Provide Property and Business Owners Storefront Grants to reduce blight:*** Matching grants to property and business owners for storefront façade improvements. Limited to $20,000 per grant.
7	***Preservation, Renovation and Seismic Upgrades to Historically Significant Structures:*** Provide gap financing and predevelopment grants to building owners and developers for activities related to bringing commercial spaces back into productive use.
8	***Support for New Commercial and Mixed-Use Development:*** Provide property and loans to encourage new development of underutilized areas, including a mix of commercial and housing developments. Examples include Museum Place and Brewery Blocks developments.
9	***Neighborhood Commercial Area Revitalization (including streetscape improvements).*** In cooperation with bureau partners, geographically targeting a variety of PDC tools (i.e. Streetscape, Storefront, DOS) on major neighborhood commercial arterials. Examples include North Killingsworth, Interstate, Lents Town Center).

10	***Development that enhances Downtown Vitality.*** Target a variety of PDC tools (i.e. property, loans and grants to real estate developers and business owners) to improve continually the central city and support increases in employment, housing and a vibrant retail core.
11	***Increase family wage jobs by providing economic development loans and support to businesses (including small businesses and start-ups) willing to expand/stay within the City.*** Provide low interest loans to companies expanding within the City and creating new jobs that pay 200% or better of minimum wage.
12	***Increase family wage jobs by recruiting sustainable and targeted industries for location in the City:*** Support national and international recruitment of companies that provide sustainable and traded sector (brings monies in from outside the region) jobs that pay 200% or better of minimum wage.
13	***Funding for Transportation Improvements (streets, streetcar, light rail, etc):*** In cooperation with the Transportation Bureau and TriMet, provide funding for the construction of new or improved streets, and alternative transportation modes, like streetcar, tram and light rail.
14	***Funding for Environmental Enhancements (brownfields, floodplain, storm water, etc.):*** In cooperation with the Bureau of Environmental Services and other partners, provide funding for the construction of flood plain, storm water and other improvements. Promote green building and sustainability. Study, assess, purchase and remediate environmentally contaminated properties.

Fax:
Attn: Christine Egan
503-823-3368
503-823-3369

Mail:
Christine Egan
222 NW 5th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97209

Appendix C: Portland Development Corporation Public Participation Manual (Excerpt)

DRAFT

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MANUAL

Investing in Portland's Future

PDC

PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

June 1, 2005

Prepared by
Christine Egan
PDC Public Affairs Department

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 3

How this Manual is Organized 3
PDC Public Participation Policy 3
Definitions 4

II. Why Public Participation is Important 6

III. When to do Public Participation 7

IV. How to Do Public Participation 9

V. Developing a Public Participation Plan 13

Step #1: Project Description and Background 14
Step #2: Assess Level of Public Concern or Interest 15
Step #3: Determine Level of Public Participation 16
Step #4: Identify Public Participation Goals 17
Step #5: Identify Stakeholders and Strategic Partners 18
Step #6: Identify Public Participation Tools 24
Step #6: Identify Public Participation Tools 24
Step #7: Schedule and Plan Activities 26
Step #8: Identify Roles and Responsibilities 28
Step #9: Feedback Loop 29
Step #10: Evaluate Public Participation Plan and Activities 31

VI. Advisory Committees 33

Committee Formation 35

VII. Meeting Notice Requirements 39

VIII. Meeting / Event Planning and Logistics 41

Scheduling a Meeting or Event 41
Selecting a Meeting Location 41
Configuring the Room 42
Setting the Meeting Agenda 44
Equipment Supply Checklist 46

IX. Helpful Lists, Resources and References 47

Stakeholder Outreach Resources and Lists 47
Public Participation Toolkit 51
Conflict of Interest 59
Public Participation Templates 60
PDC Public Participation Policy 77

XII. Bibliography 81

Appendix D: Sacramento Redevelopment Project Profile for McClellan Military Base Conversion Project

McClellan Military Base Conversion Project

Mather/McClellan-Watt Merged Project Area

Developer: McClellan Business Park, LLC

Barriers to Development

- *Many outdated buildings*
- *Obsolete infrastructure*
- *Designed for military, not commercial uses*
- *Insufficient financing capacity to fund initial infrastructure*

Redevelopment Tools

- *Public developer role*
- *Funding for basic backbone infrastructure*
- *Financial leverage*
- *Affordable housing*

Before Redevelopment

After Redevelopment

[1]Project Impact	With Redevelopment
Permanent Jobs to 2023	Increased from 10,500 base jobs to 30,000 after conversion
Construction Jobs (for capital improvements)	3,656
Affordable Housing units to 2023	5,000
Commercial square footage to 2023	16,744,162
[2]Public Investment to 2002	$18.9 million
[3]Private Investment to 2002	$54.1 million
Property taxes over life of project area	$836 million
[4]Economic benefit during construction to 10/02	$744,333,210
[5]Annual Economic Impact 2003	$92,052,471

Project Benefits

- *[6]At build out annual economic impact will exceed by $1 billion the economic impact of McClellan as a military base*
- *Restored jobs and revenues lost due to base closures*
- *Provided early infrastructure development critical for fast lease-up and tax increment growth*
- *Attracted private investment*
- *Established strong local government partnership to coordinate public resources*
- *Stimulated economic development in adjacent areas*
- *Provided transitional and permanent housing to assist homeless*
- *Leveraged $10 million in State financing for infrastructure improvements*
- *Created integrated land use pattern to optimize existing AFB assets.*

[1] Development of the project is expected to span 20 years. Projections to 2023
[2] McClellan Park and Key Adjacent Interfaces Investment strategy, 10/02
[3] ibid.
[4] Estimated economic activity resulting from capital improvement construction up to 2002
[5] Estimated annual contribution to gross regional product based on permanent jobs as of March, 2003
[6] Economic impact refers to estimated annual contribution to gross regional product based on permanent jobs on base and after base conversion.

Appendix E: San Ysidro *Sin Limites/Unlimited*: History of Presentations

SAN YSIDRO

SIN LIMITES
UNLIMITED

HISTORY OF PRESENTATIONS

S.Y. Sin Limites #1 – January 31, 2002

Change in San Ysidro

- Defenition/Explanation of Redevelopment
- Introduction to the General Plan of the City of S.D. and the Strategic Framework Element, and the "City of Villages"
- Woodbury University – Urban Study Projects in S.Y.

S.Y. Sin Limites #2 – February 20, 2002

Homeowner Rehabilitation/Improvements

- Introduction of the "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award
- Presentation – San Diego Housing Commission (Housing Assistance & Programs)
- Presentation – San Diego Gas & Electric (Assistance to Low-Income Families

S.Y. Sin Limites #3 – March 7, 2002

"City of Villages"

- Presentation – SD Planning Department (Strategic Framework Element & City of Villages)
- Discussion of San Ysidro as a "Pilot Village": Adding Affordable Housing, Infrastructure Improvements, Redevelopment of Commercial Corridor and Other Community-Wide Improvements

S.Y. Sin Limites #4 – May 9, 2002

Landlord/Tenant Issues

- Rental Assistance and Housing Options
- 2nd Presentation – SD Housing Commission (Programs)
- Presentation – San Diego Mediation Center (Conflict Resolutions)
- Presentation – Casa Familiar(Draft SY Pilot Village Proposal)
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – Zamora Family

S.Y. Sin Limites #5 – June 20, 2002

Gardening/Landscaping

- Presentation – Garbini & Garbini Landcape Architecture, John McGee
- Introduce the Tijuana River Valley Community Garden
- Workshop #1 – Gardening in Small Spaces
- Workshop #2 – Vegetable Gardening
- Workshop #3 – Decorating pottery
- Workshop #4 – Landscape Design
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – Lopez Family

S.Y. Sin Limites #6 – October 24, 2002

Designing With Community

- Presentation – Design with/without Community Involvement
- Presentation – Mona L. Favorite-Hill, Tree Advisory Board (Mayor's Office Initiative)
- Presentation – Robyn Calvey & Matt McNichol, People for Trees (Free Tree Volunteer Programs)
- Presentation – Mike Daney, MTDB (South Bay Transit First Plan)
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – Castruita Family
- Update – San Ysidro Pilot Village Application
- Workshop – Design Your Own Street (Hands-on Design of Your Own Street With Different Density Recipes)

S.Y. Sin Limites #7 – January 24, 2003

Leading Communities – San Ysidro as a Pilot

- Presentation – City of SD General Plan, Strategic Framework, City of Villages and MI PUEBLO, San Ysidro Pilot Village Application
- Workshop – Recreate "MI PUEBLO" through layers
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – _____ Family

S.Y. Sin Limites #8 – March 27, 2003

San Ysidro Projects

- Presentation – Summary of Projects Planned or Under Construction in San Ysidro
- Gallery – Project Representatives
  - Sunset Elementary School
  - Proposed San Ysidro Fire Station
  - San Ysidro Boulevard Commercial Corridor
  - International Gateway of the Americas
  - Proposed San Ysidro Library
  - Casitas de las Florecitas
  - Church Mixed-use Project
  - Abuelitos Housing
  - MI PUEBLO: Villages Create the City

S.Y. Sin Limites #9 – April 24, 2003

Community Art & Education

- Presentation – Luz Camacho (Involving the Community In Public Art Projects)
- Presentation – Plaza Comunitaria, Migrant Literacy Program for Adults

S.Y. Sin Limites #10 – August 7, 2003

Neighborhood Serving Commercial

- Presentation – Michael Gill-Branion & Ismael Marquez, Citibank Interns (Community Input on Improving the San Ysidro Commercial Corridor)
- Presentation – Jose L. Fernandez, Latino Builders (Home Improvement Grants)
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – _____ Family
- Workshop – Experimenting With Uses for the Commercial Corridor

S.Y. Sin Limites #11 – October 23, 2003

Zoning & Community Development

- Presentation – Definition of Zoning Tools in Community Development
- "Mi Casa, Mi Pueblo" Award – _____ Family
- Workshop – Design a Mixed-Use Commercial Corridor

S.Y. Sin Limites #12 – February 5, 2004

MI PUEBLO: Villages Create the City

- Presentation – MI PUEBLO Thank You Community
- Celebration of San Ysidro Being Selected and Inviting Community to City Council Pilot Village Day

S.Y. Sin Limites #13 – April 1, 2004

San Ysidro: Re-conceptualizing the Border

- Presentation – San Ysidro Port of Entry Design
- Workshop – Collect Community Input for Design and Identify Main Issues and Concerns
  - Public Amenities
  - Traffic
  - Security
  - Pedestrians
  - Commercial

S.Y. Sin Limites #14 – August 12, 2004

Sustainable Border Communities

- Presentation – Update of San Ysidro Port of Entry Design & the MI PUEBLO – San Ysidro Pilot Village
- To collect community input on the available options project by project.
- Help to document & refine community concerns & recommendations.
- Workshop: Effects of US-Mexico Border on Adjacent Communities

S.Y. Sin Limites #15 – February 17, 2005

Value of Community Input & Projects Update

- Presentation - Value of Input & Update of Projects
- To let the community know the value of their input & recommendations.
- Workshops:
- STATION 1-Border Dialogues
- STATION 2-Casitas de las Florecitas
- STATION 3-Mi Pueblo- Pathways of Knowledge Projects
- STATION 4-San Ysidro Community-wide Projects

S.Y. Sin Limites #16 – May 21, 2005

Community Walkability

- Presentation – Elements of Walkability
- To identify important elements for pedestrian pathways as well as San Ysidro pathways.
- Walk Audit – 3 groups survey different paths in SanYisdro.

S.Y. Sin Limites #17 – October 13, 2005

Community Involvement & Volunteering

- Presentation – "Community Involvement Commercials"
- To let the community know of upcoming community events and obtain volunteers to help in those events.
- STATION 1-Thanksgiving
- STATION 2-Casa Xmas Toy Party
- STATION 3-San Ysidro Planning Group
- STATION 4-Casa de Padres
- STATION 5-Dia de Muertos
- STATION 6-General CASA Volunteers
- STATION 7- Newspaper
- STATION 8-Youth Services

S.Y. Sin Limites #18 – January 19, 2006

Community Disaster Preparedness

- Presentation – "Preparing for Disasters"
- Collaboration with the American Red Cross on creating a family and community preparedness plan.

Appendix F: Central Valley Partnership: Civic Action Network

CENTRAL VALLEY PARTNERSHIP

for CITIZENSHIP

CVP Home Page

Member Organizations

CVP Stories

Civic Action Network

California's Central Valley

CVP Collaborative Programs

Become a Contributor

Civic Action Network

[an error occurred while processing this directive]

Civic Action Network
Providing grants and gatherings for immigrant civic participation

Over 175 organizations and projects comprise the CAN network. Pictured here are participants at a 2002 CAN gathering

Strengthening the participation and decision-making power of immigrant communities across California's Central Valley, the Civic Action Network (CAN) fosters the development of a diverse network of people and organizations working together to tackle local and regional problems.

CAN brings immigrant, migrant, and refugee communities together through:

A **grant-making program** providing grassroots groups with resources to launch civic action projects in community education, citizenship, economic development, immigrant rights, cultural expression, and the creation of more responsive institutions

Popular education gatherings, organized by the Pan Valley Institute, facilitating learning and building a CAN community

Organizational and community development technical assistance coordinated by the California Institute for Rural Studies

Networking and skills development through a cadre of outreach specialists

Today CAN celebrates:

- More than 175 successfully granted and implemented civic action projects
- Local outcomes include: A Cambodian radio program developed by the Khmer Society of Fresno to educate isolated community members on

common health issues, a literacy curriculum developed by the Migrant Photography Project with farmworker women, leadership training for Hmong youth developed by The Hmong Student Intercollegiate Coalition
- New skills, knowledge, experience, and partnerships developed among CAN groups

"Our CAN project helps people confront problems in their communities. We hold public forums to demonstrate to individuals that they have the ability to make changes."
-Polo Chavez, Comite No Nos Vamos/Committee We Won't Go

"I am taking home new fund development skills and encouraging relationships that I plan to cultivate."
-CAN gathering participant

A project of the Central Valley Partnership for Citizenship-engaging immigrants, migrants, and refugees in the civic life of California's Central Valley. Made possible with support from the James Irvine Foundation.

For more information about CAN, contact Eric Cohen at ecohen@ilrc.org or at (415) 255-9499, x.264.

If you are interested in becoming a funding partner, contact Noe Paramo at paramont@sbcglobal.net or at (209) 499-8637. Join us!

Join us in supporting the vision.

A project of the Central Valley Partnership for Citizenship.