

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE MADERA CITY COUNCIL AND
REGULAR MEETING OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
CITY OF MADERA, CALIFORNIA**

February 9, 2011
6:00 p.m.

City Hall
Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER – CLOSED SESSION

Mayor/Agency Chairperson/Housing Authority Chairperson Robert Poythress called to order the Closed Session for the Regular Meeting of the Housing Authority of the City of Madera and the Joint Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mayor/Chairperson Robert Poythress
 Mayor Pro-Tem/Vice Chairperson Brett Frazier
 Council/Agency Member Sally Bomprezzi
 Council/Agency Member Gary Svanda

Excused Absence: Council/Agency Member Sam Armentrout

PUBLIC COMMENT – CLOSED SESSION

The first fifteen minutes of this portion of the meeting are reserved for members of the public to address the Agency or Council on Closed Session items listed on the Agenda. Speakers seeking to comment on other items are requested to make those comments during the Public Comment portion of the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Speakers shall be limited to three minutes. Speakers will be asked to identify themselves and state the subject of their comment. The Agency and Council are prohibited by law from taking any action on matters discussed that are not on the Agenda, and no adverse conclusions should be drawn if the Agency or Council does not respond to public comment at this time.

No comments were heard.

2. CLOSED SESSION

There are no items for this section.

Mayor/Agency Chairperson/Housing Authority Chairperson Robert Poythress adjourned the Closed Session portion of both meetings at 6:05 p.m. and called for the workshop presentation as listed on the agenda for the Housing Authority of the City of Madera.

3. CALL TO ORDER – REGULAR SESSION

Mayor/Agency Chairperson/Housing Authority Chairperson Robert Poythress called the meetings of the Housing Authority of the City of Madera and the Joint Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mayor/Chairperson Robert Poythress
 Mayor Pro-Tem/Vice Chairperson Brett Frazier
 Council/Agency Member Sally Bomprezzi
 Council/Agency Member Gary Svanda

Excused Absence: Council/Agency Member Sam Armentrout

Agency staff members present: Executive Director Jim Taubert, General Counsel/City Attorney Richard Denhalter, Agency Treasurer/Finance Director David Croff, Manuel Ruiz, Neighborhood Preservation Manager, Agency Secretary Sandi Brown, and Office Assistant Elizabeth Ybarra.

City of Madera staff members present: City Administrator David Tooley, and Administrative Services Director Michael McHatten.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Robert Poythress.

Mayor/Agency Chairperson/Housing Authority Chairperson Robert Poythress recessed the Joint Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency at 6:33 p.m. the called for the items as listed on the regular meeting agenda of the Housing Authority.

Mayor/Agency Chairperson/Housing Authority Chairperson Robert Poythress adjourned the Regular Meeting of the Housing Authority of the City of Madera at 6:45 p.m. and reopened the Joint Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency at 6:57 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT – REGULAR SESSION

The first fifteen minutes of the meeting are reserved for members of the public to address the Agency or Council on items which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Agency or Council. Speakers shall be limited to three minutes. Speakers will be asked to identify themselves and state the subject of their comment. If the subject is an item on the Agenda, the Chairperson/Mayor has the option of asking the speaker to hold the comment until that item is called. Comments on items listed as a Public Hearing on the Agenda should be held until the hearing is opened. The Agency and Council are prohibited by law from taking any action on matters discussed that are not on the Agenda, and no adverse conclusions should be drawn if the Agency or Council does not respond to public comment at this time.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress opened the Public Comment portion of the meeting for the Regular Session inviting members of the public to address the Agency/City Council on non-agenda items.
No comments were heard.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

- 4A.** Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Special Meeting of Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency – January 12, 2011 **(City/Agency)**
- 4B.** Listing of Warrants Issued from January 8, 2011 to February 4, 2011 **(Agency)**
- 4C.** Monthly Financial Reports – Redevelopment Agency **(Agency)**
- 4D.** Monthly Financial Reports – Code Enforcement **(City)**
- 4E.** Code Enforcement Activity Report **(City)**
- 4F.** Consideration of a Resolution Approving an Agreement with PARC Environmental for Asbestos Abatement Services at 228 South G Street **(Agency)**
- 4G.** Consideration of a Resolution Approving an Amendment to the Agreement with Giersch and Associates for Engineering and Design Services Related to the Building Demolition Project, Phase 14 **(Agency)**
- 4H.** Consideration of a Resolution Approving an Amendment to the Agreement with Selsor Demolition for Building Demolition, Project No. RDA 10-03 (Demolition Project, Phase 14) **(Agency)**
- 4I.** Status Report on the Submittal of a Regional Grant Application for the CalRecycle Waste Tire Cleanup and Amnesty Events Program TCA8 **(City/Agency)**
- 4J.** Consideration of a Resolution Approving Exterior Home Improvement Grant for Property Located at 317 North 'D' Street in the City of Madera **(Agency)**
- 4K.** Acceptance of the Investment Report for Quarter Ending December 31, 2010 **(Agency)**

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress asked members of the Council/Agency Board if there were items on the Consent Calendar they wished to have pulled for further discussion. No items were pulled.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress called for a motion to approve the items presented on the Consent Calendar.

MRA-1458 RESOLUTION OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MADERA,
CALIFORNIA APPROVING AGREEMENT WITH PARC ENVIRONMENTAL FOR
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT SERVICES RELATED TO THE DEMOLITION OF 228

SOUTH 'G' STREET AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRPERSON TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (4F)

- MRA-1459** RESOLUTION OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MADERA, CALIFORNIA APPROVING A TWELFTH AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT WITH GIERSCH & ASSOCIATES, INC., FOR PROVIDING OF ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO DESIGN AND ENGINEERING SERVICES AT 200, 208, 212 AND 216 SOUTH 'G' STREET, APN 010-134-005, 408 NORTH 'A' STREET, 408-1/2 NORTH 'A' STREET, 420 NORTH 'A' STREET, 109 SOUTH 'B' STREET, 421 NORTH 'B' STREET AND 217 N. 'A' STREET, 25183 AVENUE 16, PARCELS 008-022-035 AND 008-022-010 (HERNANDEZ WAREHOUSE) AND 15876 AND 16108 N. LAKE STREET AND 220 AND 224 SOUTH 'G' STREET, 100 EAST SEVENTH STREET AND 129 FIG STREET, 616 EAST 6TH STREET, 111 SOUTH 'B' STREET AND 417 NORTH 'B' STREET, 1405 E. YOSEMITE AVENUE, 16120 N. LAKE STREET, 308 SOUTH 'J' STREET AND 228 SOUTH 'G' STREET AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRPERSON TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (4G)
- MRA-1460** RESOLUTION OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, MADERA CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SEVENTH AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT WITH SELSOR CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION INC., FOR THE DEMOLITION OF PROPERTIES RELATED TO THE DEMOLITION PHASE 14 PROJECT IN THE CITY OF MADERA AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRPERSON TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (4H)
- MRA-1461** A RESOLUTION OF THE MADERA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY/ MAINTENANCE COVENANT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 317 NORTH 'D' STREET IN THE CITY OF MADERA RELATED TO THE REHABILITATION OF A SINGLE FAMILY HOME AND MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS RELATED THERETO (4J)

*On motion by Council/Agency Member Frazier, seconded by Council/Agency Member Bomprezzi, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented by the following vote 4/0 vote: Ayes: Council/Agency Members Poythress, Frazier, Bomprezzi and Svanda; Noes: None; Excused Absence: Council/Agency Member Armentrout resulting in the approval of the minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency for January 12, 2011 and the adoption of Resolutions **MRA-1458, MRA-1459, MRA-1460 and MRA-1461.***

5. PROJECTS AND REPORTS

5A. Discussion Regarding Governor Brown's Proposed State Budget (Agency)

Executive Director Jim Taubert presented the staff report noting that the matter of eliminating redevelopment in California really began last year with the last election when the League of California Cities and California Redevelopment Association (CRA) placed Proposition 22 on the ballot. Proposition 22 was opposed by CTA and others, but in spite of their opposition, the measure received 60% of the vote statewide and in Madera County it received 67.7% of the vote. Mr. Taubert commented that the passage of Proposition 22 has led CTA and the Fire Fighters' union to press Governor Brown to change the face of redevelopment in the State of California, and the best way to change the face in light of Prop 22, which prohibits the take of further funds, is to eliminate redevelopment altogether. On January 10, 2011, the governor announced his plan to eliminate redevelopment by July 1, 2011. Mr. Taubert reported that the plan is vague and that redevelopment agencies would be replaced with successor agencies, although the form and how it would be governed has not been specifically identified. Mr. Taubert advised the Board that he has been listening to Assembly Joint Committee Hearings and Senate Joint Committee Hearings. He said in today's hearings the Senators put a lot of pressure on the governor's office as to when they will see a proposal, because at this point nobody knows how to react to or defend the elimination of redevelopment due to the lack of a proposal. He said that the frustration level of the legislators appears to be high, and he has been focusing on comments from the Democratic Assembly Members and Senators. There appears to

be quite a few Democratic Assembly members, he said, that are ex-City Council members and consequently ex-Redevelopment members who are in a real quandary. The Democratic Senators, on the other hand, aren't expressing the same level of concern for redevelopment and its future. He said the statewide posture of redevelopment agencies is extremely defensive. When the governor made his announcement on January 10th, several agencies, including Long Beach and Los Angeles, held special meetings to enter into agreements to encumber their funds totaling several billion dollars. Mr. Taubert said he wasn't sure they are legal agreements. If the agencies were ready to enter into a DDA or Owner Participation Agreement, why didn't they do it; why did they wait until the governor's announcement to encumber what amounts to several billion dollars in funds? He noted that during the Senate Committee meetings it was questioned if these agreements were legal. The Department of Finance (DOF) said it will depend upon what the agreements look like and what the agencies are trying to do. The press reaction to those agencies who have taken such actions has been absolutely negative. He said the first recommendations from CRA and Goldfarb and Liptman were don't do it; don't start entering into agreements that aren't ready to be entered into. Mr. Taubert continued that very few agencies took their advice and many are trying to encumber as much of their money as they can. So, he said, where does that bring us in Madera. Mr. Taubert said that prior to the governor's proposal, Madera was probably more so than most agencies impacted by the SERAF taking, which cost us \$3.1 million. The reason it impacted us so hard is because we had already approved an agreement with the State of California to give them \$4.2 million for the new courthouse. At the time, we were working with Assemblyman Villines requesting a credit on the SERAF due to the courthouse expenditure; however, the credit was not received. That said, we gave the state \$3.1 million in SERAF and \$4.2 for a courthouse, in addition to a drop in property tax value resulting in a loss of revenue of approximately \$1.2 million going into Brown's proposal. The Agency's financial position is we are generating about \$5 million annually in tax increment, and that is assuming we will not get too big of a drop this year. Due to past bonds and cash on hand, beginning July 1, 2011 we will have between \$8-9 million. The Agency has approximately \$3.2 million in land and buildings. Mr. Taubert posed the question "are we at risk" of the state coming in and taking our \$8 million and said in his opinion the Agency could be. The state could be going after any reserves that redevelopment agencies have, because one way or the other the state has to come up with \$1.7 billion in cash. Mr. Taubert said that after the Agency lost the lawsuit, the Agency went into a defensive posture because we had so many projects in the hopper that we were lining up for a bond in 2011-2012 that probably weren't going to materialize because of the drop in property taxes. That said, the Agency had housing projects in the pipeline that included the 1) The Riverwalk Subdivision, where the Agency has spent several hundred thousand dollars in acquisition/engineering/demolition costs; 2) The Midtown Village Subdivision where the Agency has spent funds to acquire and demolish property, and designed both the public improvements and new residential houses; 3) The multifamily program underway and a \$350,000 commitment to Arborpoint; and 4) Staff has been negotiating to acquire Riverside Villas. Mr. Taubert said that before January 10th the Agency has spent a considerable amount for projects and in his mind the Agency has too much invested, collectively over \$1 million, to walk away and say "that's life." Mr. Taubert said in the area of capital projects, the Agency has eleven capital projects where a significant amount of money has been spent for either acquisition or project design. Some are bid-ready and some are 50-60% designed, and he said that after the lawsuit was lost and the SERAF taking, staff suspended all engineering work on these projects, but we have made a financial commitment already. These projects include the Yosemite/Elm Signalization Project, E Street Improvement Project, Freeway 99 Entry Project, Neighborhood Improvement Projects, East Yosemite Widening Project, Central-2nd-3rd Improvement Project, Downtown Streetscape Project, Tulare Safe Route to Schools Project, Sonora/Green/Columbia Improvement Project, and the Laurel Linear Project. Collectively, he said, between the capital projects and the housing projects, the expenses are actually more money than we have funds available. Again, he continued, it was in anticipation of a 2011/2012 bond. Mr. Taubert said the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) has been playing it fairly straight, although it is often obvious they are taking the governor's position. However, there are several questions that remain unanswered, and one is "does the state have the authority to dissolve all redevelopment agencies immediately." That is a fairly significant question because even just Madera has outstanding bond holders in the amount of \$54 million. Statewide that would be a very big number. The LAO has not answered yet "who will serve as the successor agencies." Mr. Taubert said that he thinks the current RDA Board will have a role in the successor agency, but they are saying there will be other voting members that include members of the Board of Supervisors, School Board and

various special districts. He continued that the governance is unknown at this time, but said it is unlikely to be the five members of the RDA Board. Mr. Taubert said the other unanswered question is what happens to our physical assets – land and buildings. He said the senators pressed the DOF today for something in writing and the only answer given was “soon” and couldn’t give a specific date.

Mr. Taubert said his recommendation addresses both housing and infrastructure, and the disposition and management of Agency-owned properties. He said that he was prepared tonight, subject to the Board’s questions and suggestions, to recommend that we schedule a special meeting for February 16, 2011 to consider the following:

1) Consideration of a resolution approving an agreement for services with the City of Madera that utilizes existing housing funds and 25% of future tax increment to implement the Action Items identified in the 2009 Housing Element and the Housing Project/Replacement component of 2008-2013 Implementation Plan, monitoring of existing affordability covenants, and development and implementation of neighborhood revitalization program and graffiti abatement services.

Mr. Taubert reiterated that he was not suggesting that we go out and drum up phantom programs, but he is suggesting that the Agency has over a period of years made a serious financial commitment to many housing programs and that we enter into an agreement with the City to complete the projects.

2) Consideration of a resolution approving an agreement with the City of Madera to complete certain public infrastructure projects for which funds have been expended and public hearings have been conducted.

Mr. Taubert said that he is not suggesting that the Agency should create new capital infrastructure projects, but he said there are eleven specific projects in the pipeline that we have conducted public hearings asking for public comment, and the Agency has taken action spending funds on design and engineering services for the projects. He said he was suggesting that we enter into an agreement with the City that would allow us to complete those projects.

3) Consideration of a resolution to create a non-profit corporation for the disposition and management of Agency-owned properties.

Mr. Taubert said the final resolution relates to the disposition and management of Agency-owned property. He said one of the senators in today’s hearings could have been describing Riverwalk, where several years have been spent trying to assemble the property, there are one or two pieces that are needed complete the project, and the question posed was “are we going to lose the property and the project go away?” The representative from DOF responded “we don’t think so; those are the types of agreements that we will have to look at, but it will be on a case-by-case basis.” Mr. Taubert said, based upon what he heard today, we don’t need to go through the time and effort to form a non-profit entity. He said the Agency’s two largest assets are the offices at 428 East Yosemite Avenue and at 5 East Yosemite Avenue. Rather than transfer all properties, or create a non-profit, or joint-powers authority, he suggested that it might be good to transfer title of our two biggest assets to the City.

Mr. Taubert asked the Board if they had questions of either him or the Agency’s General Counsel.

Council/Agency Member Svanda asked if staff were considering a non-profit, what would be the possibility of using MORES, that is already set up and functioning under the auspices of the Housing Authority, as the entity to whom you would transfer the properties. Mr. Taubert said that he did not know anything about the structure of MORES. He said he was not saying yes, no or indifferent; he just did not know what he did not know. Member Svanda suggested that Richard and Brent talk to each other since they know better the structure and operating conditions under which MORES was established.

Richard Denhalter, Agency General Counsel, responded saying that a number of the cities that have started down this road have created special entities, special private entities to hold and administer the assets. He said that he felt the Agency might put MORES at risk if you used them because the state will not roll over on this – they will attack just like they counter-attacked with Prop 22. Mr. Denhalter said that in terms of what else can happen, he said he felt there was a third player out there that no one is talking about, and that is the people who bought the bonds from all these agencies. He said that he expects

litigation. If the state attempts to take the tax increment that was intended to repay the bonds and use it for other state purposes, the state is going to step into the shoes of the agencies and be subject to litigation. He said those people didn't buy bonds from the state, and frankly wouldn't have when they bought our bonds, and they don't want bonds from the State of California and they will want their money back. Mr. Denhalter said he anticipates a war and it will be a significant long-term battle, and if that money has to be paid back to the various bond holders, the state will net nothing out of this except litigation costs and every asset currently owned by every redevelopment agency will be liquidated to payoff bonds. Mr. Denhalter said no one is talking about that right now, and said in his business you go to the end of the line and look backward and see what the risk is, and that's a significant risk. They can play poker with this money – try to figure out how to capture it for education and other state purposes, but that number is a huge number for us and for everyone else, and you have to stop and think what are they going to go after.

Member Svanda responded that if the Agency owes \$54 million and we have roughly \$9-10 million in cash that could be used to balance budgets within the next year or two, he wasn't sure that's a good bet.

Mr. Denhalter said the bonds were projected over a 20 year period to be repaid out of the increase in property tax generated by the Agency, which has been a successful program. The state can't say that they have that kind of program and they can't go out and sell bonds right now. They are deeply in the red. If they take this money, they are going to take the obligation with it. From our end, he said, we probably want to protect our physical assets, get them into the City ownership so that they aren't liquidated and sold off to pay off bonds, or sold by the state to distribute in some other way. We probably want to finish projects that were the intent when the bonds were sold and use our revenues for the purpose they were collected for, and finish these projects until such time there is a change in how redevelopment works. Once the state starts addressing the bond issue, he said he felt the whole dialogue will change its tenor. If the state thinks the bond purchasers are going to go away and just say I took a risk and I lost, he said he did not see that happening.

Member Svanda asked how difficult would it be if we transfer all these things and make all these changes in committing the monies in housing back to the City, we put all our properties in the City, we make commitments about projects that are on the books ready to go to the City, and redevelopment does not go away. Can we get it back to redevelopment or will that be a major problem, confusion and liability for the City and/or the Agency?

Mr. Denhalter said that if you were to take one of these left turns and create a non-profit or JPA, and transfer everything into a separate entity, then we would have to unravel all that. But, he said, if you go down the path you are on – you take projects that you have already started that pre-date the governor's announcement – you work to complete those projects to the benefit of the City – you take your assets that are tangible and you put them in City ownership in exchange for various consideration that the Agency has provided in the past, you will probably be in a position to preserve pretty much the status-quo and go back to business as usual. There is really no reason for that approach or pathway to change if redevelopment survives this attack and the economy recovers enough that we actually have tax increment again. You will continue on and your bonds will be paid off and the money will be used for the projects intended in the first place.

Member Svanda asked if the money would flow back into the City to the Agency – what would change? Mr. Taubert responded that it would go to the successor agency or the Redevelopment Agency. He said Mr. Shirey with CRA said two weeks ago, no discussions between CRA and the DOF or governor's office were taking place. Today, the DOF said they are having active discussion with the League of California Cities and CRA. He said the agencies have not been brought into what is being discussed. Mr. Taubert said that Richard brought up something that he too thinks is important related to our bonds. He said that when we issued our bonds in 2008 as part of the official statement we had to list the projects that we intended to spend the bond revenue on, and he said that he is fairly sure that every one of the housing projects and infrastructure projects are listed in the official statement of the bond, which would provide us with documentation when the DOF starts looking at agencies that the Agency planned the projects long before the governor's announcement in January 2011.

Council/Agency Member Frazier asked for clarification on the statement that transferring to MORES could put them at risk, would that same liability be true for the City.

Mr. Denhalter said that if you just handed cash over, that might occur. But he said that he didn't agree that would be the case with the real estate; we have ways of dealing with the transfer of real estate and it is frankly underway all the time with City projects. With respect to the cash, if it was just put into the City's general fund, sure that would be exposed. It would be the same if any private non-profit had it, whether it's MORES or a newly created one. He said the other side is if funds are put into these projects, which is what it was created for and collected for and that is what bonds were sold for, then he said he felt the state is going to have a really difficult time saying it shouldn't be used for that. How will the state steal it if it's already invested in the projects that their own legislation directed we use it for, and our plan was adopted – it's all proper and appropriate. We are not playing a shell game; it's not gamesmanship as some cities' schemes have been called by the press. This is redevelopment doing what it does – maybe a little accelerated because of the threat. But, nevertheless this is what the money is for and what the voters approved it for, it's what the Agency exists to do, it is just a matter of doing it until we are told not to do it anymore. He said that he did not think the Agency is at risk there.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Taubert asked if Mr. Tooley had any comments. City Administrator David Tooley addressed the Board stating he was available to answer any questions, and added that he is in full support of the Executive Director's recommendations.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress asked if there were further questions; there were none. He called for a motion to consider items #1 through #3 as listed on staff report at a special meeting to be scheduled for February 16, 2011.

Council/Agency Member Frazier asked for clarification if the motion is to schedule that special meeting.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress said the motion was to recommend that items #1-3 would be placed on a special meeting agenda for February 16.

Mr. Denhalter advised February 16 is a City Council meeting night and placing these items on the agenda would constitute a joint meeting, and you would be able to take action one way or the other as both entities. He said staff will try to tailor them however you direct us.

On motion by Council/Agency Member Frazier, and seconded by Council/Agency Member Bomprezzi, to schedule a joint meeting for February 16, 2011 to consider items #1 through #3 as listed on the staff report was approved by the following 4/0 vote: Ayes: Council/Agency Members Poythress, Frazier, Bomprezzi and Svanda; Noes: None; Excused Absence: Council/Agency Member Armentrout.

For the Record: Items #1 through #3 are as follows:

- 1) Consideration of a resolution approving an agreement for services with the City of Madera that utilizes existing housing funds and 25% of future tax increment to:
 - a. Implement the Action Items identified in the 2009 Housing Element and the Housing Project/Replacement component of 2008-2013 Implementation Plan.
 - b. Annual monitoring of existing affordability covenants.
 - c. Development and implementation of neighborhood revitalization program and graffiti abatement services.
- 2) Consideration of a resolution approving an agreement with the City of Madera to complete certain public infrastructure projects for which funds have been expended and public hearings have been conducted.
- 3) Consideration of a resolution to create a non-profit corporation for the disposition and management of Agency-owned properties.

6. AGREEMENTS

There are no items for this section.

7. HOUSING

There are no items for this section.

8. GENERAL

There are no items for this section.

9. AGENCY MEMBER REPORTS

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress noted that today is Civics Day, the longest running Civics Day program in America – this being the 86th year for Madera and said it is a privilege and honor to participate in the program. He offered his appreciation to City and Redevelopment Agency staff as well as Councilmember Svanda for their participation. He requested that his thanks be shared with staff at their staff meetings.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress advised that he attended a County Policy Council meeting in Sacramento that was mainly centered on transportation funding. He said it was interesting because the Stockton Mayor spoke about High Speed Rail and she mentioned that everyone on the County Policy Council supported High Speed Rail. He added that there were several that did not respond at that time; however, at the end of the day council members started sharing more of their thoughts concerning High Speed Rail Authority, and their seemingly lack of communication and public relations abilities, or the lack thereof – their feckless effort.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress said that he recently attended a graffiti program presentation at Nishimoto school that was outstanding and complimented Manuel Ruiz and staff on the presentation.

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress reported that he attended a neighborhood graffiti block meeting at Sierra Vista school and said that he was really impressed by the community turnout. He said that he has attended several meeting in the past, but the mix of residents attending this meeting, which included English-speaking and non-English-speaking, was impressive. He said the attendees were supportive of the program and expressed a real desire to participate and improve their communities. Member Poythress added that it really encourages him to see that type of participation and desire of our residents to take personal responsibility for their neighborhoods and themselves and the safety of their community to make things better. He thanked staff for their efforts.

No additional comments were presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor/Chairperson Poythress adjourned the Joint Special Meeting of the Madera City Council and Regular Meeting of the Madera Redevelopment Agency at 7:34 p.m.


Sandi Brown, Agency Secretary


Mayor/Chairperson Robert Poythress