



CITY OF CARSON

MINUTES CARSON CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNED SPECIAL MEETING JULY 15, 2021 5:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 P.M. by Mayor Lula Davis-Holmes via Zoom Teleconference.

ROLL CALL:

Chief Deputy City Clerk John W. Carroll, Sr. noted the roll:

Council Members Present via Zoom Teleconference:

Mayor Lula Davis-Holmes, Council Member Jawane Hilton, and Council Member Cedric Hicks

Council Members Absent:

Mayor Pro Tem Jim Dear (Joined at 5:02 P.M.)

Also Present via Zoom Teleconference:

Monica Cooper, City Treasurer; Sharon Landers, City Manager; Sunny Soltani, City Attorney; David Roberts, Assistant City Manager; John Raymond, Assistant City Manager; Saied Naaseh, Director of Community Development; Robert Lennox, Director of Community Services; Faye Moseley, Director of Human Resources and Risk Management; Tarik Rahmani, Director of Finance; and Eliza Jane Whitman, Director of Public Works

FLAG SALUTE:

Council Member Hicks led the Pledge of Allegiance.

INVOCATION:

Council Member Hilton gave the invocation.

CLOSED SESSION (Item 1)

REPORT ON ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (CITY CLERK) –
None.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (CITY ATTORNEY)

City Attorney Soltani announced the Closed Session item.

RECESS INTO CLOSED SESSION

The meeting was recessed at 5:03 P.M. by Mayor Davis-Holmes to Closed Session.

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

The meeting was reconvened at 5:39 P.M. by Mayor Davis-Holmes with all members previously noted present.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS (CITY ATTORNEY)

City Attorney Soltani provided the Closed Session report as follows:

Item No. 1. 2021-568 CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION (CITY COUNCIL)

Recommendation: A closed session will be held, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(2) or (d)(3) & (e)(1), because there is a significant exposure to litigation in three cases.

ACTION: No reportable action was taken.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY: (Item 2)

Item No. 2. 2021-514 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ON APPEAL OF CARSON PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION ADOPTING PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21-2708, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING RELOCATION IMPACT REPORT NO. 04-19 FOR MITIGATION OF RELOCATION IMPACTS OF CLOSURE OF RANCHO DOMINGUEZ MOBILE ESTATES

Mayor Davis-Holmes asked if there were any speakers.

Chief Deputy City Clerk Carroll, Sr. noted there are two public comments and one anonymous comment. Also, there are additional exhibits from Ana Zuniga and Michael Novosky that will be made part of the record.

Chief Deputy City Clerk Carroll, Sr. presented the following public comments that were submitted electronically:

Gabriela Ayala - Resident of Rancho Dominguez Mobile Estates
Asked for an extension of her residency

Jose Godinez

Asked owner to accept in today's money the same amount he paid for the coach as when he bought it with no adjustment

Director Naaseh gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Appeal of Planning Commission Decision Approving Rancho Dominguez Mobile Estates Relocation Impact Report RIR No. 4-19. He informed the City Council that the Community Center is available with residents for comments.

Mayor Davis-Holmes declared the Public Hearing open at 5:58 P.M.

Carlos Franco

Spoke in regard to the time frame is still in place if the Covid-19 causes another lockdown

Mr. Rodriquez

Spoke on when they moved into the estates (2005-2008) he was informed of an extension being requested for ten (10) years; Moratorium in 2012 by the City of Carson stating no mobile homes parks will be closed; Was told extension and would have lawyers take care of it. If they do not comply with the orders, please do not approve the park closure; Asked for assistance and fair treatment

Deborah Fore

Spoke on her home being appraised at \$135,000.00 compared to the Brabant appraisal at \$28,000.00, wants her appraisal as well as three other residents want their appraisal taken into consideration; asking for a fair price

Victor Camerena – Space #27, Rancho Dominguez Mobilehome Park

Stated the city is violating Section 2782 on replacing any loss of low-income housing with other low income housing of equal value; urged the City Council not to close the park

Eduardo Anthony Almeda - Space #79, Rancho Dominguez Mobilehome Park

Stated notices were handed out and not printed in Spanish so the residents could understand; concern for seniors; hopes the City will protect the seniors.

Emma Torres with Interpreter Diana – Space #63, Rancho Dominguez Mobilehome Park

Asked the city to do all possible to help them to stay in the estates; need more time, also would like to say if the City of Carson will open up other mobile parks with affordable rent prices.

Socorro with Interpreter Diana

From the Godinez family, they want to put us out. You promised to help and protect us, we voted for you. Where can I place \$2,000 or \$3,000 to live in Carson, that will take all my retirement money. Mr. Spencer lives in New York; he just wants the money.

Leonor Gonzalez – Space #97, Park Avalon Mobilehome Estates resident

Pass the mobile home zoning to prevent further homelessness; the city is in violation of Section 2782; asked for assistance and protect the community

Dehsong Matheu – Attorney from Legal Services

Spoke on how the park prevented owners from selling their properties; the city needs to

investigate the Brabant appraisals; come up with more fair appraisal value for their mobilehomes

Attorney Michael Novosky

Stated no comment to add since Dehsong Matheu spoke on his behalf

Tom Casparian - Applicant representing the owners of Rancho Dominguez Mobile Estates

Urged the City Council to reject the proposal to prohibit closure of Rancho Dominguez for three years from closure approval; delaying the closure is not in the residents' interest

Mayor Davis-Holmes closed the Public Hearing at 6:26 P.M.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear suggested to give the residents 2.5-year time frame to make a life adjustment.

Council Member Hilton stated he agrees with Mayor Pro Tem Dear's suggestion on the 2.5 years.

Council Member Hicks stated he agrees with his colleague on the 2.5-year time frame. He inquired if the upgrades were taken into consideration for the property appraisal

Director Naaseh stated the appraisal was done after the improvements were done to their homes and took them into consideration, therefore, there is no further adjustments to the appraised value because of those improvements.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear asked if the appraiser entered the homes to see any improvements done.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated the appraiser did not enter the homes due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Under condition No. 18 of the Proposed Conditions of Approval, it sets up a process whereby residents can apply to Director Naaseh if they have any claim that there was something that was overlooked, some upgrade or improvement that was not taken into account in the appraisal. They can submit an application documenting that to city staff and staff would determine whether that is complete and whether the necessary information has been submitted. If it has then the application would be forwarded on to the appraiser Jim Brabant to review and determine whether he needs to modify or increase the appraised onsite value of the home to take into account whatever was overlooked. Even though the City Council makes a decision tonight, that does not preclude that process from going forward and making sure there was no mistakes.

City Attorney Soltani stated all the issues have been addressed previously. She clarified that AB 2782 does not require a mandate for the city to replace any affordable housing units used with other affordable housing units. It simply requires the city to conduct a study or have findings and the city has already done a study and will be making findings in the resolutions.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear stated he would like to be sure that more than two years of benefit was given as far as being forced to move out. He does not support closure of the park and for staff to assure that no one in the park will be made homeless by the action of the City Council.

City Attorney Soltani stated if the City Council were to not vote on staff's recommendation tonight then the benefits would revert to the lesser benefits that the Planning Commission has given the

residents. That by taking no action or if City Council does not have consensus, it will not be good for the residents and they will get less benefits and less time for park closure. The park is not going to close for two or two and a half years or whatever the City Council decides. No one will be homeless during the COVID-19 pandemic. Every resident who needs to move out of the park will receive a relocation package that will be close to \$75,000 on the average per coach. If the residents are careful with how they plan that money out, they have subsidy for at least four and a half years after they move out of the park. Now, we are out six/seven years that no one should be impacted for seven years. By that time, all the new issues that the City Council has asked staff to look into and bring back to the staff – use of housing monies, looking at low market rate, ordinances, and whether those monies can be used towards compensating, it requires the residents to come back in seven to eight years to revisit the issue. The City Council is taking the proactive step of trying to create funds and create a situation and even after seven to seven and a half years if the residents come back and there's issues the City Council maybe the city can be of help; hope that clarifies that no one in the park is going to be homeless. These are the steps the City Council is taking to protect the residents.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear stated for clarification for everyone to understand what the city is proposing even though they do not want the park to close. The owners do own the property and will force the closure one way or the other with through the Planning Commission decision or through a process the City Council adds benefits to the residents. Mayor Pro Tem Dear asked the City Attorney to reiterate and outline the number of years of subsidized rent will the residents receive in a location of their choice.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated the amount of time that would be reflected in the rent subsidy would be anywhere from two to four years depending on the amount of Option B benefits that the resident would receive.

City Attorney Soltani stated depending on the fair market value of the coach.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated the Option B benefits is the appraised fair market value or the purchase price that the resident paid for their coach whichever is higher and if that number is \$40,000 or more then the resident would receive two years of rent differential subsidy, if \$30,000 to \$40,000 the resident would receive two and a half years of rent differential subsidy, \$20,000 to \$30,000 the resident would receive 3 years, \$10,000 to \$20,000 three and a half years, and if less than \$10,000 four years. Two to four years of rent subsidy plus the appraised fair market value or purchase price and that would not kick in until two to two and a half years that would elapse before park closure that is why looking at the seven to eight years out. He clarified that is not based on the actual rents that the resident would be paying in the relocation housing, it is based on the HUD fair market rents so its more of a standardized fair market rent for the Los Angeles Metropolitan area and those were the levels that Director Naaseh outlined in his presentation earlier. That would be the number that you would focus on for purposes of determining the rent subsidy amount and as mentioned previously the rent subsidy would be paid in a lump sum and two installments, 50% of it 60 days in advance of move out and the other 50% by move out. It would not be paid in a monthly basis while the residents in the future housing. It would be paid by the date of move out.

City Attorney Soltani stated the residents have to be smart because they will receive a large lump sum upfront and they should plan out how they are going to use those funds to make sure they don't go on spending on something that is meant to be for their rent subsidies going forward.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear stated that it would be money in addition to what they are paid when they sell their coach to the developer. City Attorney Soltani responded in the affirmative and stated the fair market value of the coaches given the legal non-conforming status of the park is not sufficient to mitigate the impacts of the park closure so was very necessary to come up with rent subsidies and the City Council increasing what the Planning Commission had done is good for the residents because they have a longer period rent subsidy.

Mayor Davis-Holmes stated the City of Carson takes pride in advocating and been in the forefront fighting for the mobilehome parks and with the passage of AB 2782 and SB 510. Decision has to be made and for staff and City Attorney to come up with the best plan to give residents a good package. She requested staff to come back with an ordinance that will address below market rate and also to look at housing funding to bring back at a future City Council meeting.

- Recommendation:
1. TAKE any remaining public testimony.
 2. CLOSE the public hearing.
 3. ADOPT Resolution No. 21-070, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARSON, CALIFORNIA, MODIFYING, PURSUANT TO CARSON MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 9173.4(C)(2)(b), THE DECISION OF THE CARSON PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTING PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21-2708 CONDITIONALLY APPROVING RELOCATION IMPACT REPORT NO. 04-19 FOR MITIGATION OF RELOCATION IMPACTS OF CLOSURE OF RANCHO DOMINGUEZ MOBILE ESTATES, BY IMPOSING ADDITIONAL RELOCATION IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES, ALTERING THE PROOF OF PURCHASE PRICE REQUIREMENTS, AND MAKING OTHER SPECIFIED MINOR MODIFICATIONS, AND AFFIRMING THE DECISION IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS (Exhibit No. 3 - 3A)

ACTION: It was moved to adopt Resolution No. 21-070, as read by title only, and to extend the period of move out from two years to 2.5 years on motion of Davis-Holmes, seconded by Hicks.

During discussion of the motion, Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones confirmed the amendment to Condition No. 2 of the Amended conditions of RIR No. 04-19 to set that period at 2.5 years between the date of Council action and the earliest possible closure date which was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion.

Mayor Pro Tem Dear requested a zoning ordinance for mobilehome parks.

The motion, as amended, was unanimously carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Mayor Davis-Holmes, Mayor Pro Tem Dear, Council Member Hilton, and Council Member Hicks
Noes: None
Abstain: None

Absent: None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (COUNCIL MEMBERS) – None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 P.M. by Mayor Davis-Holmes.

Lula Davis-Holmes
Mayor

ATTEST:

John W. Carroll, Sr.
Chief Deputy City Clerk