Suite 601
Spreckels Building
121 Broadway
San Diego, California 92101-5074
619/236-7101

Centre City
Development
Corporation

John G. Davies
PRESIDENT
Gil R. Ontai
VICE PRESIDENT
Philip C. Blair
SECRETARY
Janay P. Kruger
TREASURER

DIRECTORS
Thomas F. Carter
Patrick Kruer
Henri S. Lagatella

Pamela M. Hamilton
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

[MS-0398.039.008.005]

Memorandum

DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 1989

TO: CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

FROM: PAMELA M. HAMILTON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: LOCATION OF SUPERIOR COURTS WITHIN CENTRE CITY

RECOMMENDATION

That the Corporation adopt a resolution recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the Walker Scott site as the location of the nine new superior courts within Centre City.

BACKGROUND

The Redevelopment Agency is contributing $3 million towards the location of nine superior courts within Centre City. Two sites are under consideration by the County. One site is at the former El Cortez Hotel Convention Center at Beech Street and Eighth Avenue and the other at the former Walker Scott Department Store located at Fifth and Broadway. While both sites are within the boundaries of the Centre City planning area, the location of the courts at the Walker Scott site would be of greater benefit to the revitalization efforts within Centre City than the El Cortez location.

REQUEST

The County Board of Supervisors will soon decide on the location of the courts. It is appropriate that the Board be provided with insight as to the reasons why the Walker Scott site should be favored. On comparing the two sites, the Walker Scott location would have greater impact upon the Centre City because:

Item Number 6
Meeting of November 17, 1989
Agenda Number 339

- it is adjacent to existing retail and restaurant uses,
- it is adjacent to public transportation, including the San Diego Trolley, and
- the courts are considered an ideal catalytic use in this traditional core location which currently suffers from inappropriate uses and high vacancies.

The location of the courtrooms at Fifth and Broadway supports the Centre City Community Plan by keeping the facilities in close proximity to other similar public uses. The Centre City Community Plan calls for a dense urban core and activity node. The nine courts at Fifth and Broadway would contribute to this goal.

While the El Cortez site is acceptable, the area is primarily a residential neighborhood. Placement of the courts in this location could lead to the conversion of dwelling units to law offices and other court related uses. The site is up a steep hill from major public transportation modes, thus, potentially increasing the dependence upon the automobile for access. In addition, restaurants and other retail shops are not in close proximity or easy walking distance from the site.

The financial "package" presented to the County by each owner has not been taken into account relative to this site recommendation. What is being asked of the Board of Supervisors is to carefully weigh the financial considerations as evaluated by their staff against the positive revitalization impact that the courts would make at Broadway and Fifth Avenue, the Walker Scott site, particularly in light of the Redevelopment Agency's $3 million contribution.

Pamela M. Hamilton

PAMELA M. HAMILTON
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

A RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION SUPPORTING THE WALKER SCOTT SITE AS THE LOCATION FOR THE NINE ADDITIONAL SUPERIOR COURTS.

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego has charged Centre City Development Corporation with the responsibility of overseeing the revitalization of the Centre City of San Diego; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of the positive economic impact that justice facilities have on the viability of the Centre City, the Redevelopment Agency has agreed to contribute $3 million toward the location of nine additional superior courts within the Centre City; and

WHEREAS, the County of San Diego has evaluated sites for these nine additional courtrooms and has narrowed the field to two locations: the Walker Scott Building at Fifth and Broadway and the other at the El Cortez Convention Center at Eighth Avenue and Beech Street.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Centre City Development Corporation recommends that the County Board of Supervisors carefully weigh the positive revitalization impact that the courts would make at the Walker Scott site at Fifth and Broadway, because:

- the site is adjacent to existing office, retail, and restaurant uses;
- the site is adjacent to public transportation, including the San Diego Trolley; and
- the courts are considered an ideal catalytic use in this traditional core location which currently suffers from inappropriate uses and high vacancies.

JOHN G. DAVIES
PRESIDENT

Marie Burke Lia
Attorney at Law

427 C Street, Suite 310 • San Diego, California 92101

619/235-9766

November 8, 1989

THIS LETTER WAS RECEIVED IN THE CCDC OFFICES ON 11/9/89

Mr. John G. Davies, President
Ms. Pam Hamilton, Exec. Vice President
Centre City Development Corporation
121 Broadway, Suite 601
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Location of Superior Courts within Centre City

Dear Mr. Davies and Ms. Hamilton:

On behalf of the developers of the Walker Scott Building at Fifth and Broadway in the downtown core area, I wish to set forth the reasons why this site is the best choice for the temporary location of the nine Superior Courts. When the Corporation recommended, and the Redevelopment Agency voted to contribute $3,000,000 to the development of these temporary courts, for the benefit of the City at large and the Centre City in particular, the Corporation and Agency earned the right to participate in the location decision to ensure that all public interest factors were considered. On this issue we disagree with counsel for the Cortez hill site that it is "inappropriate for CCDC to take a position contrary to the County of San Diego Department of General Services".

1. The County staff decision was made solely on economic factors, not on considerations of function or use.

It is first necessary to understand the county decision making processes. The County Department of General Services Staff has made a determination to proceed with negotiations with the Cortez Hill location on the basis of economic factors alone.

These factors, to the extent known to us, will be detailed below, but it is important to understand that practical and functional uses of these courts were not factors in the County staff decision.

The economic factors in brief are, to the extent known to my clients, as follows. Walker Scott is offering to modify the majority of their eight story building to construct the court and related facilities as desired by the Superior Court and to enter into a ten year lease at a rental rate beginning at $1.19 per square foot/per month. The Cortez Hill site owners are offering to modify their convention center structure and enter into a five year lease with a five year option at a lower rental rate per square foot. The basic reason for this difference in monetary cost is that the Cortez Hill site was acquired for approximately $3,400,000, and the Walker Scott Building has an acquisition cost basis of $5,100,000, about a $1,700,000 difference in basis, due to its core location on Broadway. Another reason for this difference is that it is likely that the Cortez Hill property will be removed and redeveloped at a higher use consistent with the rest of the new development planned by Minami Group of Tokyo on their large development site encompassing most of the hilltop. The Walker Scott building is a local historic landmark, with Historical Site Board approved plans for restoration of its original 1918 appearance. Because it is not a "tear down" but an important building defining San Diego's architectural heritage, its conversion to court use, at the quality level required by the Superior Courts, cannot be accomplished at a lower economic

rental rate.

2. These nine courtrooms are intended to serve as an annex and to interact with the main courthouse, four blocks away from the Walker Scott. The most important factor left out of the County staff's decision making process is the functioning of the courts and access by the people served. A visit to the current courthouse at 220 West Broadway would illustrate this point. It is reasonable to predict that hundreds of people will require access to these premises on a daily basis. These include judges, court personnel, attorneys, law enforcement personnel, jurors, witnesses, parties to court actions, their friends and family, expert witnesses, and all of the standard categories of suppliers and operational personnel. The main courthouse, that this temporary location is intended to serve as an annex to, is four level blocks away from the Walker Scott, whereas it is twelve mostly non-level, blocks to the Cortez Hill site. The first important locational criteria ignored by the County staff was that the Walker Scott location is within convenient walking distance to the existing courthouse it is meant to serve. The Cortez Hill site at the top of the highest hill in the downtown area is not walkable from the main Courthouse as a practical matter, by any of the categories of persons needing to interact between the two. Even if the Cortez Hill site were to offer free parking to the hundreds of daily users of these court facilities, from judges to low income litigants, choosing an annex location that is only accessible by car with little available off street parking, rather than one with full

pedestrian and transit access, unnecessarily increases the auto congestion in the Centre City area, for a function (interaction between the main and annex courtrooms) that could be essentially pedestrian.

3. The majority of the public using the court system arrive by public transit.

The average participants in the court process, parties to court actions, their witnesses and families and supporters, jurors and most court personnel reach the main courthouse by San Diego Transit or the Trolley. Mass transit will deliver them to the doorstep of the main courthouse and the Walker Scott site. It has been proposed that Grosvenor Industries would provide free shuttle services from the public transit systems to their hilltop location, if so the costs of such a service would have to be factored into the ultimate lease rate, or Minami Group would have to make a ten year commitment to donate this service.

4. Users of the courts within the Centre City rely on pedestrian access.

A factor not unknown to the Centre City Development Corporation is the large number of law offices and other related services centered around the existing court and government complex. A significant factor in leasing existing and proposed office space is walking distance to court. For the same reasons that Walker Scott would serve as a walkable annex to the main courthouse, it would serve as a walkable location for the existing and future legal and court support professions, which include attorneys and the

legal community, bail bondsmen, court reporters, expert witnesses, etc.

5. For the next ten years Minami Group/Grosvenor Industries will be undertaking a $250 million four block new construction project surrounding the proposed temporary courtrooms.

This much publicized new development calls for the construction of four residential and hotel high rises, ranging from 24 to 26 stories, and the rehabilitation of the El Cortez Hotel, all encircling the temporary courtrooms. The County staff neglected to consider the ten year construction noise impact on court operations. The staff also neglected to consider the traffic impact of such a major construction project. It is difficult to conceive of greater traffic congestion than would be generated by the combination of four blocks of new high rise construction with the addition of hundreds of court users seeking parking, court or county clerk access.

6. While the temporary courtroom use allows Minami Group/Grosvenor Industries a short term income from an otherwise unusable piece of their new develoment project area, the building may cease to be available at the end of the lease term, and unless a significant expansion of the court system has been constructed by then, the City and County could be back to square one.

because of development by Minami

With the Cortez Hill site, the City's $3,000,000 is only buying a ten year solution, maximum. Thereafter the property will be redeveloped. The Walker Scott building, with its $13 million in rehabilitation will celebrate its centennial in 2018. The Walker Scott vicinity will continue to

house the city's established legal, business and governmental facilities. The City's $3,000,000 will be invested in a long-term rather than short-term solution.

7. All court users will be without convenient access to food service and shopping.

The Cortez Hill site, which is and will remain primarily residential, will not provide access to needed restaurant and retail services.

The courts will be required to add a shuttle service to transport jurors in deliberation to lunch. Although this might seem a small matter, if all nine courtrooms are hearing jury trials of twelve jurors each, that is 108 persons to be transported to lunch along with alternates and bailiffs. Currently a multitude of restaurant options are within walking distance to the main Courthouse and the Walker Scott building, none of these would be readily accessible from the Cortez Hill site. The Walker Scott location will futher support Gaslamp and Centre City redevelopment projects, adding depth to the customer base.

8. The Centre City Community Plan and its pending revisions call for residential development throughout the Cortez Hill area.

The following objectives are stated in Centre City Planning Committee's Preliminary Community Plan.

1.) "Retain existing judicial and governmental facilities and offices in Centre City. Actively encourage the location of new governmental and

judicial offices and facilities in Centre City." [Economic Development, p. 4].

2.)"Stimulate residential development especially in Centre City East, Cortez Hill and Harborview with zoning incentives and magnet amenities . . ." "Remove existing land uses and discourage the location of future land uses, which are inappropriate to the development of neighborhoods in downtown through zoning requirements. [Housing, p.10]

3.) "Enrich downtown by preserving buildings and groups of buildings that create a strong sense of character or theme." [Urban Conservation. p. 20]

9. <u>The proposed court facilities are not permitted uses in residential zones, including Cortez Hill, and it will be difficult, if not impossible, to make the findings required to permit this deviation from the zoning law.</u>

Superior Court facilities have never been proposed or constructed in residential neighborhoods in California as they have never been considered appropriate compatible uses. Here, if the Minami Group elects to proceed with the courtroom proposal, it would need to secure a Conditional Use Permit. It is respectfully submitted that the required Municipal Code findings allowing such a Conditional Use Permit could not be made in these circumstances.

The Centre City Planning committee has called for Cortez Hill to provide a significant portion of the desired Centre City population of 30,000 by 2010, using mid and high rise construction. Cortez Hill owners of existing

residential properties and properties planned for new residential development will strongly oppose the ten year introduction of civil and criminal courtrooms into this neighborhood. Although the Superior Court might make every effort to only assign civil cases to these court rooms, the temporary courtroom experience at the San Diego Hotel illustrates that the incredible demand for courtroom facilities does not enable the Superior Court to honor a promise to restrict the assignment of criminal cases.

Another significant factor negating the viability of a Conditional Use Permit for this use in a residential neighborhood would be the traffic impact. Although this issue will be addressed in the environmental review of the CUP, it is reasonable to predict that these nine courtrooms, the County Clerk's office, and related services will generate between 300 and 500 visitors per day. It is necessary to contemplate vehicle access for this number of visitors per day, the resulting traffic impact on a residential neighborhood, the construction traffic and street closures generated by the ten year construction plan, and the lack of off street parking for these 300 to 500 daily visitors, to conceive of the nightmare that this use would bring to the neighborhood.

The fact that county staff is unfamiliar with court and county clerk functions is best illustrated by their estimate to City Planning that only 75-90 persons per day would use these court and clerk facilities. Each of the nine Superior Courts requires a minimum of five staff members, a judge, a clerk, a bailiff, a court reporter and a secretary, at least 45 persons.

The county clerk processes all civil and criminal filings and records and it is reasonable to assume that at least 30 staff members will be required at this location. Miscellaneous court administrative and operational personnel will easily bring the total up to 90. The county staff user estimate therefore excludes, all attorneys, all litigants, all witnesses, all jurors, and all persons using the county clerk's office. Their estimate assumes these court and clerk facilities would never be used by the public. The required CUP "public interest and general welfare" findings will be particularly hard to make since the Walker Scott site is available and much more appropriately located for this nonresidential and visitor intense use.

10. Will the Grosvenor courts proposal be honored by the Minami Group, the new property owners.

The proposal to the Superior Courts for Cortez Hill was made by Grovsenor Industries, at that time the owner of the property. On October 13, 1989 Minami Group of Tokyo, Japan purchased the property. The County staff selected the Cortez site as the primary site to negotiate with, based on the economics of the Grovsenor proposal. To this date no one has confirmed that Minami, the current owner, is aware of, or intends to honor the Grovsenor proposal. We understand that as of November 3, 1989 Minami's local attorneys were unaware of this proposal.

11. Selection of the Walker Scott building for the temporary courtrooms will guarantee the rehabilitation and retention of one of San Diego's largest historic buildings and further enhance the historic core area that

includes the Gaslamp Quarter, Horton Plaza Park and the U.S. Grant Hotel. It is a common complaint that the City and County have failed to take positive action to preserve their historic resources. It is particularly ironic that in this circumstance when the City and County are joining to fund these court facilities, they would pass up a local historic landmark, ideally located for this function, to invade a residential neighborhood in order to provide an off shore owner with some temporary income during construction of its new high rise project.

The Historical Site Board, Save Our Heritage Organisation, the Gaslamp Quarter Council and Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 have all called upon the county to consider the historic preservation ramification of this selection decision.

We also ask Centre City Development Corporation to support this use that will rehabilitate and retain this landmark for generations to come.

The Minami Group will be able to find another temporary tenant for their building, one which will not be so diametrically opposed to the surrounding residential uses. Passing up the Walker Scott building, the only logical and practical site for these temporary courtrooms, will be the height of disastrous urban planning.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Burke Lia
Attorney at Law

cc: Marianne Munsell
Mike Stepner
Miriam Kirschner, EQD
Honorable Wayne Peterson
City Council Members
Board of Supervisors
County GSA Staff
Ernest Hahn

Suite 601
Spreckels Building
121 Broadway
San Diego, California 92101-5074
619/236-7101

Centre City Development Corporation

John G. Davies
PRESIDENT
Gil R. Ontai
VICE PRESIDENT
Philip C. Blair
SECRETARY
Janay P. Kruger
TREASURER

DIRECTORS
Thomas F. Carter
Patrick Kruer
Henri S. Lagatella

Pamela M. Hamilton
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Memorandum

DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 1989

TO: CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

FROM: PAMELA M. HAMILTON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO AND THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO REGARDING THE FUNDING OF NINE COURTROOMS IN DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO

RECOMMENDATION

That the Corporation recommend that the Redevelopment Agency approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

FISCAL IMPACT

The 1989-90 Fiscal Year Redevelopment Agency Budget includes $3 million for the provision of nine additional superior courtrooms in downtown San Diego.

BACKGROUND

On August 5, 1989, at a joint meeting between the City Council and the Board of Supervisors, both bodies agreed to the funding of nine additional superior courtrooms in downtown San Diego.

AGREEMENT

The MOU provides for the payment of the $3 million at the time that the County approves a contract to modify, for courtroom use, the site selected within the Centre City planning area. The County agrees that the majority of the cases assigned to the courts will be civil matters. Civil matters are favored in downtown San Diego because such cases benefit the downtown business community more than criminal cases. The courtrooms will be at the temporary

Item Number 5
Meeting of November 17, 1989
Agenda Number 339

location for at least five years. The $3 million will be spent for tenant improvements rather than for operational use. This is in compliance with the state redevelopment law relative to the use of Agency funds. Should any funds remain after building modification, they will be utilized for architectural and engineering services for the permanent downtown court facilities.

With regard to the future, it is understood that the Redevelopment Agency and County will continue to work cooperatively toward a permanent location for expanded downtown justice facilities. The County agrees to utilize the Centre City planning area to serve as the primary location for the San Diego Judicial District. The County, as part of the subject agreement, requests that the Agency acknowledge the establishment of "full service" branches in all judicial districts of the County.

To implement the purposes of this Memorandum of Understanding, a Cooperation Agreement to be signed by the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency and the Chief Administrative Officer of the County will be prepared. The Agreement will document the use of redevelopment funds as required by the State Health & Safety Code Community Redevelopment Law. A copy of the MOU authorized by the County is attached.

Pamela M. Hamilton
PAMELA M. HAMILTON
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO AND THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO REGARDING THE FUNDING OF NINE COURTROOMS IN DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO

1. The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego agrees to provide the County of San Diego a lump sum payment in the amount of $3.0 million in order to fund nine additional courtrooms in downtown San Diego.

2. The payment shall occur upon the Board of Supervisors approval of the contract to undertake improvements to the site selected for the nine courtrooms.

3. The County of San Diego agrees to locate the nine additional Superior Courtrooms within the boundaries of the Centre City Community Planning Area.

4. The County of San Diego with the concurrence of the Superior Court agrees that the majority of cases assigned to the new facility shall be civil matters.

5. The facility shall be operational for at least five years.

6. The funds for the nine courtrooms shall be spent on physical (tenant) improvements to the leased facility as opposed to ongoing operational expenditures.

7. The payment for physical improvements may consist of the pro-rata share of tenant improvements amortized in the lease.

8. If there are any remaining funds from the lump sum payment they shall be spent on the architectural and engineering studies required as part of the Downtown Court Facilities Master Plan.

9. The Redevelopment Agency and the County of San Diego will continue to work cooperatively to expand the Downtown Courthouse Complex in order to accommodate the growth forecast for both the San Diego Municipal and Superior Courts.

10. The Redevelopment Agency and the County will jointly prepare a Cooperative Agreement that will address the findings required under Section 33445 of the Community Redevelopment Law and other issues relevant to the appropriation.

11. The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego and the County agree to jointly prepare a Cooperation Agreement that will, among other issues, address findings required under

Section 33445 of the Community Redevelopment Law.

12. The Centre City Community Planning Area will continue to serve as the primary area for accommodating existing and planned Superior and Municipal Court judicial positions whose cases venue are associated with the San Diego Judicial District.

13. The County will eventually establish "full-service" (excluding Juvenile, Probate, Mental Health cases) branches of the Superior Court in all of the Judicial Districts in San Diego County.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

By: _____
MAUREEN O'CONNOR, Chair

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

SUSAN GOLDING
Chairperson of the Board of Supervisors

Approved and/or authorized by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego

OCTOBER 24, 1989 (21)

Kathryn A. Nelson

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Approved as to form

JOHN WITT, General Counsel

By: _____
Allison L. Thomas
Deputy Counsel
City of San Diego
Redevelopment Agency

Approved as to form

LLOYD M. HARMON, JR., County Counsel

By: _____
WILLIAM SMITH, Deputy
for the County of San Diego 10/16/89

b:mouccdc

Suite 601
Spreckels Building
121 Broadway
San Diego, California 92101-5074
619/236-7101

Centre City
Development
Corporation

John G. Davies
PRESIDENT
Gil R. Ontai
VICE PRESIDENT
Philip C. Blair
SECRETARY
Janay P. Kruger
TREASURER

DIRECTORS
Thomas F. Carter
Patrick Kruer
Henri S. Lagatella

Pamela M. Hamilton
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

AGENDA 339

AGENDA FOR THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1989, 8:00 AM

Committee Conference Room, 12th Floor
City Administration Building
202 C Street, San Diego

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 3, 1989

3. APPROVAL OF BASIC CONCEPTS/SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR SEABRIDGE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT - PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 3, 1989 - **COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

4. CENTRAL BAYFRONT DESIGN PRINCIPLES - as approved by the Broadway Complex Coordinating Group for Corporation consideration with respect to development regulations within its jurisdiction - **MARINA/COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

5. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO AND THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO REGARDING THE FUNDING OF NINE COURTROOMS IN DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO - **GENERAL**

6. LOCATION OF SUPERIOR COURTS WITHIN CENTRE CITY - recommending approval of the Walker Scott site for location of the nine new superior courts within Centre City - **GENERAL**

7. SECOND IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT - ONE HARBOR DRIVE - to provide for a revised conveyance date for the Agency-owned parcel of June 30, 1990 - **MARINA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

8. FISCAL YEAR 1989 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION - continued from meeting of November 3, 1989 - **GENERAL**

OVER PLEASE

9. WATERMARK OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS - approving a contract with Austin Hansen Group for the preparation of construction drawings and construction administration of the off-site improvements - **MARINA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

10. FIRST AMENDMENT TO NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT - CABOT, CABOT AND FORBES CORPORATE CENTER II - reinstating the 120-day negotiation period to permit redesign of the proposed development - **COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

11. AUTHORIZING PAYMENT TO MTDB FOR MODIFICATIONS OF ITS CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTION ITEMS FOR THE LINEAR PARK, **MARINA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

12. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE RESIDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Reappointment of Murray Galinson and Cecilia Contini and appointment of Martin Poirier and Steven Kruis - **GENERAL**

13. CENTRE CITY PLAN UPDATE - FOR INFORMATION - status of the Centre City Planning and Redevelopment Expansion efforts - **GENERAL**

14. TOXIC CONSULTANT SELECTION - **MARINA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

15. AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH MOORE MAINTENANCE - increasing the compensation for maintenance of the sidewalk area adjacent to the Balboa Theatre - **HORTON PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

16. SECOND AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR MAINTENANCE SERVICES WITH BURT LAMBERSON - increasing the amount of compensation for general maintenance services - **GENERAL**

17. FISCAL YEAR 1989 ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDIT FOR THE HORTON PLAZA, MARINA, COLUMBIA AND GASLAMP QUARTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - continued from meeting of November 3, 1989 - **GENERAL**

CLOSED SESSION

18. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST TO REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD TO DESIGNATE THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AS LEAD AGENCY FOR PREPARATION OF A GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION PLAN - **MARINA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

URGENT NON-AGENDA ITEMS (Action items must meet requirements of Government Code Sec. 54954.2)

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

ADJOURNMENT