



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
of the County of Los Angeles**

2 Coral Circle • Monterey Park, CA 91755
323.890.7001 • TTY: 323.838.7449 • www.lacdc.org



Gloria Molina
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich
Commissioners

Carlos Jackson
Executive Director

November 8, 2005

Honorable Board of Commissioners
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Commissioners:

**ADOPT RESOLUTIONS RELATED TO NECESSARY STEPS TOWARD ADOPTION
OF A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR WHITESIDE COMMUNITY (1)
(3 Vote)**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Adopt and instruct the Chair to sign the attached resolution approving the Preliminary Report for the Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project and authorizing transmittal of the Preliminary Report to each affected taxing entity.
2. Adopt and instruct the Chair to sign the attached resolution receiving the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project and authorizing transmittal of the Redevelopment Plan to the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles for its report and recommendation concerning the Redevelopment Plan and its conformity to the County's General Plan.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The purpose of the recommended actions is to take the necessary steps towards the adoption of a Redevelopment Plan in a portion of the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles known as the Whiteside community. Adoption of the attached resolutions is necessary for this purpose.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING:

There is no fiscal impact associated with these actions.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

The Whiteside community, identified in the attached Redevelopment Plan and Preliminary Report, comprises approximately 171 acres in unincorporated Los Angeles and is characterized by a mix of industrial and residential land uses.

On February 15, 2005, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution designating the Whiteside community as a redevelopment survey area and stating that further study was required to determine if a redevelopment project was feasible within the survey area.

On March 2, 2005, the County Regional Planning Commission adopted a Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside community, which also designated the boundaries of the proposed Project Area.

On March 29, 2005, the Board of Commissioners accepted the Preliminary Redevelopment Plan and authorized preparation of the Preliminary Report.

In accordance with the requirements of California Health and Safety Code 33344.5, a Preliminary Report has been prepared for the Project Area. The first resolution presented to your Board would approve this Preliminary Report and authorize its transmittal to each taxing entity that may be financially impacted by the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan. The Preliminary Report states the reasons for selecting the Project Area and documents the blighting conditions within the Project Area that qualify it for selection as a redevelopment project. The Preliminary Report also contains a list of proposed programs to improve or alleviate the blighting conditions in the Project Area and a preliminary assessment of the proposed method of financing such programs. In addition, the Preliminary Report also discusses a contemplated future merger with the adjacent Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area, which is administered by the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles. The Preliminary Report is attached as Exhibit A to the first resolution.

The second resolution presented to your Board would receive a proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside community and authorize its transmittal to the Regional Planning Commission, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 33346. The proposed Redevelopment Plan contains a description of the Project Area, the redevelopment goals and objectives, a description of land uses in the Project Area, methods of financing the Redevelopment Plan, and a discussion of redevelopment techniques that are to be used to achieve the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan. The proposed Redevelopment Plan is attached as Exhibit B to the second resolution.

After being received, the proposed Redevelopment Plan, will be transmitted to the Regional Planning Commission for its report and recommendation on the

Redevelopment Plan and to determine if the Redevelopment Plan is in compliance with the County's General Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

The activities authorized by these resolutions are exempt from the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act pursuant to 24 Code of Federal Regulations Part 58, Section 58.34 (a)(3) because they involve administrative activities that will not have a physical impact on or result in any physical changes to the environment. The activities are also exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines 15060(c)(3) and 15378 because they are not defined as a project under CEQA and do not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

Prior to Board approval of the final Redevelopment Plan, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared and circulated for public review pursuant to CEQA. The Board will review the final EIR and other environmental documentation prior to the consideration of the final Redevelopment Plan.

IMPACT ON CURRENT PROJECTS:

Adoption of the attached resolutions will allow the County and the Commission to proceed toward the adoption of a redevelopment plan for the Whiteside community.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLOS JACKSON
Executive Director

Attachments: 2

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES APPROVING THE PRELIMINARY REPORT FOR THE
PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE WHITESIDE
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING TRANSMITTAL OF
THE PRELIMINARY REPORT TO EACH AFFECTED TAXING ENTITY**

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 82-0139, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles established the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission") with the rights, powers and duties related to redevelopment and formulation of redevelopment projects within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law ("CRL") (California Health and Safety Code Section 33000, *et seq.*); and

WHEREAS, the Commission desires to prepare and adopt a redevelopment plan to include a portion of area located within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, known as the Whiteside community; and

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2005, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles, by resolution, designated the boundaries of the proposed Project Area for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Project Area"), approved a Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Preliminary Plan") including a map of the proposed Project Area as an exhibit thereto, and submitted the Preliminary Plan to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, on March 29, 2005, the Commission, by resolution, accepted the Preliminary Plan and Project Area and authorized preparation of certain documents necessary for the adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Redevelopment Plan") and the transmittal of required notices to each affected taxing entity; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with CRL Sections 33344.5 and 33344.6, the Commission has prepared a Preliminary Report for the proposed Redevelopment Plan, which is attached as Exhibit A (the "Preliminary Report") and incorporated herein by this reference for transmittal to each affected taxing agency.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. The Preliminary Report for the proposed Redevelopment Plan, attached as Exhibit A is hereby approved.

Section 3. The Executive Director of the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of the Preliminary Report for the proposed Redevelopment Plan to all affected taxing entities.

The foregoing Resolution was on this ____ day of _____, 2005, adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS
ANGELES

By: _____
Chair

ATTEST:
Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer-Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors of
the County of Los Angeles

By: _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Raymond G. Fortner, Jr.
County Counsel

By:  _____
Deputy

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RECEIVING THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
PLAN FOR THE WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR SUBMISSION TO
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY
OF LOS ANGELES FOR ITS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 82-0139, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles established the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission") with the rights, powers and duties related to redevelopment and formulation of redevelopment projects within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law ("CRL") (California Health and Safety Code Section 33000, *et seq.*); and

WHEREAS, the Commission desires to prepare and adopt a redevelopment plan to include a portion of area located within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, known as the Whiteside community; and

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2005, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Planning Commission"), by resolution, designated the boundaries of the proposed Project Area for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Project Area"), approved a Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Preliminary Plan") including a map of the proposed Project Area as an exhibit thereto, and has submitted the Preliminary Plan to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, on March 29, 2005, the Commission, by resolution, accepted the Preliminary Plan and Project Area and authorized preparation of certain documents necessary for the adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Redevelopment Plan") and the transmittal of required notices to each affected taxing entity; and

WHEREAS, CRL Section 33346 provides that, prior to a joint public hearing on the proposed Redevelopment Plan, the Commission shall submit the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Planning Commission for its report and recommendation concerning the Redevelopment Plan and its conformity to the County's General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has prepared and completed in draft form the proposed Redevelopment Plan, which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this reference.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. The Executive Director of the Community Development Commission is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles for its report and recommendation concerning the Redevelopment Plan and its conformity to the County's General Plan.

The foregoing Resolution was on this ____ day of _____, 2005, adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles.


BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS
ANGELES

By: _____
Chair

ATTEST:
Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer-Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors of
the County of Los Angeles

By: _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Raymond G. Fortner, Jr.
County Counsel

By: 
Deputy

**PRELIMINARY REPORT
for the
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
for the
WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Prepared for:

**THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
of the
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

Prepared by:

Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.

OCTOBER 2005

V. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED METHOD OF FINANCING THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY, AND REASONS FOR INCLUDING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING.....	83
A. ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COSTS.....	83
B. FINANCING METHODS AVAILABLE TO THE COMMISSION	88
C. PROPOSED FINANCING METHOD, ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY, AND REASONS FOR INCLUDING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING.....	90
D. BONDED INDEBTEDNESS LIMIT	91

Appendix A - Field Survey Instructions, Survey Sheet and Methodology

Appendix B - Photographic Examples of Blighting Conditions Within The Project Area

Appendix C - Real Estate Broker Interviews

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY MAP.....	3
FIGURE 2: EXISTING LAND USE MAP	9
FIGURE 3: URBANIZATION MAP.....	14
FIGURE 4: BUILDING RATING.....	21
FIGURE 5: DEFECTIVE DESIGN	24
FIGURE 6: BUILDING AGE	27
FIGURE 7: BUILDINGS OF INADEQUATE SIZE - INDUSTRIAL	32
FIGURE 8: LOCATION OF SITE CONDITION DEFICIENCIES	40
FIGURE 9: INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES	42
FIGURE 10: INADEQUATELY SIZED PARCELS - INDUSTRIAL	46
FIGURE 11: DEPRECIATED OR STAGNANT PROPERTY VALUES	49
FIGURE 12: SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COMPARISON AREAS – 1.7-MILE RADIUS AND FIVE SURROUNDING ZIP CODES	54
FIGURE 13: LOCATION OF COMMERCIAL FACILITIES	64
FIGURE 14: BOUNDARIES OF THE EAST LOS ANGELES CRIME REPORTING DISTRICT.....	66
FIGURE 15: LOCATION OF CURB, GUTTER AND SIDEWALK DEFICIENCIES IDENTIFIED BY PUBLIC WORKS, 2005.....	70
FIGURE 16: LOCATIONS OF INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES, FIELD SURVEY, 2004	71
FIGURE 17: COMPOSITE OF INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES, FIELD SURVEY, 2004 AND PUBLIC WORKS, 2005.....	72
FIGURE 18: COMPOSITE MAP OF SIGNIFICANT BLIGHTING CONDITIONS	76

**PRELIMINARY REPORT
FOR THE
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR THE
WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

I. INTRODUCTION


A. PURPOSE

This Preliminary Report ("Report") for the proposed adoption of the Redevelopment Plan ("Plan") for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Project Area" or "Project") has been prepared for the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission" or "CDC" or "LACDC") to fulfill the requirements of Section 33344.5 of the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Section 33000 *et seq.*; the "CRL"). The Project Area consists of approximately 171 acres and is located within a portion of the City Terrace area referred to as "Whiteside", which is located within the County of Los Angeles ("County") unincorporated territory along the Interstate 10 Freeway west of the Interstate 710 Freeway (see Figure 1). The Project Area is generally bounded by the City of Los Angeles communities of Boyle Heights on the west and Lincoln Heights on the north, and unincorporated County territory to the south, and the City of Monterey Park on the east. The Project Area primarily consists of industrial land uses with smaller areas consisting of commercial, residential and public land uses. Major streets that traverse the Project Area include Herbert Avenue, Medford Street, Fowler Street, and Whiteside Street.

As part of the process of adopting the proposed Plan, the CRL requires specific information be provided to taxing agencies and officials ("affected taxing entities") that share a portion of the general property tax within the Project Area before the adoption of the proposed Plan. Such information includes this Preliminary Report prepared pursuant to CRL Section 33344.5. The taxing entities' receipt of this Report initiates the consultation process leading up to the adoption of the proposed Plan.

The Preliminary Report provides documentation on the nature and extent of the existing conditions (blighting conditions) within the Project Area and how these conditions will be corrected through the use of redevelopment. The Preliminary Report also describes how the redevelopment of the Project Area will be financed so that economic feasibility can be demonstrated. As shown below, the Report is divided into five (5) sections that generally correspond to the subdivisions contained in CRL Section 33344.5, which specify the required contents of the Preliminary Report as described on the following page.

FIGURE 1
PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY MAP



In 2004, the Commission contracted with Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) to prepare a redevelopment feasibility analysis to determine whether the Project Area would qualify as blighted for inclusion within a redevelopment project area in accordance with the CRL. The redevelopment feasibility analysis study area included the Project Area along with the residential area southwest of the Project Area along Ellison, Attridge and Whiteside Streets. Subsequent to the preparation of the redevelopment feasibility analysis, the Commission decided to exclude that portion of the residential area from the Project Area because including the residential area would not achieve the Commission's primary goal for the Project Area, which is to develop a viable biomedical technology area. Thus, in March of 2005, the Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles, by resolution, selected the boundaries of the Project Area to be further studied as a redevelopment project area. The remaining residential uses are those that are integral to the larger Project Area and will likely be impacted and benefited by the proposed redevelopment activities. The existing conditions within the proposed Project Area, including the physical and economic blighting conditions, are described in Section III of this Report.

The purposes and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan are to eliminate the conditions of blight, as defined by Community Redevelopment Law, existing in the Project Area and to prevent the recurrence of deteriorating conditions in the Project Area. The Commission proposes to eliminate such conditions and prevent their recurrence by providing, pursuant to this Plan, for the planning, development, re-planning, redesign, redevelopment, reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Project Area and by providing for such facilities as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare, in accordance with the General Plan and other planning documents promulgated pursuant thereto as may be adopted or amended from time to time. The Commission proposes to:

1. Encourage the redevelopment of the Project Area subject to and consistent with the County's General Plan and/or specific development plans as may be adopted from time to time through the cooperation of private enterprise and public agencies.
2. Enhance the long-term economic well-being of the Project Area.
3. Provide public infrastructure improvements and community facilities, such as the installation, construction, and/or reconstruction of streets, utilities, public buildings and facilities (such as facilities for pedestrian circulation and parking facilities), storm drains, utility undergrounding, street lighting, landscaping and other improvements which are necessary for the effective redevelopment of the Project Area.
4. Provide for participation in the redevelopment of property in the Project Area, where feasible, by owners who agree to so participate in conformity with this Redevelopment Plan.
5. Encourage joint efforts and cooperative efforts among property owners, businesses and public agencies to achieve desirable economic development goals and programs and to reduce or eliminate deteriorating conditions.

III. PHYSICAL AND ECONOMIC BLIGHTING CONDITIONS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

A. EXISTING LAND USES


The Project Area primarily consists of industrial uses with pockets of residential, commercial, public uses, and vacant land interspersed among the industrial uses. Table 1 shows the overall breakdown of the existing land uses within the Project Area by acreage, number of parcels, and the number of buildings. Industrial land uses represent the largest portion of the Project Area acreage at 77 percent, with 49 percent of the parcels and 51 percent of the buildings. As shown in Table 1, residential land uses, including both single- and multi-family, represent the second largest land use category within the Project Area accounting for approximately nine percent of the acreage, 29 percent of the parcels and 36 percent of the buildings. Approximately 62 percent of the residential units are multi-family dwellings. Commercial retail and office uses represent a small portion of the Project Area consisting of approximately eight percent of the total acreage, nine percent of the parcels, and 10 percent of the buildings. Public land uses represent three percent of the acreage and two percent of the parcels and two percent of the total buildings within the Project Area. The public uses consist of three State-owned parcels, a Southern California Edison substation, a California Water Service building, and two churches. The remainder of the Project Area consists of vacant land (4.9 acres) and public rights-of-way (35.9 acres) (see Table 1, Figure 2).

B. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING CONDITIONS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

Most of the industrial uses consist of manufacturing and heavy industrial uses with pockets of light industrial. The industrial buildings within the Project Area are primarily classified by real estate brokers as Class C buildings, with some Class B buildings mixed in. Class C buildings consist of older buildings that do not contain many of the contemporary amenities associated with newer industrial buildings. For instance, Class C buildings typically do not have HVAC systems, fire sprinkler systems, adequate ceiling heights, or dock high truck loading bays. Even Class B industrial buildings that are newer than Class C buildings often do not have all of the contemporary amenities that new Class A buildings might have such as ceiling clear heights of 24-30 feet or have 1.5 truck docking bays per 10,000 square feet of building space. Approximately 54 percent of the industrial buildings within the Project Area are older than 50 years, with 50 years considered the limit on life expectancy for heavy industrial and manufacturing buildings.¹ In fact, based upon the field survey conducted for the blight analysis, 34 percent of the industrial buildings in the Project Area are either deteriorated or dilapidated, which is primarily a combination of age, a lack of maintenance and substandard improvements. In addition, 37 percent of the industrial buildings contain characteristics of defective design or physical construction such as faulty additions or the use of poor building materials. These conditions contribute to the general perception that the industrial buildings are obsolete. As an

¹ Marshall and Swift, Marshall Valuation Service, February 2004, Section 97, pg. 7.

**FIGURE 2
EXISTING LAND USES MAP**



Most of the industrial uses within the Industrial Submarket have better access to the ports of Long Beach and San Pedro, and to Orange and San Diego Counties. The type of industrial uses in the Project Area is mixed, but tends to consist of heavy industrial uses, primarily because the County is more lax in their zoning standards than the City of Los Angeles and other nearby communities. However, even with the lax County zoning standards, the Project Area according to real estate brokers, is not even close to being comparable to other regional industrial market areas. According to one real estate broker, basically, it is a step down from Vernon and Commerce and there is no comparable market.

Although industrial properties are the predominant land use in the Project Area, there are pockets of residential properties on the fringe of the Project Area. The primary residential areas are located in the south central portion of the Project Area along Herbert Avenue between Medford Street and Whiteside Street and in the northeast corner of the Project Area between Worth Street and Tim Avenue. These areas consist of 141 units with 38 percent single-family units and 62 percent multi-family units. Approximately 22 percent of the residential structures are deteriorated or dilapidated, which is significantly less than the industrial buildings, this is still a significant level of deterioration. Like the industrial uses, many of the single-family homes and multi-family units are older and are in need of substantial investment. Approximately 85 percent of the residential structures are older than 50 years with 40 percent at least 75 years old. The average size of a single-family unit in the Project Area is 1,412 square feet and 34 percent are less than 1,000 square feet. This is small by today's standards as the average single-family unit constructed nationwide is 2,225 square feet. At the same time, the average household size or number of persons living in a unit is above the average. Approximately 49 percent of the Project Area's residential units are overcrowded, of which, 31 percent of the units are seriously overcrowded. In terms of crime, real estate brokers have indicated that crime is a major problem. Crime has increased by 13 percent from 2000 to 2004, while crime overall in the County has decreased by 12 percent. Furthermore, violent crimes within the Project Area have decreased at a significantly slower rate than the County. As a result of the physical and economic blighting conditions that exist in the Project Area, the residential (and industrial) areas are considered less desirable than other surrounding areas. The above factors affect housing values. Although single-family home sales price per square foot are similar in the immediate adjacent area, the sales price per square foot in the Project Area is 10 percent lower than the six zip codes that surround the Project Area, which includes portions of Alhambra and Monterey Park.

Finally, scattered throughout the Project Area are commercial uses, which primarily consist of older commercial retail stores serving the adjacent residential community. Approximately 43 percent of the commercial buildings in the Project Area are over 50 years old. Due to the lack of upkeep and maintenance, 35 percent of the buildings are either deteriorated or dilapidated. Furthermore, 89 percent of the commercial buildings within the Project Area are small in size and do not meet contemporary standards for the minimum size for a grocery store (30,000 square feet), which residents in the area desire. In addition, many of the retail buildings lack necessary parking to accommodate customers. Of the 24 commercial parcels within the Project Area, 13 parcels or 54 percent have been identified as providing inadequate parking. A combination of these physical blighting conditions have impacted the value of commercial

The urbanization analysis is summarized in Table 2 below and is organized pursuant to CRL Section 33320.1(c).

Table 2: Urbanization Analysis

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>%</u>
Total Number of Acres in the Project Area	170.70	100.0%
Total Number of Acres Characterized by the Existence of Subdivided Lots of Irregular Form and Shape and Inadequate Size for Proper Usefulness and Development that are in Multiple Ownership	64.8	38%
Total Number of Acres in Agricultural Use	0	0%
Total Number of Acres that is an Integral Part of an Area Developed for Urban Uses	170.70	100.0%
Vacant Land	4.9	3%
Percent of Property that is Predominately Urbanized	170.70	100.0%

In evaluating the urbanized area status of the Project Area, KMA reviewed aerial photos, MetroScan data, and information collected during the field survey for the Project Area. The legal description prepared for the Project Area identifies a total acreage of 170.70. Within the Project Area there are a few vacant parcels. Even the few vacant parcels would qualify as urbanized because they are integral to the Project Area and are completely surrounded by developed urban uses (see Figure 3). Furthermore, utilities, streets, sidewalks and other infrastructure associated with urbanized areas serve all portions of the Project Area. Finally, there are a total of 150 parcels with a combined acreage of 64.8 that are characterized as subdivided lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development that are in multiple ownership. It is presumed that any parcel that is too small for contemporary development (and is in multiple ownership) is also of irregular shape. In other words, it is not possible to have a standard shaped parcel that is too small for contemporary development. Either the parcel length or width or both must be too short for proper usefulness and development. The location of lots characterized as subdivided lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size are shown in Figure 3.

Based upon the breakdown of the urbanization of the Project Area by acreage as outlined in Table 2 and shown in Figure 3 (Urbanization Map), the data confirms that the Project Area is predominantly urbanized.

D. BLIGHT FINDINGS

1. Community Redevelopment Law Requirements

Section 33030(b)(1) of the Community Redevelopment Law (CRL) states that a blighted area is one that is both predominately urbanized and is an area in which the combination of blighting conditions is so prevalent and so substantial that it causes a reduction of, or lack of, proper utilization of the area to such an extent that it constitutes a serious physical and economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise or governmental action, or both, without redevelopment. The following are the blighting conditions defined in Section 33031 of the CRL:

Physical Blighting Characteristics - CRL Section 33031(a)

1. Buildings in which it is unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work. These conditions can be caused by serious building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction, faulty or inadequate utilities, or similar factors.
2. Factors that prevent or substantially hinder the economically viable use or capacity of buildings or lots. This condition can be caused by substandard design, inadequate building size given present standards and market conditions, lack of parking, or other similar factors.
3. Adjacent or nearby uses that are incompatible with each other and which prevent the economic development of those parcels or other portions of the project area.
4. The existence of subdivided lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development that are in multiple ownership.

Economic Blighting Characteristics – CRL Section 33031(b)

1. Depreciated or stagnant property values or impaired investments, including but not necessarily limited to, those properties containing hazardous wastes that require the use of Commission authority.
2. Abnormally high business vacancies, abnormally low lease rates, high turnover rates, abandoned buildings, or excessive vacant lots within an area developed for urban use and served by utilities.
3. A lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods, including grocery stores, drug stores, and banks and other lending institutions.

then compared industrial sales comparisons for the past 10 years (1994-2004) as provided by CoStar Comps for properties within the Industrial Submarket to industrial sales information for the Project Area for the same 10-year time period as obtained from MetroScan to determine if the Project Area had lower industrial sales prices. In order to take into consideration building and parcel size, this information was aggregated and compared on a sales price per square foot of land and building space basis. Similarly, single-family sales transactions within the Project Area (since 1994) were compared with the surrounding residential areas (1.7 mile radius and the six zip code area surrounding the Project Area) to determine if sales transactions were lower in the Project Area than the surrounding areas. Single-family sales transactions were provided by MetroScan and were compared on a sales price per square foot basis.

To assess the availability of neighborhood facilities in and near the Project Area, KMA used the Yahoo Yellow Pages to identify all necessary commercial facilities, including grocery stores that were in the Project Area or service radius of these uses encompassing the Project Area. This analysis also examines overcrowding conditions in the residential portion of the Project Area. This was accomplished by using 2000 US Census information; a comparison of overcrowded conditions within the Project Area was made with the City of Los Angeles and the County. Finally, to determine the impacts of crime, crime statistics from the last five years (2000-2004) as obtained from the County Sheriff's Department, was compared the number of criminal incidences, including violent and non-violent crimes, that occurred within the Project Area with the number of criminal incidences within the larger crime reporting districts that encompasses the Project Area.

Below is a description of physical and economic blighting conditions affecting the proposed Project Area.

E. PHYSICAL BLIGHTING CONDITIONS IN THE PROJECT AREA

Based on the findings of the field survey, review of assessor data, sales transaction data and discussions with real estate brokers the primary physical blight conditions impacting the Project Area are structural deterioration and frequently related defective design, including misapplied or substandard building materials, faulty additions and substandard design, particularly as it relates to industrial buildings and residential structures. Substandard design or obsolescence was evidenced by inadequate building size given present standards and market conditions, and lack of parking (both of which are "factors that prevent or substantially hinder the economically viable use or capacity of buildings or lots"). Other physical blighting conditions within the Project Area include incompatible land uses and subdivided parcels of inadequate size for proper usefulness and development that are in multiple-ownership. Site deficiencies were also noted as a contributing factor to the deteriorated physical appearance of the Project Area.

1. Buildings in Which it is Unsafe or Unhealthy for Persons to Live or Work

By definition, as set forth by the Redevelopment Law, buildings which are considered unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in, include those which exhibit deterioration and

As shown in Table 3, approximately 29 percent of all structures in the Project Area were rated as either deteriorated or dilapidated. Photographic Plates 1 through 4 in Appendix B show examples of this condition. Although 29 percent may not seem significant, 86 structures are included in this percentage. Of these 86 deteriorated or dilapidated structures, 51 are industrial structures or 34 percent of the total number of industrial buildings; 23 are residential structures or 22 percent of the total number of residential buildings; 11 are retail and office structures or 36 percent of the total commercial buildings and one (1) is a public building. As shown in Figure 4, deteriorated or dilapidated structures are located throughout the Project Area with no specific area predominating. The overall rehabilitation of the 86 structures alone would result in a significant cost. A major rehabilitation typically represents 25 percent of the property value.⁶ Therefore, based on the total assessed valuation of \$21,212,096 for these 86 structures, a substantial rehabilitation would result in an estimated cost of \$5,303,024.


Deterioration resulting from a lack of reinvestment is reflected in lower sales prices for residential, commercial and industrial properties, low assessed values for commercial uses, and also lower lease rates for industrial properties. This is evidenced by the fact that the Project Area has a 19 percent lower average sales price per square foot of industrial building space than the Industrial Submarket and the average lease rate in the Project Area is 29 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket. Furthermore, single-family homes within the Project Area have a 10 percent lower median sales price when compared to homes within the six surrounding zip codes of the Project Area. Approximately 79 percent of the commercial uses have decreased in assessed value or remained stagnant since 1997-98. In addition, commercial sales transaction prices in the Project Area are 29 percent lower than other commercial properties within the same zip code. The effect of deterioration and obsolescence and other blighting factors on property values and the resulting effect on the feasibility of improving properties in the Project Area is illustrated by the industrial rehabilitation pro-forma included in the Blight Analysis. As discussed later, the cost to rehabilitate a typical industrial building is not feasible, as the existing and future lease rate will not support the cost of such improvements.

b. Defective Design/Physical Construction

Defective design or physical construction of buildings generally refers to a variety of conditions related to buildings or their additions, which do not meet acceptable and common standards/practices for building design and construction. These conditions typically include faulty additions/alterations, use of inappropriate building materials, missing or inadequate building components, or other similar characteristics. These conditions contribute to deteriorated and unsafe building conditions.

⁶CRL Section 33413(b)(2)(iv) states that "substantially rehabilitated dwelling units" shall mean rehabilitation, the value of which constitutes 25 percent of the after rehabilitation value of the dwelling, inclusive of the land value.

FIGURE 4
BUILDING RATING



**TABLE 4
DEFECTIVE DESIGN/PHYSICAL CONSTRUCTION
LACDC - WHITESIDE**

Land Use	Total No. of Buildings in Project Area		Total No. of Buildings with at least one Element of Defective Design/Phys. Const		Faulty Addition/Alteration		Illegal Use ¹		Substandard Materials and/or Construction ²		Missing/Inadeq. Bldg. Components		Garage Conversion	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Residential - Single Family	59		14	23.7%	12	20.3%	3	5.1%	4	6.8%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%
Residential - Multi Family	47		17	36.2%	7	14.9%	1	2.1%	6	12.8%	5	10.6%	3	6.4%
Commercial - Retail	28		11	39.3%	6	21.4%	4	14.3%	10	35.7%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%
Commercial - Office	3		1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Industrial	149		55	36.9%	16	10.7%	1	0.7%	48	32.2%	7	4.7%	0	0.0%
Public	6		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Buildings	292		98	33.6%	42	14.4%	9	3.1%	69	23.6%	15	5.1%	4	1.4%

Source: Consilium Associates Field Survey, March 2004

¹ Use of a building that does not comply with code requirements. These include garages, commercial buildings or recreational vehicles being used for residential units.

² Building materials have been improperly used such as plywood as an exterior finish, steel corrugated walls, or metal siding.

Similar to structural deterioration described above, defective design and physical construction exhibit a lack of reinvestment and impacts the overall quality of the structure, which is reflected in lower sales prices for residential and industrial properties, lower lease rates for industrial properties, and also decreasing or stagnant assessed values for commercial properties. This is evidenced by the fact that the Project Area has a 19 percent lower average sales price per square foot of industrial building space than the Industrial Submarket and the average lease rate in the Project Area is 29 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket. Furthermore, single-family homes within the Project Area have a 10 percent lower median sales price when compared to homes within the six surrounding zip codes of the Project Area. Finally, approximately 79 percent of the commercial uses have decreased in assessed value or remained stagnant since 1997-98 and commercial sales transaction prices are 29 percent lower than other commercial properties within the same zip code.

2. Factors That Prevent or Substantially Hinder the Economically Viable Use or Capacity of Buildings or Lots


This condition can be caused by substandard design, inadequate building size given present standards and market conditions, lack of parking, or other similar factors. For the purpose of this Analysis, "other similar factors" includes poor site conditions and site deficiencies.

a. Substandard Design

Building Age

The term "substandard design" refers to building or property conditions that do not provide for the needs of contemporary uses. These conditions prevent or substantially hinder the economically viable use of parcels, and contribute to obsolescence in facilities. In turn, these conditions discourage investment by property owners to modernize and improve their property. Age is frequently a factor that contributes to substandard design. Without expansion or modernization, older properties often become obsolete. When there is a concentration of older buildings that have not been maintained or modernized, like the Project Area, this can indicate a lack of reinvestment within the Project Area. For example, an area in demand will often have a large proportion of newer or rehabilitated buildings as reinvestment and intensification take place. Table 5 presents data on the age of buildings in the Project Area by land use for which construction date information was available from MetroScan. The Project Area building stock contains a significant portion of buildings (55 percent) that are 50 years and older. In the Project Area, there have only been 25 buildings built in the last 30 years, which accounts for only nine percent of the building stock (Table 5). Figure 6 indicates the location of buildings by age. The fact that 55 percent of the structures were built prior to 1950 correlates with the findings of the field survey, which indicated that 57 percent of the buildings are in need of maintenance, are deteriorated or dilapidated.

FIGURE 6
BUILDING AGE



smaller in size and are in a more advanced state of disrepair/deterioration than commercial structures built in the last 30 years. Of the nine commercial buildings that were built prior to 1950, four buildings are in need of maintenance (44 percent), six buildings have inadequate parking (67 percent), and two buildings (22 percent) are very small (less than 2,000 square feet) which limits economic viability as is evidenced by low commercial property transaction sales.

b. Buildings of Inadequate Size

Older buildings are traditionally not built to the same standards as modern-day buildings. Buildings of inadequate size are one of the most notable characteristics of substandard design within the Project Area. For the most part, building size requirements for industrial and residential uses have been increasing. The industrial building sizes in the Project Area were compared to published standards, and both industrial and residential structures were compared to the average size of recently sold properties in the County, regional submarket, or surrounding area. Public and semi-public were not evaluated because of their unique use and lack of standard building type.

Industrial

Although the market for industrial space in the Project Area tends to be for the smaller structures, this is primarily a function of cheap rents. If the Project Area had a concentration of newer and larger buildings there would likely be the ability to attract a wider range of uses, such as the industrial reuse of abandoned oil fields in Santa Fe Springs. The following analysis compares contemporary development standards for industrial uses as defined by the ULI to the existing building stock. As shown in Table 6, 139 of the 149 industrial buildings in the Project Area are included in the analysis. The remaining 10 buildings cannot be evaluated because parcel information provided by MetroScan does not contain building square footage for these buildings. However, the remaining 139 buildings are considered a significant sum (93 percent).

The needs for industrial uses vary greatly. For example, small single-tenant industrial buildings generally house small mom and pop distribution businesses with assembly and manufacturing. These uses will occupy marginal obsolete space, primarily because of low lease rates and are generally 25,000 square feet in size.⁸ These uses likely represent the majority of uses in the Project Area. Marketable industrial facilities, which can house contemporary uses such as light industrial, can vary in sizes ranging from 30,000 to 100,000 square feet. Warehouses have continued to require increasingly larger building floor plates. In the 1980s, 200,000 square feet was considered large, and today a building is considered large if it measures more that 1 million square feet.⁹

⁸ Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook, Second Edition, Urban Land Institute, pg. 136.

⁹ Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook Second Edition, Urban Land Institute, pg. 131.

However, for the purposes of this Report a more conservative estimate of 150,000 square feet is used because according to an industry source a typical warehouse facility is 500 feet long and 300 feet wide or 150,000 square feet.¹⁰

Based on the field survey, single-tenant manufacturing industrial buildings, light industrial buildings and warehouse and distribution facilities are located throughout the Project Area with no specific type of industrial use predominating. The following analysis compares the existing industrial building stock by use type in the Project Area to industry standards. Of the 139 industrial buildings within the Project Area that square footage information is available, 37 buildings or 27 percent of the total industrial buildings are small manufacturing tenants. Of these 37 manufacturing buildings, 34 buildings (92 percent) are less than the minimum standard of 25,000 square feet for this type of use and range from 2,496 to 112,571 square feet. As shown in Table 6, there are 74 light industrial facilities within the Project Area, of which 68, or 92 percent, are less than the minimum standard of 30,000 square feet for a contemporary light industrial facility. Furthermore, there are 28 warehouse facilities in the Project Area, of which all (100 percent) are less than 150,000 square feet, and therefore do not meet the minimum standard for a warehouse/distribution facility. Figure 7 shows the location of the inadequate sized industrial buildings. Finally, the average size of industrial buildings within the Project Area is 14,748 square feet. The average size of industrial buildings sold in the past 10 years (1994-2003) in the Industrial Submarket is 24,358 square feet, which is 65 percent larger than the Project Area.

Within the Project Area, the asking lease rates are significantly lower than the lease rates for the Industrial Submarket. Based on sales comps, the industrial building size in the Project Area on the average is comparable to the Industrial Submarket. In a competitive real estate market, if the physical improvements are comparable, then other considerations such as location will play a deciding factor. As previously stated, the asking lease rates for available industrial space in the Project Area on the average are 29 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket.


Residential

Aside from industrial buildings, KMA also analyzed single-family and multi-family homes that are of inadequate size. The average size of a single-family home in the Project Area is 1,412 square feet. The average single-family home sold within 1.7 miles¹¹ of the Project Area between 1994-2005 totaled 1,185 square feet. Also, the average size of a single-family home sold within the six zip codes that surround and include the Project Area between 1999-2005 totaled 1,279 square feet. Based upon the averages for single-family residential units described above, 34 of the 59 single-family units (58 percent) are less than 1,185 square feet and do not meet the size of the average house

¹⁰ Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook Second Edition, Urban Land Institute, pg. 134.

¹¹ The 1.7-mile radius was selected because DataQuick, Inc., a company that tracks residential real estate transactions, provides residential sales up to 1.7-miles from a given point (i.e., street address).

FIGURE 7
BUILDINGS OF INADEQUATE SIZE - INDUSTRIAL



sold within 1.7 miles of the Project Area between 1994-2005. Furthermore, 39 out of 59 single-family units (66 percent) are less than 1,279 square feet and do not meet the size of the average single-family house sold in the six surrounding zip codes between 1999-2005.¹²

A single-family home that is less than 1,000 square feet in size is considered to be extremely small by any standard. In total, 20 of 59 (34 percent) single-family homes in the Project Area are less than 1,000 square feet. This is particularly problematic in area of high residential overcrowding such as the Project Area and adjacent areas. Based on 2000 census data, 49 percent of the residents are living in overcrowded and severely overcrowded conditions. Furthermore, inadequate sized single-family residential units in Project Area affects the housing sale prices compared to the surrounding areas. The average value per square foot of single-family home sales in the Project Area is \$162.66 compared to \$180.25 for the adjoining residential area consisting of the six surrounding zip codes. Therefore, the Project Area has an average value per square foot of single-family home sales that is 10 percent lower than the six surrounding zip codes.

For purpose of this analysis, multi-family homes include duplexes and buildings with between three and six units. There are no multi-family structures in the Project Area with more than six units. Between 1994-2005, 30 multi-family structures (64 percent) were built and sold in the Project Area with an average unit size of 1,190 square feet. Based upon this average, 36 of the 47 multi-family residential buildings (77 percent) are less than the contemporary size of a multi-family residential unit. Furthermore, the average unit size of a multi-family building built since 1994 in the Project Area is 822 square feet. Based on the criteria, 26 of the 47 multi-family residential buildings (55 percent) have units that are below contemporary standards and are inadequately sized. Similar to single-family residential units, the small multi-family units have contributed to the overall overcrowding problem that currently exists in the Project Area.

Commercial

As previously stated, there are a total of 31 commercial buildings within the Project Area, of which, 28 buildings are retail uses and three buildings are used as offices. For purposes of this Report, the three office buildings will not be included within this analysis because there is no set standard for the minimum size for office uses and furthermore the nearest office market that could be used for comparison purposes in relation to size would include office buildings located in Downtown Los Angeles, which would skew the overall analysis due to the higher intensification and different make-up of the area.

KMA evaluated the percentage of buildings in the Project Area that would qualify as large enough to accommodate contemporary single-use tenant in a freestanding building (i.e., fast food, video store, or a drugstore). KMA also evaluated the Project Area commercial building stock to a neighborhood shopping center standard provided by

¹² Information provided by California Market Data Cooperative.

ICSC. These use types were selected because they represent the type of uses usually found in a highly urbanized area consisting of multiple land uses. According to the ICSC a neighborhood shopping center is a "convenience center" that serves the adjacent neighborhoods and attracts customers who live within three miles.

The industry standard for the smallest single-use freestanding building is 2,000 square feet. This is the size for a fast food restaurant such as a McDonald's. Within the Project Area, eight of 28 commercial retail buildings (29 percent) are less than 2,000 square feet, and therefore do not meet the commercial standard for even the smallest single-use tenant. As another example, a video store (Hollywood Video) requires a building size of 7,500 square feet. Based upon the commercial retail buildings within the Project Area, 21 buildings or 75 percent are less than 7,500 square feet and do not meet the standards for a single-use tenant such as a video store. According to the ICSC, a Walgreens' type drugstore requires buildings of at least 15,000 square feet. This type of drugstore would provide over-the-counter and prescription drug services along with everyday health and beauty aids. In total, 25 of the 28 commercial retail buildings (89 percent) in the Project Area are not adequate in size for a drugstore. According to the ICSC, a neighborhood shopping center that contains a supermarket (Von's supermarket) requires a minimum building size of at least 30,000 square feet. However, the typical square footage for this type of center varies and could range as high as 46,000 (Safeway) and 51,000 (Ralph's) square feet.¹³ These centers typically provide convenience goods (food, drugs, etc.) and/or services (photo lab, cleaners, copying, etc.). For the purpose of this analysis, the more conservative standard of 30,000 square feet for a neighborhood shopping center is used for comparison with existing commercial retail buildings within the Project Area. In total, 25 of the existing commercial retail structures (89 percent) are not adequate in size for a neighborhood shopping center.

In addition to the limitations to house larger retail uses, the small older commercial buildings combined with the presence of incompatible land uses and crime in the area results in lower sales prices and assessed values. As discussed later, commercial retail sales transactions within the Project Area are 29 percent lower than other commercial properties located in the same zip code, and 79 percent of the 28 commercial retail properties have an assessed valuation that has decreased or remain stagnant since 1997-98. The decreasing or stagnant property values reflect a lack of investment in the Project Area to upgrade the existing blighted properties.

c. Parking Deficiencies

A field survey was conducted to identify parking deficiencies within the Project Area. As shown in Table 7, based upon the field survey 108 of the 259 total parcels (42 percent) within the Project Area had at least one parking deficiency that included either no on-site

¹³ Trade Dimensions Retail Tenant Directory, California Centers Magazine.

parking, insufficient number of spaces, poor parking accessibility, or inadequate layout or design. Most of the parcels that contained a parking deficiency (70 of 259 total parcels or 27 percent) did not have a sufficient number of parking spaces. As an example, employees along Medford Street are forced to park on the street because there are not a sufficient number of off-street parking spaces (see Photographic Plate 11 of Appendix B). Furthermore, residential parking is impacted by the overcrowding situation. In many cases of inadequate residential parking, the results were residents parking on the front yard or sidewalk since there was insufficient or no off-street parking and parking space is limited on the street (see Photographic Plate 12).

Although there are industrial, commercial and residential parking deficiencies, parking deficiencies most directly affect the viability of the businesses. A field survey for this type of blighting condition has its limitations. For instance, the time of day when the survey was conducted may be during non-peak hours, which would not give a true indication of existing parking deficiencies. Thus, the field survey would under estimate the actual number of parking deficiencies. Therefore, KMA also examined industrial parking deficiencies based upon the building-to-lot coverage ratio to evaluate parking adequacy. The following describes the methodology and findings of the site coverage analysis. Manufacturing, light industrial and warehousing manufacturing facilities are frequently combined when discussing design standards, including parking requirements. These uses employ the fewest people and therefore require the smallest amount of parking. One to two spaces per 1,000 square feet is considered the rule of thumb for warehousing.¹⁴ Nationally, the average industrial building covers 33.17 percent of the site.¹⁵ KMA compared the percentage ratio of building area to site area as provided by the Assessor to the 33 percent site coverage standard. The table on the following page outlines the findings of this analysis.

As shown in Table 8, of the 139 of 149 (93 percent) industrial parcels within the Project Area that contained building square footage information as identified by MetroScan, 86 parcels (62 percent) have a higher percent of building-to-lot coverage than the standard described above (greater than 33 percent lot coverage). A significant amount of the parcels (61 parcels or 43 percent) range between 40 and 70 percent building coverage, which are significantly higher than the standard. As a further comparison, six industrial sites have been developed in the Project Area since 1990, in which the average site

¹⁴ Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook, Second Edition, Urban Land Institute.

¹⁵ Warehouse/Distribution Property Characteristics in the United Kingdom and the United States, A Comparison, Bob Thompson, Roy T. Black and John T. Warden; published in Warehouse/Flex Industrial Facilities, Selected References, Information Packet No. 379, Urban Land Institute.

**TABLE 7
PARKING DEFICIENCIES
LACDC - WHITESIDE**

Land Use	No. of Parcels in Project Area		Total No. of Parcels with at least one Parking Deficiency ¹		No On-Site Parking		Insufficient No. of Spaces		Poor Parking Accessibility		Inadequate Layout/Design	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Residential - Single Family ¹	53	28.3%	15	6%	10	19%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Residential - Multi Family	31	61.3%	4	13%	15	48%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%
Commercial - Retail	24	54.2%	4	17%	9	38%	1	4%	5	21%	5	21%
Commercial - Office	3	33.3%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Industrial	142	41.5%	23	16%	35	25%	11	8%	10	7%	10	7%
Public	6	16.7%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Parcels	259	41.7%	35	14%	70	27%	15	6%	16	6%	16	6%

Source: Consilium Associates Field Survey, March 2004

¹ Inadequate parking refers to limited parking due to outdoor storage, steep slopes or missing driveway (street parking only).

TABLE 8
SITE TO BUILDING COVERAGE RATIO - INDUSTRIAL
LACDC - WHITESIDE

% of Building to Site Improvement	Number of Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Parcels as compared to Standard
1.0 - 9.9%	9	6%	38.1% of parcels provide adequate site area for parking and storage ¹
10 - 19.9%	17	12%	
20 - 29.9%	19	14%	
30 - 33.9%	8	6%	
34 - 39.9%	12	9%	33% or less is desired
40 - 49.9%	16	12%	
50 - 59.9%	27	19%	
60 - 69.9%	18	13%	
70 - 79.9%	4	3%	
80 - 89.9%	2	1%	
90 - 99.9%	7	5%	61.9% of parcels do not provide adequate site area for parking and storage ¹
TOTAL	139	100%	

Source: Metroscan, FY 2004-05, Consilium Associates Field Survey, March 2004

Note: 10 buildings were missing building square footages from Metroscan.

¹ Site area should include adequate site area for parking, loading, storage and other typical outdoor functions.

coverage ratio of these sites is 35 percent. Using this as a measure, 60 percent of the parcels in the Project Area do not have sufficient yard space to accommodate outdoor activity and parking. Based upon the above information, most of the industrial parcels in the Project Area cannot provide adequate on-site parking to meet contemporary industry standards.

d. Poor Site Conditions and Site Deficiencies

The field survey conducted by Consilium Associates identified nine types of site deficiencies, including open storage, abandoned vehicles, graffiti, weeds/overgrown vegetation, inadequate screening, and litter and debris. The site deficiencies contribute to the deteriorated appearance of the Project Area, which is a major deterrent for businesses to locate to the Project Area. In many instances, it will only take one or two deficient or poorly maintained properties in an area to create an image of neglect.

Within the Project Area, litter/debris, open storage, weeds/overgrown vegetation and graffiti are the most common examples of poor site conditions. As shown in Table 9, of the 294 separate parcels in the Project Area, 175 or approximately 60 percent had one or more incidences of poor site conditions. As shown in Figure 8, the 175 parcels are, for the most part, scattered throughout the Project Area. Generally, the highest incidences of poor site conditions within the Project Area occur in the industrial area along Medford and Whiteside Streets and the residential uses along Herbert north of Whiteside Street.

Table 9 shows that there were a total of 390 incidences of site deficiencies which impact 294 parcels within the Project Area or an average of 1.33 incidences per parcel. As shown in Table 9, open storage was the most predominant site deficiency occurring on 89 parcels (30 percent). Open storage refers to materials and equipment that are not contained within a building or screened from public view. Open storage contributes to the deteriorated appearance of the Project Area and discourages prospective tenants and reinvestment. Litter/debris was the next most predominate condition related to poor site conditions occurring on 66 parcels or 22 percent of the total parcels in the Project Area. Litter/debris may create a harborage for vectors, a fire hazard, an attractive nuisance and a sight obstruction.

Weeds/overgrown vegetation occurred on 58 parcels (20 percent of the total parcels). Similar to litter/debris, weeds create a harborage of vectors, a fire hazard and impedes pedestrian use of sidewalks. Graffiti was noted on 56 parcels or 19 percent of the total parcels. Graffiti is considered a criminal act that in many cases provides evidence of gang activity in the Project Area. As mentioned, real estate brokers have indicated that crime is perceived to be a problem in the Project Area, which is supported by the fact that crime has increased by 13 percent since 2000, while crime has decreased by 12 percent for the East Los Angeles Reporting District as a whole.

**TABLE 9
SITE CONDITION DEFICIENCIES
LACDC - WHITESIDE**

	Total No. of Parcels in Project Area with Detrimental Site Conditions 1	Percent of Project Area
<u>Site Conditions</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Open Storage	89	30.3%
Exposed Equipment/Open Activity	40	13.6%
Abandoned Vehicle	10	3.4%
Litter/Debris	66	22.4%
Weeds/Overgrown Vegetation	58	19.7%
Graffiti	56	19.0%
Unimproved Earth	29	9.9%
Inadequate Screening	39	13.3%
Standing Water/Poor Drainage	3	1.0%
TOTAL	390	

Total Parcels 294


No. of Properties with One or More Elements of Poor Maintenance	175 ²	59.5%
--	-------------------------	--------------

¹ Percentages in the "Total" row are based on the total of 294 parcels in the Project Area (they are not totals of their respective columns).

² Although the parcel may have multiple site deficiencies, the total represents the total number of parcels with one or more deficiencies.

Source: Consilii Field Survey, March 2004

FIGURE 8
LOCATION OF SITE CONDITION DEFICIENCIES



3. Incompatible Land Uses


Incompatible land uses that prevent economic development occur when the use or activity on a parcel of land negatively affects the economic use and/or development of adjacent and surrounding properties. For example, industrial businesses that wish to expand but are constrained by surrounding residential properties or other sensitive uses may not be able to grow or may choose to relocate to other sites. Conversely, residential uses or other sensitive uses adjoining industrial uses are often impacted by traffic, noise and reduced privacy, which affects property value and viability of the property for residential use. Real estate brokers representing properties in the Project Area specifically stated that many industrial users do not want to be located adjacent to residential areas.

There are multiple factors that have created depressed industrial prices in the Project Area including structural deterioration, obsolete buildings and crime in addition to the proximity of residential uses. Therefore, it is difficult to demonstrate that any one factor, such as incompatibility with residential uses, affects the economic viability and development of industrial properties. However, the financial impacts on residential properties, which are adjacent to industrial properties, can be more readily isolated and are therefore the focus of the following analysis.

Incidents of incompatible adjacent or nearby uses involving industrial and residential uses within the Project Area are found at four general locations. These locations involve a total of 53 residential, industrial and commercial parcels of which 32 parcels are residential properties (see Figure 9). Primarily, the incompatible land uses occur along Fowler Street from Indiana Street to Medford Street, at the corner of Marianna Avenue and Whiteside Street, and in the central portion of the Project Area along Herbert Avenue and Bonnie Beach Place south of Medford Street. As an example, at the corner of Medford Street and Bonnie Beach Place, there are multiple residential units adjacent to an auto-related body shop and back-up to industrial uses located along Bonnie Beach Place (see Photographic Plate 13 in Appendix B). The industrial businesses in this Project Area conduct outdoor activities, the noise from which impacts the adjacent residential units. Furthermore, there is a significant amount of truck traffic along Herbert Avenue that also impacts the residential units. Also, examples of incompatible land uses include single-family and multi-family residential uses located adjacent to industrial uses along Fowler Street and Fishburn Avenue, which are impacted from truck traffic and outdoor activities (see Photographic Plate 14).

Evidence of the impact of industrial and commercial uses on the economic development of residential uses is interpreted to mean economic impact to property values for purpose of this analysis. As described below, the residential properties directly adjacent to the industrial uses

**FIGURE 9
INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES**



Prepared by: Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
 Filename: Figure 9 - Incompatible Uses.ai; 07/07/05; eb

have lower property values than residential uses located in the exclusively residential area directly adjacent to the Project Area. The average assessed value of the 32 residential units that are adjacent to industrial and commercial uses is \$55.81 per square foot. The average assessed value of the remaining 320 residential units located outside but directly adjacent to the Project Area, is \$80.37, which is 44 percent higher than the 32 residential units located directly adjacent to the industrial and commercial properties within the Project Area.

4. Lots of Irregular Shape and Inadequate Size

Appropriate parcel size and dimension are necessary if land is to be effectively utilized. In order for property to be attractive to investors, parcels must be large enough to build a structure that not only meets building code standards, but also accommodates current industry standards. This also applies to parcels of relatively large size when their triangular or otherwise odd shape cannot accommodate the desired structure and its parking needs.

To determine the prevalence of parcels of inadequate size within the Project Area, existing parcel size for industrial and single-family residential uses, as provided by MetroScan was reviewed against current industry standards. Commercial and public uses were not evaluated due to the small amount of parcels related to these uses within the Project Area. Multi-family residential uses also were not evaluated due to the varying number of units contained within the structures that would make such analysis problematic, in that, unlike single-family residential, there is no set standard for the amount of parcel square footage per multi-family unit.

For parcels to be determined irregular or inadequate size, they must also be in multiple-ownership. For instance, if a parcel is determined to be inadequate in size then all of the surrounding parcels must be owned by different individuals. The reason is if the same individual owned adjacent parcels, then the combination of these two parcels would provide adequate area for development. Furthermore, as previously stated, it is presumed that any parcel that is too small for contemporary development (and is in multiple ownership) is also of irregular shape. In other words, it is not possible to have a standard shaped parcel that is too small for contemporary development. Either the parcel length or width or both must be too short for proper usefulness and development. The following discussion of inadequate parcel size is presented for industrial and single-family residential land use type.

a. Industrial Uses

Industry Standard

Using the three previous categories described to measure buildings of inadequate sizes, parcel size standards for the 66 industrial parcels in the Project Area that are in multiple ownership are shown in Table 10. KMA assessed the number of parcels that would be large enough within the Project Area for a 25,000 square foot single-tenant

TABLE 10
 INADEQUATELY SIZED INDUSTRIAL PARCELS
 LACDC - WHITESIDE

Manufacturing/Assembly	Minimum or Preferred		Total No.	
	Parcel Size	No. Parcels <= 75,000 sq.ft.	Manufacturing / Assembly Parcels	% of Total
	75,000 sq.ft.	9	16	56%

Light Industrial/Flex	Minimum or Preferred		Total No. Light Industrial Parcels	
	Parcel Size	No. Parcels <= 90,000 sq.ft.	Industrial Parcels	% of Total
	90,000 sq.ft.	31	35	89%

Warehouse/Distribution	Minimum or Preferred		Total No. Warehouse / Distribution Parcels	
	Parcel Size	No. Parcels <= 450,000 sq.ft.	Parcels	% of Total
	450,000 sq.ft.	15	15	100%

Source: Metroscan, FY 2004-05
 Note: Assumed 33% lot coverage to determine the minimum parcel size standards.

manufacturing industrial building, a 30,000 square foot light industrial facility and a 150,000 square foot warehouse facility based upon the existing land use as identified in the field survey. The "going" ratio of land area to building area for new general-purpose industrial buildings is most commonly between 3:1 and 4:1, which results in a structural lot coverage of 25 to 33 percent.¹⁶ This desired building lot coverage allows for adequate parking and landscaping of the site. Thus, using a ratio of 3:1 for land area to building area or building lot coverage of 33 percent, the total number of inadequately sized industrial parcels can be determined. Based upon this standard, a single-use industrial building would require a parcel size of 75,000 square feet. Within the Project Area, nine of the 16 single-tenant manufacturing parcels (56 percent) that are in multiple ownership are less than 75,000 square feet and therefore are not adequate in size to accommodate a contemporary single-tenant manufacturing building (Table 10). A contemporary light industrial facility would require a parcel size of 2.1 acres (90,000 square feet). Within the Project Area, 31 of the 35 light industrial parcels (89 percent) that are in multiple-ownership are less than 2.1 acres and therefore are not adequate in size to accommodate a light industrial facility.

For a 150,000 square foot warehouse, a parcel the size of 10.3 acres (450,000 square feet) would be required. Based upon this standard, all 15 of the warehouse/distribution parcels (100 percent) within the Project Area that are in multiple-ownership would not be large enough to support a contemporary warehouse facility (see Table 10). The use of the 3:1 land to building ratio as described above is reinforced by the fact that the average building coverage for warehouse properties in the U.S. is 33.2 percent.¹⁷ The location of these inadequately-sized industrial parcels are shown on Figure 10.


Industrial Submarket Comparison

As previously stated, the Project Area is part of the Industrial Submarket area. The average lot size of an industrial parcel within the Project Area is 31,624 square feet. The average size of an industrial parcel sold in the Industrial Submarket within the past 10 years (1994-2004) is 71,003 square feet, which is 125 percent higher than the Project Area. The 66 industrial parcels that are in multiple-ownership within the Project Area were compared to the average size of the industrial parcels in the Industrial Submarket. In all, 50 of 66 industrial parcels (76 percent) within the Project Area that are in multiple-ownership are less than the average industrial parcel sold in the Industrial Submarket in the past 10 years (71,003 square feet).

¹⁶Industrial Real Estate, 4th Edition, Society of Industrial Realtors, 1984, pg. 72.

¹⁷ Warehouse/Flex Industrial Facilities, ULI InfoPacket No. 379, The Real Estate Finance Journal, Spring 2000, "Warehouse/Distribution Property Characteristics in the United Kingdom and the United States: A Comparison", Bob Thompson, Toy T. Black and John T. Warden, pg. 17-18.

FIGURE 10
INADEQUATELY SIZED PARCELS UNDER MULTIPLE OWNERSHIP - INDUSTRIAL



b. Single-family Residential Uses

The minimum standard size for a single-family parcel in the County of Los Angeles according to the zoning code is 5,000 square feet. Within the Project Area, 20 of the 53 single-family residential parcels (38 percent) are less than the minimum parcel standard of 5,000 square feet.

The average size of a single-family residential parcel in the Project Area is 6,334 square feet. The average size of a single-family parcel sold in the Project Area since 1994, is 6,443 square feet; of which, 40 of the 53 single-family parcels (75 percent) in the Project Area are less than this average. The average size of a single-family residential parcel that was sold between 1994 and 2005 located within 1.7 miles of the Project Area is 6,021 square feet, which is nine percent larger than the Project Area. The average size of a single-family residential parcel that was sold between 1999 and 2004 and located within the six zip code areas that surround the Project Area, is 6,526 square feet, which is 27 percent larger than the Project Area.

Small residential parcels restrict the size of a dwelling unit due to required setbacks. The smaller lots do not allow for additions if the economics of the Project Area would support reinvestment. As previously noted, approximately 49 percent of the population in the Project Area is living in overcrowded conditions.

c. Commercial Uses

Using the three categories to measure buildings of inadequate size, commercial parcel size was evaluated to accommodate single-use freestanding structures (fast food restaurant and a drugstore) and a neighborhood shopping center. The parcel size for a video store (such as Hollywood Video) was not analyzed in this section because the required parcel size of 30,000 square feet is exactly the same as the standard of 30,000 square feet for a fast food restaurant. Therefore, the three categories described above were selected to examine a range of parcel sizes for various uses.

The industry standard minimum parcel size for a commercial single-use freestanding building consisting of a fast food restaurant (McDonald's) is 30,000 square feet. Within the Project Area, 21 of the 24 commercial retail parcels (88 percent) are less than 30,000 square feet and therefore below the industry standard size even for the smallest of single-use buildings (fast food restaurant). According to the ICSC, a Walgreens' type drugstore requires parcels that are at least 40,075 square feet (0.92 acres) in size. Only one of the 28 commercial retail parcels in the Project Area that are not in multiple-ownership, meet the 0.92-acre minimum criteria. In total, 92 percent of the commercial parcels are not adequate in size for a drugstore. There are 70 parcels in the Project Area that would be large enough to support a neighborhood shopping center that contained a supermarket anchor. ICSC requires a neighborhood shopping center to

have a minimum parcel size of at least 82,760 square feet. In all, 100 percent of the commercial retail parcels are not adequate in size for a neighborhood shopping center.

F. ECONOMIC BLIGHTING CONDITIONS IN THE PROJECT AREA


The following economic blighting factors were analyzed: assessed valuation, industrial sales transactions, single-family residential sales transactions, low lease rates, retail sales, lack of commercial facilities and a high crime rate. These indicators were selected as those conditions, which most readily reflected the economic distress in the Project Area. The analysis of these economic indicators within the Project Area is a comparative analysis with other comparable residential and industrial areas, adjacent areas, and the City and County as a whole.

1. Depreciated or Stagnant Property Values

Over the time period between fiscal year 1997-98 and 2003-04, the total amount of assessed property value for the Project Area has increased by a lower rate than the County of Los Angeles as a whole. The total assessed valuation for the Project Area in 1997-98 was \$70,596,746 and in 2004-05 was \$92,159,815 or an increase of 31 percent (4.5 percent annual average growth). By way of comparison, the County as a whole had a total assessed valuation of approximately \$487,996,000,000 in 1997-98 and \$749,156,125,470 in 2003-2004 (latest available information) for an overall growth rate of 53 percent (7.6 percent annual average growth). Clearly from these assessed value numbers, the Project Area is not seeing growth that is experienced at the County level. The Project Area has seen very little new development or substantial improvements over the past six years; therefore, the growth in assessed valuation in the Project Area is primarily related to inflation of the real estate market that the County and State has experienced since 1995.

There are a total of 294 parcels within the Project Area, of which, 270 are assessed property taxes in accordance with State law. The remaining parcels are either public lands, tax-exempt properties, or parcels that have been subdivided or merged and therefore do not exist in one or the other comparison year. Of the 270 assessed properties, 21 parcels or approximately eight percent showed a decrease in assessed valuation from 1997-98 to 2004-05. Within the Project Area, 59 parcels or 22 percent of the total assessed parcels increased by more than two percent annually. The remaining 190 parcels or 70 percent remained stagnant and only increased between zero percent and approximately two percent annually, which is the maximum assessment in accordance with State law that can be applied to properties that did not either have improvements or change of ownership during that assessment roll year. Overall, approximately 78 percent (211 parcels) of the assessed properties within the Project Area either had a decrease in assessed valuation or remained stagnant at two percent annual growth. As shown in Figure 11, most of the properties that had a decrease in assessed valuation are located along Whiteside Street, Herbert Avenue, and Medford Street. Of the 211 parcels that either had a decrease in assessed valuation or remained stagnant at two percent annual growth or less since 1997-98, 110 were industrial parcels (77 percent of all industrial parcels), 19 were

FIGURE 11
DEPRECIATED OR STAGNANT ASSESSED VALUES (1997-98 to 2004-05)



commercial parcels (79 percent of all commercial retail parcels), and 58 were residential parcels (69 percent of all residential parcels).

As discussed above, there are 282 assessed parcels within the Project Area totaling \$94,466,892, which is an average assessed value of \$334,989 per parcel. In comparison, there are 2,590,008 assessed parcels within the County totaling \$749,156,125,470, which is an average assessed value of \$289,249 per parcel or 14 percent lower than the Project Area. However, this is primarily the result of the Project Area having a higher concentration of commercial and industrial land uses, which tend to have higher assessed values per parcel than residential land uses. Approximately 59 percent of the parcels within the Project Area are either commercial or industrial which is a high percentage considering most cities average ten (10) percent for commercial or industrial properties. The County as a whole consists of eleven (11) percent commercial and industrial land uses. Since the County includes various land use differences than the Project Area it is necessary to make a comparison between the Project Area and comparable communities (those with a similar land use mix). A comparable area was defined as a community with at least 35 percent of the parcels developed with industrial and commercial uses. As shown in Table 11, the comparable areas consist of the cities of Commerce, Industry, Irwindale, Santa Fe Springs, South El Monte and Vernon. As shown on Table 11, the Project Area has the second lowest assessed valuation per parcel when compared to these communities with only the City of South El Monte being 20 percent lower than the Project Area.

Changes in assessed values not only indicate the direction and stability of the economy within a particular area, but also provide implications for County revenue generation. The lower the assessed values, the lower the amounts of property tax revenues to be distributed to the County and other governmental taxing agencies. Meanwhile, County services and programs for the Project Area will continue to be required. As discussed later in this Report, criminal activity within the Project Area is occurring at a rate significantly higher than the County. Therefore, the demand for law enforcement protection within the Project Area and adjacent areas is higher than other parts of the County. If this trend continues, over time the Project Area becomes a drain on County resources.

2. Impaired Investments

a. Industrial Property Transactions

Transactional data for industrial properties were analyzed and compared to data for the Industrial Submarket for the period of 1994 through 2004. Review of the data reveals that, in general, the sales prices on a per square foot basis were lower in the Project Area.

As shown in Table 12, a comparison of statistics for the Project Area and the Industrial Submarket indicated that the average building size transacted in the Industrial Submarket was 24,358 square feet compared to 19,849 for the Project Area, which is 19

TABLE 11
AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUES PER PARCEL - COMPARABLE AREAS¹
LACDC - WHITESIDE

Area	Total Parcels	Total Assessed Value (2003-2004)	Average Assessed Value per Parcel	% Higher than Project Area
Industry	1,461	\$ 4,913,894,539	\$ 3,363,378	904%
Vernon	1,383	\$ 3,052,804,670	\$ 2,207,379	559%
Irwindale	882	\$ 1,486,937,280	\$ 1,685,870	403%
Commerce	3,615	\$ 3,266,714,036	\$ 903,655	170%
Santa Fe Springs	5,592	\$ 4,317,003,645	\$ 771,996	130%
Project Area	282	\$ 94,466,892	\$ 334,989	
South El Monte	4,431	\$ 1,191,011,025	\$ 268,791	-20%

Source: Metroscan, Los Angeles County Assessor's Annual Report, 2004

¹ Comparable areas consist of cities in Los Angeles County for which at least 35 percent of the parcels consist of industrial and commercial land uses, which is similar to the Study Area (58 percent).

² There are 294 parcels in the Project Area, but only 282 are assessable.

TABLE 12
INDUSTRIAL SALES TRANSACTIONS
LACDC - WHITESIDE

Comp_No	Ind_Type	APN	No Bldgs	Address	Sale_Date	Sale_Price	Land_SF	Average Price per Land SF	Bldg_SF	Average Price per Bldg SF
LEC-33579-12-94	Single Tenant Ind	5224001002	1	1636 N Bonnie Beach Pl	11/4/1994	\$ 700,000	37,919	\$ 18.46	21,000	\$ 33.33
LEC-40686-03-95	Heavy Ind	5223037013	2	4101, 4123 Whiteside St	11/23/1994	\$ 1,260,000	72,993	\$ 17.26	52,236	\$ 24.12
LEC-58015-01-97	Single Tenant Ind	5224028019	1	3930 Whiteside St	10/7/1996	\$ 475,000	15,500	\$ 30.65	12,220	\$ 38.87
LEC-59359-04-97	Industrial Bldg	5224028012	4	3900 Whiteside St	2/14/1997	\$ 525,000	34,100	\$ 15.40	10,587	\$ 49.59
LEC-49920-12-9819	Multi Tenant Ind	5224001002	1	1636 N Bonnie Beach Pl	9/23/1998	\$ 960,000	37,920	\$ 25.32	14,960	\$ 64.17
LEC-06935-03-9919	Single Tenant Ind	5224009017	2	1501 Fishburn Ave	1/7/1999	\$ 250,000	27,770	\$ 9.00	4,800	\$ 52.08
LEC-37448-05-0020	Multi Tenant Ind	5224028006	4	4036-4048 Whiteside St	3/21/2000	\$ 650,000	28,087	\$ 23.14	16,138	\$ 40.28
LEC-39382-05-0020	Single Tenant Ind	5223037008	2	4207 Whiteside St	4/10/2000	\$ 300,000	28,241	\$ 10.62	9,000	\$ 33.33
LEC-69621-08-0120	Whs/Distribution	5223037012	3	4101-4131 Indiana St	6/29/2001	\$ 1,700,000	108,237	\$ 15.71	50,206	\$ 33.86
LEC-99899-10-0320	Single Tenant Ind	5224003007	1	3621 Medford St	9/10/2003	\$ 657,000	20,408	\$ 32.19	13,850	\$ 47.44
LEC-29037-03-0420	Single Tenant Ind	5224003007	1	3619-3621 Medford St	2/20/2004	\$ 775,000	20,408	\$ 37.98	13,850	\$ 55.96
LEC-46077-02-0520	Multi Tenant Ind	5224009014	2	1533 Fishburn Ave	9/28/2004	\$ 500,000	21,998	\$ 22.73	5,360	\$ 93.28
LEC-63850-02-0520	Single Tenant Ind	5224005018	2	4436 Worth St	11/2/2004	\$ 1,650,000	83,770	\$ 19.70	45,000	\$ 36.67
LEC-05678-04-0520	Industrial Shop	5223036009	1	4232 Whiteside St	12/17/2004	\$ 570,000	15,500	\$ 36.77	8,680	\$ 65.67
INDUSTRIAL SUBMARKET					AVERAGE	\$ 783,714	\$ 39,489	\$ 19.85	\$ 19,849	\$ 39.48
					AVERAGE	\$ 1,192,648	\$ 33,592	\$ 35.50	\$ 24,358	\$ 48.96

Source: Costar Group, Inc. (Central Los Angeles Trend Report & Detailed Sales Comparables)

percent smaller than buildings transacted in the Industrial Submarket. However, the average sales price per transaction was significantly higher than the Project Area indicating that building size is not the primary factor in determining property values in the Project Area. The average industrial sales transaction in the Industrial Submarket was \$1,192,648 compared to \$783,714 for the Project Area, which is 34 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket compared to an average building size that is 19 percent smaller. As would be expected, the average sales price per square foot of building space and land was higher in the Industrial Submarket when compared with the Project Area. The average industrial sales transaction per square foot of building space in the Industrial Submarket is \$48.96 compared to \$39.48 for the Project Area (19 percent lower). When comparing the sales transactions on a price per square foot of land basis using the same industrial transactions described above, the average industrial sales transaction per square foot of land in the Industrial Submarket is \$35.50 compared to \$19.85 for the Project Area, which is 44 percent lower. The discrepancy in sales transactions per square foot of building and land is an indication of negative image of the Project Area.


b. Single-Family Residential Sales

An analysis of single-family home sales in the Project Area compared to the surrounding area was conducted to determine the relative economic viability of single-family residential properties in the Project Area. If single-family homes are selling at lower prices than what is experienced in the comparison areas, then investments are likely to be impaired. Transactional data for single-family homes over the past 11 years (1994-2005) for the Project Area was compared to the surrounding areas.¹⁸ The "surrounding areas" is composed of the Project Area and the area within a 1.7-mile radius around the Project Area (see Figure 12). In addition to sales price, the sales price per square foot for the Project Area was compared with the surrounding area. The analysis of total sales per square foot of building is provided to equalize the analysis regardless of varying housing sizes.

Review of the residential sales data reveals that overall sales prices for single-family housing units including building value per square foot in the Project Area are lower than those for single-family homes that are located in the surrounding area. The average sales price for a single-family home in the Project Area between 1994-2005 was \$147,972 compared to \$196,562 for the surrounding area during that same time period. Thus, the Project Area has an average sales price that is 25 percent lower than the surrounding area. The average building size of the single-family homes transacted between 1994-2005 in the Project Area was 1,036 square feet; therefore, the average value per square foot of single-family home sales within the Project Area totaled \$142.87. In comparison, the average building size of the single-family homes transacted between 1994-2005 in the surrounding 1.7-mile radius, was 1,185 square feet; therefore,

¹⁸ A similar comparison to multi-family housing sales transaction was not analyzed because of the limited amount of transactions that have occurred for this particular land use in the past ten years.

FIGURE 12
SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COMPARISON AREAS:
(1.7 MILE RADIUS AND SIX SURROUNDING ZIP CODES)



the Project Area is 13 percent smaller than the surrounding area. The average value per square foot of single-family home sales for the surrounding 1.7-mile radius is \$154.44. Thus, the Project Area has an eight percent lower single-family home sales per square foot than the surrounding 1.7-mile radius.

The fact that the value per square foot is not significantly greater in the 1.7-mile radius area than in the Project Area and that the rather substantial price difference (25 percent lower in the Project Area) is due in part to the size of the homes. As noted above, the average size of a single-family home sold in the Project Area is 1,536, which is small compared to today's standards. The size of a newer home (constructed after 1994) built within the 1.7-mile radius area is 1,981 square feet which is 29 percent larger than the average size single-family home that was sold in the Project Area in the past 10 years. Approximately 34 percent of the single-family homes within the Project Area that were sold in the past 10 years are less than 1,000 square feet. Therefore, the price per square foot for small single-family units will be somewhat skewed because of the very small size building.

A comparison was also made to the single-family residential sales that occurred over the past five years (1999-2005) within the six zip codes (90031, 90032, 90033, 90063, 91754 and 91803), which includes the communities of Monterey Park, Alhambra, Boyle Heights and Lincoln Heights that surround the Project Area (see Figure 12). The Project Area is located within the 90063 zip code. Overall sales prices for single-family housing units and more specifically, building value per square foot in the Project Area is significantly lower than those for single-family homes that are located in the six zip codes. The average sales price for a single-family home in the Project Area between 1999-2005 was \$169,574 compared to \$253,130 for the area comprising of the six zip codes during that same time period. Thus, the Project Area has an average sales price that is 33 percent lower than the surrounding communities. Based upon an average building size of the single-family homes transacted between 1999-2005 of 1,042 square feet; the average value per square foot of single-family home sales within the Project Area totaled \$162.66. In comparison, the average building size of the single-family homes transacted between 1999-2005 in the six zip code area was 1,279 square feet, which is 23 percent higher than the Project Area average of 1,042 square feet. The average value per square foot of single-family home sales for the six zip code area was \$180.25; therefore, the Project Area is 10 percent lower than the six zip code area. This would again indicate that home size is a major factor in property values for residential uses. However, there is a premium to pay to live in areas or communities with a better image. In fact, Zip Codes 91754 and 91803 (consist primarily of the cities of Monterey Park and Alhambra) have an average sales price that is over \$311.00 per square feet, which is significantly higher than the Project Area (\$162.66). This shows that a preferred location and better image of an area has a significant impact on the sales price of a single-family home.

c. Commercial Property Transactions

Transactional data for commercial properties were analyzed and compared to data for the surrounding area for the period from 1993 through June 2005. For purposes of this analysis, the surrounding area is defined as the area (including the Project Area) that is within Zip Code 90063. Review of the data reveals that while commercial buildings in the Project Area that were transacted during this time period, were comparable in size to the buildings in the surrounding area (Zip Code 90063), in general, the sales prices on a per square foot basis were significantly lower in the Project Area.

A comparison of statistics for the Project Area and the surrounding area indicate that the average commercial building size transacted in the Project Area was 3,900 square feet, which on an average was 27 percent larger than buildings transacted in the surrounding area (3,069 square feet). Based upon information from MetroScan, the average sales price per transaction was higher in the surrounding area than the Project Area. The average commercial sales transaction in the Project Area was \$245,000 compared to \$273,178 for the surrounding area. Therefore, the average commercial sales transaction in the Project Area was 10 percent lower than the surrounding area. However, the average sales price per square foot of building was significantly higher in the surrounding area when compared to the Project Area. The average commercial sales transaction per square foot of building in the Project Area was \$62.83 compared to \$89.01 for the surrounding area; therefore, the Project Area had a 29 percent lower average per commercial sales transaction than the surrounding area.

3. Low Lease Rates

Abnormally low lease rates, relative to other locations, are often indicative of: 1) weak demand for lease space; 2) an excess supply of lease space; or 3) the substandard physical condition of space offered for lease. Lease rates vary according to certain conditions and types of use. Notable conditions that have major implications for lease rates include location, access to market/customers, visibility, amenities, and condition of property and age of property. This is especially true for the industrial area portion of the Project Area. Most of the industrial buildings are small Class C buildings that do not provide the necessary amenities (sprinklers, HVAC systems, clear height, and dock high loading) and are therefore considered functionally obsolete. Lease rates in the Project Area tend to be lower compared with the Industrial Submarket. As previously stated, according to one real estate broker, there are few vacancies and little turnover, which is a direct result of long-time businesses accepting the obsolete building space either because of the low rent or because of the lax County zoning standards. However, new prospective users tend not to locate in the Project Area because the area is not attractive, has a high crime rate, and most of the buildings are small and functionally obsolete. These conditions contribute to lower lease rates within the Project Area compared to other parts of the Industrial Submarket area. The lower lease rates make it difficult to upgrade buildings because the cost of rehabilitating a building exceeds the lease revenues that could be

generated from the building. Therefore, as discussed later in this section, rehabilitating a structure becomes financially infeasible.

Lease rates were obtained for seven (7) industrial properties that are available within the Project Area and compared with the Industrial Submarket. As shown in Table 13, there are four light industrial, two manufacturing buildings, and one warehouse that are currently for lease. The overall average weighted asking lease rate per square foot of industrial space in the Project Area is \$5.38 per year or \$0.45 per month, which includes a lease rate of \$0.51 for light industrial uses, \$0.39 for manufacturing uses, and \$0.48 for warehouse uses. In comparison, the overall average weighted lease rate of industrial building space within the Industrial Submarket area is \$7.59 per year or \$0.63 per month; therefore the Project Area is 29 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket (Table 13). This includes a weighted asking lease rate of \$0.83 per month for light industrial uses compared to \$0.51 for the Project Area (39 percent lower) and a weighted asking lease rate of \$0.67 per month for manufacturing uses compared to \$0.39 for the Project Area (42 percent lower). Similarly, the average weighted asking rate per square foot of warehousing uses in the Industrial Submarket is \$0.55 per month compared to \$0.48 for the Project Area (13 percent lower).

As previously stated, most of the industrial buildings are over 50 years old and are in need of upgrading to be competitive with more contemporary industrial buildings located in the region. However, most of the rehabilitation needed to the existing building stock, would require significant improvements to meet contemporary standards for ceiling height, dock high loading, and fire sprinkler systems. Furthermore, current rent levels support reinvestment of existing property if the balance of the mortgage is paid off and lease rate revenues are used primarily for on-site improvements. However, acquisition and subsequent upgrading of industrial properties is not considered feasible within the Project Area due to the cost to acquire the property and make improvements, which will not generate enough lease rate revenues to make the improvements financially feasible. For example, the cost to rehabilitate older structures (pre-1950) varies depending upon the degree of upgrading required and the level of seismic, structural and other improvements necessary to lease the space, but typically can be in the range of \$25 per square foot of building area, excluding soft costs (design, government fees, financing, etc.), which is half of the shell costs for a new industrial building (\$50 per square foot). After factoring typical indirect and financing costs, rehabilitation could cost approximately \$33 per square foot (see Table 14). Assuming a property owner owned a property that was large enough to accommodate a small manufacturing tenant (25,000 square feet), the rents that are currently achievable in the Project Area would support rehabilitation only if there is no remaining real estate debt on the property and most revenues generated from the lease of the property can be used for rehabilitation costs. On a per square foot basis, the weighted average asking rents in the Project Area (approximately \$0.45 or \$5.40 per square foot per year) would support \$45 per square foot in reinvestment (net operating income of \$4.88/sf/year divided by targeted

**TABLE 13
LEASE RATE ANALYSIS - STUDY AREA AND INDUSTRIAL SUBMARKET
LACDC - WHITESIDE**

STUDY AREA

Parcel No.	Ind. Type	Address	Bldg SF	Monthly Lease Rate (FSG)	Average Annual Lease Rate by Specific Use (FSG)	Average Weighted Annual Lease Rate Overall (FSG)
5224014025	Light Industrial	3512 Fowler St	10,589	\$0.43	\$0.39	
5224009010	Light Industrial	1532-1536 N Indiana St	46,400	\$0.40	\$1.57	
5224024007	Light Industrial	1567 N Bonnie Beach ¹	1,752	\$1.03	\$0.15	
5224008008	Light Industrial	1612 N Indiana St	82,955	\$0.57	\$4.00	
SUBTOTAL LT IND.			141,696		\$6.11	\$4.42
5223036003	Manufacturing	4160 Whiteside St	9,895	\$0.37	\$1.14	
5224005020	Manufacturing	4466 Worth St	28,574	\$0.40	\$3.57	
SUBTOTAL MFG			38,469		\$4.71	\$0.92
5223038003	Warehouse	4700 Worth St	16,060	\$0.49	\$0.48	\$0.04
TOTAL STUDY AREA			196,225			\$5.38

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Ind. Type	Bldg SF	Average Annual Lease Rate by Specific Use (FSG)	Average Weighted Annual Lease Rate Overall (FSG)
Light Industrial	126,635	\$9.95	\$2.01
Manufacturing	154,080	\$8.00	\$1.97
Warehouse	346,175	\$6.55	\$3.62
TOTAL LA COUNTY	626,890		\$7.59

Source: Loopnet Comps (all industrial properties for sale or lease within Los Angeles County), Broker Interviews, For Lease flyers

¹ This property was recently leased out for \$1,800/month, but is now for sale by the broker.

Note: Only included properties within the Central Los Angeles Industrial Submarket, as defined by the Costar Group.

TABLE 14
ESTIMATED REHABILITATION COSTS - INDUSTRIAL USE
LACDC - WHITESIDE

Assumptions:
 Rehab of 1-story building
 Parking - public lot or street parking
 FAR: .50

	Acquisition		No Acquisition	
	PSF	% of Direct Costs	PSF	% of Direct Costs
Acquisition	\$39.48			
Direct Costs				
Rehabilitation	\$25.00	95%	\$25.00	95%
Contingency (5% of Direct)	\$1.25	5%	\$1.25	5%
Subtotal	\$26.25	100%	\$26.25	100%
Indirect Costs				
A&E	\$1.25	5%	\$1.25	5%
Taxes/Insurance/Legal/Accounting	\$0.38	2%	\$0.50	2%
Permits and fees	\$0.50	2%	\$0.50	2%
Marketing & Leasing	\$1.00	4%	\$1.00	4%
Developer Admin. Costs	\$0.75	3%	\$0.75	3%
Contingency	\$1.25	5%	\$1.25	5%
Subtotal	\$5.13	21%	\$5.25	21%
Financing Costs				
Const. Loan Fees	1.50%	\$0.50	2%	\$0.50
Const. Loan Interest	8% - 9 mos.	\$0.85	3.4%	\$0.85
Subtotal		\$1.35	5%	\$1.35
Development Costs		\$72.21		\$32.85
	<i>Rounded</i>	\$70		\$33

return on investment of 11 percent; see Table 15). Even the highest asking rate (\$0.57) for a building over 10,000 square feet would support around \$57 per square foot of reinvestment assuming a target of return on investment of eleven percent (11 percent) to attract private investment (see Table 15). Therefore, reinvestment and improvement of a property is possible only if most of the lease rate revenues generated could be used for on-site improvements.

As presented previously in Table 12, sales data for industrial properties in the Project Area were reviewed for the previous 10 years (1994 through 2004). These properties sold for an average of approximately \$39.48 per square foot. These data indicates that while it could be cost effective to acquire existing buildings and use them in their existing condition since owner/users (who are not depending upon lease income for an investment return), may be able to make economic use of the existing building stock, the return to a private owner after investing in upgrading their property will not be sufficient to support such upgrades without lease rates rising to levels at or near those in nearby markets. For example, as shown in Table 14, the acquisition and improvement of a typical industrial property in the Project Area will cost approximately \$70 per square foot and require a lease rate of \$0.70 per square foot per month to be financially feasible. It is not likely that even after substantial rehabilitation of an industrial building that lease rates would reach \$0.70 per square foot, given the fact that such improvements probably could not consist of all the amenities needed to be competitive with contemporary industrial buildings in the region; therefore, for the same lease rate as the Project Area, an individual could rent a newer industrial building in the Industrial Submarket with more amenities.

4. Residential Overcrowding

Residential overcrowding is a significant problem in the Project Area and the surrounding areas. Many of the homes and apartments date from the 1930s and were designed to accommodate singles and small families. The increase in housing costs in the Los Angeles region over the past 15 years has forced many people to "double-up" in units. The following analysis is based upon review of data available from the 2000 US Census information for the census blocks that encompass the Project Area and that comprise the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles.

The US Census reports overcrowding according to the basic unit standard used by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), which is more than one person (1.01+) per room within a unit. A room is defined by HUD as a habitable room within a dwelling unit and can be any room except the hallway, kitchen and the bathroom. More specifically, ideal housing is 1.00 persons per room or less, overcrowded housing is 1.01-1.50 persons per room, and severely overcrowded housing is 1.5+ persons per room. Based upon the 2000 US Census (the latest information available) Table 16 presents living conditions as defined by HUD for the Project Area and for comparison purposes, the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles. The table shows that the number of persons in ideal conditions in the Project Area for the year 2000 was 52 percent compared to the City at 74 percent and the County at 77 percent. Therefore, almost 49 percent of the occupied housing units are considered overcrowded in

**TABLE 15
PRIVATE INVESTMENT SUPPORTED - INDUSTRIAL
LACDC - WHITESIDE**

SCENARIO 1 - WEIGHTED AVERAGE ASKING INDUSTRIAL RENT

Annual Rental Income	\$0.45 /mo.	\$5.40 /SF/Yr.
Less Vacancy & Bad Debt	5%	<u>(\$0.27) /SF/Yr.</u>
Annual Effective Rental Income		\$5.13 /SF/Yr.
Annual Expenses		
Non-Reimbursables (Incl. Mgmt. Fee)	3%	(\$0.15) /SF/Yr.
Reserves	\$0.10 /SF/Yr.	<u>(\$0.10) /SF/Yr.</u>
Total Annual Expenses		(\$0.25)
Net Operating Income (NOI)		\$4.88 /SF/Yr.
Targeted Return on Costs (Blended return on debt and equity)		11%

Private Investment Supported Per Sq. Ft.	\$44.33
---	----------------

SCENARIO 2 - HIGH AVERAGE ASKING INDUSTRIAL RENT

Annual Rental Income	\$0.57 /mo.	\$6.84 /SF/Yr.
Less Vacancy & Bad Debt	5%	<u>(\$0.34) /SF/Yr.</u>
Annual Effective Rental Income		\$6.50 /SF/Yr.
Annual Expenses		
Non-Reimbursables (Incl. Mgmt. Fee)	3%	(\$0.19) /SF/Yr.
Reserves	\$0.10 /SF/Yr.	<u>(\$0.10) /SF/Yr.</u>
Total Annual Expenses		(\$0.29)
Net Operating Income (NOI)		\$6.20 /SF/Yr.
Targeted Return on Costs (Blended return on debt and equity)		11%

Private Investment Supported Per Sq. Ft.	\$56.39
---	----------------

TABLE 16
 NUMBER OF OVERCROWDED HOUSING UNITS
 LACDC - Whiteside

Persons Per Room	2000		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Project Area ¹	% of Total	City of Los Angeles	% of Total	Los Angeles	% of Total
1.00 or Less (Ideal)	265	52%	949,400	74%	2,413,405	77%
1.01 - 1.50 (Overcrowded)	92	18%	95,602	7%	249,094	8%
1.51 or more (Severely Overcrowded)	157	31%	230,356	18%	471,275	15%
TOTAL	514		1,275,358		3,133,774	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

¹ Includes census blocks 5307.001 and 5307.002.

comparison to only 26 percent for the City and 23 percent for the County. Furthermore, 31 percent of the occupied housing units in 2000 are severely overcrowded compared to 18 and 15 percent for the City and County, respectively.

Overcrowded conditions are directly related to the size of the dwelling unit. As previously discussed, 34 percent of all single-family homes in the Project Area are less than 1,000 square feet, which is an extremely small size for a single-family residential unit.

5. Lack of Commercial Facilities

CRL Section 33031(b)(3) defines lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods, including grocery stores, drug stores and banks and other lending institutions as a blighting condition. For the most part, there is a limited amount of commercial establishments within the Project Area due to the industrial and residential nature of the Project Area. In fact, residents within the Project Area have indicated to County staff that a full service grocery store is desired, if not needed. These residents feel that there are no supermarkets that are close to the Project Area.


To illustrate this point, KMA obtained the addresses of all grocery stores, banks and drug stores in the Project Area by conducting a search through Yahoo yellow pages and Switchboard.com. The locations of these uses were mapped using GIS. As shown on Figure 13, drug stores and banks were located sufficiently within 1-½ miles to the Project Area and therefore are adequately serving the residents within the Project Area. A grocery store typically serves an area located within one to three miles.¹⁹ As shown on Figure 13, using one-mile radius as a standard, there are over 30 small markets located inside and just outside the one-mile radius of the Project Area including three markets within the Project Area. However, most of the stores are considered specialty stores or convenience stores that contain a specific type of goods not normally found in a regular grocery store and therefore lack the variety of goods sold at a major chain, such as a Vons or Albertson's. KMA plotted the location of major national grocery store chains that provide all of the necessary goods and services that the small markets in the surrounding area cannot provide. As shown in Figure 13, there are two Food 4 Less stores and a Vons located less than two miles away, while two Ralph's and a Sav-On are located less than three miles away. Therefore, using the one-mile radius as a standard, residents within the Project Area are not conveniently served by major grocery store chains.

6. High Crime Rate

The CRL identifies "a high crime rate that constitutes a serious threat to the public safety and welfare" as a condition of blight. The Project Area is perceived by both the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and the general public as having a crime problem that is a serious threat to public safety and welfare. This perception is due to the overall increase in criminal

¹⁹ International Council of Shopping Centers, Industry News, "Supercenters Pose Quandary for Strip Centers", December 2001, pg. 2.

FIGURE 13
LOCATION OF COMMERCIAL FACILITIES



Prepared by: Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
Filename: Figure 13 - Comm Facilities.ai; 07/05/05; cb


activity within the Project Area compared to the Sheriff's Department regional reporting district, the East Los Angeles District, which encompasses the Project Area. The County Sheriff's Department reports crimes by districts. The East Los Angeles District, which includes the communities of City Terrace and East Los Angeles and consists of approximately 4,839 acres and has an estimated population of 112,053. The East Los Angeles District is broken down by 17 sub-districts including Reporting District 271, which encompasses all of the area within the Project Area. For the analysis below, Reporting District 271 is referred to as the Project Area since the Project Area boundaries consist of 79 percent of Reporting District 271. The Reporting District 271 has an estimated population of 2,100 people and consists of 216 acres. Figure 14 shows the boundaries of the Project Area in comparison to the East Los Angeles District.

The Sheriff's Department reports crime by district under eight main categories, which are Part I crimes. Part I crimes consist of homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, grand theft auto, larceny and arson. Table 17 presents the number of Part I crimes reported for the past five years (2000-2004) for the Project Area and for East Los Angeles District. The overall criminal activity has increased in the Project Area and has decreased in the East Los Angeles District from 2000 to 2004. In 2000, a total of 86 crimes were reported within the Project Area and in 2004, 97 crimes were reported, which is an increase in criminal activity of 13 percent. In comparison, the East Los Angeles District had a total of 5,076 criminal incidences in 2000 and 4,451 criminal incidences in 2004, which is an overall decrease of twelve (12) percent during that time period. As shown in Table 17, aside from the one homicide that occurred in 2003 compared to zero homicides in 2000, the most significant increase in the type of crime within the Project Area was grand theft auto, which increased by 46 percent from 2000 to 2004.

The Reporting District 271's population represents less than two (1.9) percent of the East Los Angeles District's population, yet, the criminal activity within this District represents approximately 2.2 percent of the criminal activity in the East Los Angeles District as a whole. This indicates that criminal activity within the Project Area is occurring at a rate that is disproportionate with its population. Furthermore, based upon criminal activity between 2000 and 2004, the Project Area has a high crime rate when compared to the East Los Angeles District for crime incidences per 1,000 people. As shown in Table 18, in 2000, the Project Area had a crime rate of 40.95 crimes per 1,000 people, which was actually 10 percent lower than the East Los Angeles District rate of 45.30 crimes per 1,000 people. However, in 2004, the amount of criminal incidences within the Project Area increased to 46.19 crimes per 1,000 while the East Los Angeles District decreased in crimes per 1,000 people to 39.72 (see Table 18). Therefore, the Project Area has a total number of crimes per 1,000 people that is 16 percent higher than the East Los Angeles District in 2004.

Finally, based upon the information in Table 18, when comparing the Project Area and the East Los Angeles District by type of crime, the numbers indicate that violent crimes against people, which include homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault, have been decreasing in the Project Area at a slower rate than the East Los Angeles District. For instance, violent crimes within the East Los Angeles District have decreased by 32 percent from 2000 to 2004 while the

**FIGURE 14
BOUNDARIES OF THE EAST LOS ANGELES CRIME REPORTING DISTRICT**



Prepared by: Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
Filename: Figure 14 - Crime Districts.at; 07/05/05; cb

TABLE 17
PART I CRIMES - STUDY AREA AND REPORTING DISTRICT
LACDC - WHITESIDE

	2000		2001		2000-2001 (%) Change)		2002		2001-2002 (%) Change)		2003		2004		2003-2004 (%) Change)		2000-2004 (%) Change)	
	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East	RD	East
	271 ¹	LA ²	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA	271	LA
Homicide	0	25	0	9	0%	-64%	1	31	100%	244%	1	15	1	18	0%	20%	100%	-28%
Robbery	6	408	6	419	0%	3%	4	449	-33%	7%	9	376	8	325	-11%	-14%	33%	-20%
Rape	1	33	0	38	-100%	15%	0	51	0%	34%	0	33	0	41	0%	24%	-100%	24%
Aggravated Assault	13	1,104	13	1,023	0%	-7%	21	1,094	62%	7%	9	747	9	687	0%	-8%	-31%	-38%
Burglary	17	687	21	665	24%	-3%	15	639	-29%	-4%	17	531	17	491	0%	-8%	0%	-29%
Grand Theft Auto	26	1,134	22	1,142	-15%	1%	26	1,401	18%	23%	51	1,534	38	1,462	-25%	-5%	46%	29%
Larceny	22	1,611	12	1,417	-45%	-12%	17	1,489	42%	5%	22	1,432	16	1,362	-27%	-5%	-27%	-15%
Arson	1	74	7	54	600%	-27%	19	83	171%	54%	6	64	8	65	33%	2%	700%	-12%
Total	86	5,076	81	4,767	-6%	-6%	103	5,237	27%	10%	115	4,732	97	4,451	-16%	-6%	13%	-12%

Source: Los Angeles County Sheriff, East Los Angeles Station

¹ Reporting District 271 encompasses the Project Area.

² The East Los Angeles District encompasses the Project Area, and extends south to the City of Commerce.

TABLE 18
PART I CRIMES PER 1,000 PERSONS
LACDC - WHITESIDE

	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004	
	RD 271 ¹	East	RD 271	East	RD 271	East	RD 271	East	RD 271	East
		LA ²		LA		LA		LA		LA
Homicide	-	0.22	-	0.08	0.48	0.28	0.48	0.13	0.48	0.16
Robbery	2.86	3.64	2.86	3.74	1.90	4.01	4.29	3.36	3.81	2.90
Rape	0.48	0.29	-	0.34	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.37
Aggravated Assault	6.19	9.85	6.19	9.13	10.00	9.76	4.29	6.67	4.29	6.13
Burglary	8.10	6.13	10.00	5.93	7.14	5.70	8.10	4.74	8.10	4.38
Grand Theft Auto	12.38	10.12	10.48	10.19	12.38	12.50	24.29	13.69	18.10	13.05
Larceny	10.48	14.38	5.71	12.65	8.10	13.29	10.48	12.78	7.62	12.15
Arson	0.48	0.66	3.33	0.48	9.05	0.74	2.86	0.57	3.81	0.58
Total	40.95	45.30	38.57	42.54	49.05	46.74	54.76	42.23	46.19	39.72

Source: Los Angeles County Sheriff, East Los Angeles Station

¹ Reporting District 271 encompasses the Project Area.

² The East Los Angeles District encompasses the Project Area, and extends south to the City of Commerce.

Note: Census block boundaries were overlaid over the East LA district boundary in order to determine the 2000 population. The East LA District has a population of approximately 112,053 persons, and Reporting District 271 has an approximate population of 2,100 persons.

violent crimes occurring in the Project Area has only decreased by ten (10) percent during the same time period. Also, the remaining Part I crimes consisting of burglary, grand theft auto, larceny and arson has increased by 20 percent in the Project Area from 2000 to 2003 while the East Los Angeles District has seen an overall decrease of four (4) percent.

G. INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES

The Project Area was developed in the 1920's and the infrastructure dates from this period. There is no available information on the specific drainage, sewer and water systems in this area. Given the age of the area and the condition of the visible infrastructure (roads, curbs, sidewalks, etc.), it is anticipated that infrastructure reconstruction is needed throughout the Project Area. The County Public Works Department conducted a field inspection of the Project Area to document infrastructure deficiencies and identified extensive road, curb, gutter and sidewalk deficiencies ranging from a complete lack of curbs, gutters and sidewalks improvements to substantially deteriorated improvements that exceed what would be addressed through County maintenance programs. Many of these same infrastructure deficiencies were documented during the field survey (field survey) conducted by Consilium Associates of the Project Area in May 2004. Figure 15 shows the location of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk deficiencies identified by Public Works based upon a field survey conducted in summer of 2005. Figure 16 shows the location of infrastructure deficiencies noted during the field survey. Photographs of the infrastructure deficiencies taken during the 2004 field survey are provided in Appendix B. Figure 17 overlays the County's identified deficiencies and the location noted during the field survey of building conditions. As shown in Figure 17 many of the same deficiencies were identified during both the field survey and the documentation provided by County Public Works. Some of the differences in conditions identified by public works and those documented during the field survey are attributed to what is considered a street deficiency and what is identified as a curb and gutter deficiency. Also, the field survey identified railroad right-of-way that is being used as vehicle access as streets, while public works did not.

As would be expected given County budget constraints, the area receives basic improvements such as road slurry seal. This does not address adequate road with or even the potential need for reconstruction. Even the basic slurry seal improvements are subject to funding shortages. According to Public Works there are plans to slurry seal all of the local roads and alleys in the area with a few exceptions. However, this work has been deferred until Fiscal Year 2008-09 or later due to a budget shortfall.

The County Public Works assessment does not consider future needs. Public Works anticipates that development will fund future public improvements or at least a portion of the public improvements. For example, it was noted by Public Works that lighting levels in the Project Area are generally adequate, and if widespread new development is proposed then Public Works recommends that the developers be required to install streetlights with underground wiring. Therefore, large-scale improvements over the 30-year life of the redevelopment plan is not contemplated by Public Works nor are the extensive infrastructure improvements that would be required to develop a biomedical technology center. As a result,

the projects, programs and costs reflected in this Preliminary Report anticipate significant infrastructure improvements to assist the private sector develop a biomedical technology center.

H. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT BLIGHTING CONDITIONS

For the duration of the Redevelopment Plan, the Commission's focus will be on implementing the goals and objectives described in Section II of this Report to eliminate blighting conditions and facilitate the redevelopment and revitalization of the Project Area. The goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan can be achieved through the implementation of the programs described in Section IV of this Report. As described in detail in the prior sections, the significant blighting conditions by type within the Project Area are shown on Figure 18 and summarized in Table 19. In all, 264 of the 294 parcels (90 percent) within the Project Area contain at least one physical or one economic blighting condition.

1. Lack of Proper Utilization

The physical conditions within the Project Area combined with the economic conditions, cause a reduction of and lack of proper utilization of the area. One of the primary economic indicators of lack of proper utilization is the lack of new development and reinvestments. Of the 292 buildings in the Project Area only 25 buildings or eight percent have been developed or substantially rehabilitated in the past 30 years. In addition, there are 29 vacant parcels totaling 4.9 acres and 83 parcels have buildings that cover less than 25 percent of the parcel indicating underutilization or a lack of proper utilization.

Smaller parcels and buildings restrict the type of business that can be accommodated in the Project Area. Using industrial land uses within the Project Area as an example, approximately 80 percent of the industrial buildings within the Project Area are less than 25,000 square feet, which is the minimal contemporary size for an industrial manufacturing building. The average lot size in the Project Area for industrial uses is 31,624 square feet compared to a lot size average of 71,003 square feet for industrial parcels within the Industrial Submarket. These conditions restrict the effective use of the land. This is reflected in the impact the sale prices of industrial properties, which are 19 percent lower per square foot than the Industrial Submarket, and the lease rates that are 29 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket.

**TABLE 19
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT REMAINING BLIGHTING CONDITIONS – PROJECT AREA
LACDC – WHITESIDE**

DEFINITION OF BLIGHT	BLIGHTING CONDITIONS IN PROJECT AREA
<p>PHYSICAL BLIGHTING CHARACTERISTICS</p> <p>Buildings in which it is unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work. These conditions can be caused by serious building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction, faulty or inadequate utilities, or similar factors can cause these conditions.</p>	<p>Based upon the field survey, approximately 86 buildings or 29 percent of all structures in the Project Area were rated as either deteriorated or dilapidated with at least one major building element showing signs of advanced deterioration. These conditions can compromise the integrity of the structure, resulting in unsafe or unhealthy conditions to live or work. Major rehabilitation typically represents 25 percent of the property value; therefore, for the substantial rehabilitation of these 86 structures would result in a cost of \$5.3 million. Similarly, these conditions impact the property sales for industrial and commercial uses, which compared to surrounding areas, are 19 and 29 percent lower in the Project Area, respectively.</p>
<p>Factors that prevent or substantially hinder the economically viable use or capacity of buildings or lots. This condition can be caused by substandard design, inadequate building size given present standards and market conditions, lack of parking, or other similar factors.</p>	<p>Three characteristics of substandard design impact the Project Area, age/obsolescence, buildings of inadequate size, and parking deficiencies. In total, 55 percent of the buildings are 55 years or older and are nearing the end of their useful life. Only eight percent of the buildings were built in the past 35 years. Approximately 80 percent of the industrial buildings are less than 25,000 square feet, which is the minimum contemporary size for an industrial manufacturing building. Approximately 29 percent of the commercial buildings are less than 2,000 square feet, which is the minimum contemporary size for a commercial building, such as a fast food restaurant. In all, 27 percent of the parcels contain a parking deficiency, primarily an insufficient number of parking spaces. The age of the buildings combined with size and other factors, such as site and parking deficiencies, reduces their viability evidenced by a 19 percent lower value for industrial sales and 29 percent lower asking lease rates than the Industrial Submarket. In addition, commercial property sales transactions are 29 percent lower in the Project Area than the surrounding area and 79 percent of the commercial properties have either decreased or remained stagnant in terms of assessed values since 1997-98.</p>
<p>Adjacent or nearby uses that are incompatible with each other and which prevent the economic development of those parcels or other portions of the project area.</p>	<p>Incompatible uses in the Project Area include industrial uses and commercial uses located adjacent to residential uses. The industrial and commercial uses have impacted the value of the residential uses. In all, 32 residential are impacted and have an average assessed value of \$55.81 per square foot. The average assessed value of the 320 residential parcels located just outside the Project Area is \$80.37, which is 44 percent higher than the 32 residential parcels that are impacted by adjacent industrial and commercial uses.</p>
<p>The existence of subdivided lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development that are in multiple ownership.</p>	<p>Small lots of irregular shape and inadequate size contribute to the lack of development and reinvestment in the area. The median size of an industrial parcel in the Project Area is 55 percent smaller than in the Industrial Submarket area. Approximately 80 percent of the industrial buildings are less than 25,000 square feet, which is the minimum contemporary size for an industrial manufacturing building. Approximately 88 percent of the commercial parcels are less than 30,000 square feet, which is the minimum contemporary size for a commercial parcel, such as a fast food restaurant. Approximately 96 percent of the single-family residential parcels are less than 5,000 square feet, which is the minimum size for a single-family residential parcel. The size and shape of a parcel impacts the ability to provide adequate-sized buildings and sufficient parking. These parcels by definition are of irregular shape, in that the dimensions of the parcels are inadequate to accommodate contemporary uses. These small and irregular parcels in multiple-ownership are difficult to develop. The impact of the irregular form and shape and inadequate size is demonstrated by the lack of new development in the Project Area and the size of parcels being developed in the industrial subarea. Since 1970, only 27 parcels or 9 percent have been developed in the Project Area</p>

TABLE 19 - CONTINUED

DEFINITION OF BLIGHT ECONOMIC BLIGHTING CHARACTERISTICS	BLIGHTING CONDITIONS IN FOCUS AREA
<p>Depreciated or stagnant property values or impaired investments, including but not necessarily limited to, those properties containing hazardous wastes that require the use of agency authority.</p>	<p>In the Project Area there are both conditions of depreciated or stagnant property values and impaired investments. Since 1997-98, the Project Area has had an average yearly growth in assessed valuation of 4.5 percent compared to 7.6 percent for the County as a whole. Of the 270 assessed parcels within the Project Area, 21 parcels (eight percent) have decreased in value since 1997-98 and 190 parcels (70 percent) have remained stagnant with less than two percent annual growth. In comparison to communities with similar land use profiles, the cities of Commerce, Vernon, Irwindale and Santa Fe Springs have average assessed values that are between two and ten times higher than the Project Area. Impaired investments in the Project Area are evidenced by the low industrial, commercial and residential sales compared to surrounding areas. The average industrial sales transaction between 1993-2004 in the Project Area is 19 percent lower per square foot of building space than the Industrial Submarket. The average commercial sales transaction between 1993-2004 in the Project Area is 29 percent lower per square foot of building space than the surrounding area. The average residential single-family sales transaction between 1999-2005 in the Project Area is 10 percent lower per square foot of building space than the six surrounding zip codes.</p>
<p>Abnormally high business vacancies, abnormally low lease rates, high turnover rates, abandoned buildings, or excessive vacant lots within an area developed for urban use and served by utilities.</p>	<p>Abnormally low lease rates for industrial properties impact the Project Area. The average lease rate for industrial space in the Project Area is \$0.45 per square foot compared \$0.63 in the Industrial Submarket. Therefore, the Project Area had an average lease rate that was 19 percent lower than the Industrial Submarket. This substantial difference in lease rates would be considered abnormally low. The low lease rates are insufficient to support substantial reinvestment of industrial properties unless the balance of the mortgage is paid-off and lease rate revenues are used primarily for on-site improvements.</p>
<p>A lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods, including grocery stores, drug stores, and banks and other lending institutions.</p>	<p>A grocery store typically serves an area located within one to three miles. Although there are approximately 30 small markets located within one mile of the Project Area, these markets are considered specialty or convenience stores that do not sell the type of goods found in a regular grocery store, such as a Vons or Albertson's. The nearest national chain grocery store to the Project Area consists of two Food 4 Less grocery stores approximately two miles away. The Project Area lacks a full service grocery store that is within a convenient distance to residences in the Project Area.</p>
<p>Residential overcrowding or an excess of bars, liquor stores, or businesses that cater exclusively to adults, that has led to problems of public safety and welfare.</p>	<p>The residential uses within the Project Area are located in an area that contains overcrowded conditions. Based upon 2000 Census information, 49 percent of the occupied units within the census tract encompassing the project area was considered overcrowded or severely overcrowded. In comparison, only 26 and 23 percent of the residential units in the City of Los Angeles and the County were either overcrowded or severely overcrowded, respectively. Overcrowding is directly related to the size of the dwelling unit, of which, 34 percent of the single-family units in the Project Area, which make up the majority of residential units, are less than 1,000 square feet, which are small by any measure.</p>
<p>A high crime rate that constitutes a serious threat to the public safety and welfare.</p>	<p>Between 2000-2004, criminal activity in the Sheriff's reporting sub-district that contains the Project Area has increased by 13 percent while crime as a whole has decreased within the East Los Angeles District has decreased by 12 percent. Violent crime has decreased by 32 percent in the East Los Angeles District compared to only ten percent for the sub-district that contains the Project Area. These violent crimes are a serious threat to public safety and welfare.</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES</p>	<p>The infrastructure deficiencies that exist within the Project Area primarily consist of circulation deficiencies, street deterioration, lack of signalization, and drainage deficiencies. The estimated cost of the infrastructure improvements are identified in Section V of this Report.</p>

2. Burden on the Community

Between 1998 and 2005, the Project Area has experienced growth in total assessed valuation of 4.5 percent, which is significantly less than the 7.6 percent annual growth for the County as a whole. Changes in assessed values not only indicate the direction and stability of the economy within a particular area, but also provide implications for County revenue generation. The lower the assessed values, the lower the amounts of property tax revenues to be distributed to the County and other governmental taxing agencies. Meanwhile, County services for the Project Area will continue to be required.

Locally generated revenue (including property tax and retail sales tax revenues) to the County accounts for 23 percent of the County's Budget in FY 2005-06. In contrast, in FY 2001-02, locally generated revenue accounted for approximately 13 percent of the County's total revenue. Although this increase in percentage of locally generated revenues as a portion of the County's total revenues can be partially attributed to an increase in overall property values since 2001, the increase is also a direct result of a decrease in State and Federal assistance. State and Federal assistance has decreased from \$9.6 billion in 2001-02 to \$7.8 billion in 2005-06, which is a decrease of 19 percent in outside funding for the County's budget. The decrease in State and Federal funding affects the amount of available funds to be used for County-related programs and infrastructure projects. As previously discussed, the Project Area requires a number of public improvements that are necessary for not only the economic viability of the area, but include safety improvements such as circulation and traffic signalization (estimated Commission funding of \$2.8 million) and pavement reconstruction of Project Area roadways (estimated Commission funding of \$5.7 million). According to the County's 2005-06 Budget, approximately \$710 million was appropriated for capital projects that address high priority health, public safety, recreation and infrastructure needs. Of this total, only \$34.9 million (five percent) is appropriated for infrastructure improvements to County roads, aviation, and septic systems and the remediation of contaminated sites, of which, none of the funds are earmarked for the Project Area. Based upon this information, there are limited resources available to address the needed capital improvements within the Project Area particularly for an area that, generating a disproportionately small amount of revenues while needing a disproportionately large amount of revenues to subsidize infrastructure improvements.

The lack of available funding at the County level has hindered the County's ability to make necessary public improvements within the Project Area. However, through implementation of the projects and programs described in Section IV, the Plan will provide the necessary improvements and increase the County's property tax base. Furthermore, the Plan will facilitate the development of new housing units.

3. Inability of Private and Public Action without Redevelopment

As previously mentioned, new development in the Project Area has been limited to eight percent of the buildings over the past 30 years. The age, type and condition of the buildings within the

Project Area have made it infeasible for property owners to reinvest in their property. As an example, most of the industrial buildings would require significant improvements to meet contemporary standards for ceiling height, dock high loading, and fire sprinkler systems. However, current rent levels support reinvestment of existing property only if the balance of the mortgages are paid off and lease rate revenues are used primarily for on-site improvements. Based upon the pro forma analysis included in this Report, the average cost for the rehabilitation of an industrial building in the Project Area is \$33 per square foot. The current average rent in the Project Area could generate approximately \$45 per square foot in revenues. Thus, if a typical industrial building was rehabilitated, only \$12 per square foot or 27 percent of the rent revenues could be allocated to paying off the existing mortgage. Furthermore, the acquisition and rehabilitation of an industrial building would cost approximately \$70 per square foot and require a lease rate of \$0.70 per month to be financially feasible, which is unlikely considering that the Project Area, in its present state, does not provide the necessary infrastructure and amenities to achieve average lease rates of \$0.70 per month. It is unlikely that such a scenario could take place without public sector assistance.

The existing infrastructure in the Project Area is deficient and in need of upgrading. As discussed earlier in this Report, this includes street reconstruction, the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. As previously stated, the County does not have adequate funding to assist in the redevelopment of the Project Area and to place the entire infrastructure costs upon the individual property owners would not be feasible or realistic. Without Commission assistance, the current uses and development trends in the Project Area, or lack thereof, will likely continue. This means that the Project Area will be dominated by small marginal industrial uses. These uses will continue to generate low property taxes and pay lower lease rates. As a result, there will continue to be a lack of incentive to develop in the Project Area.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIFIC PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION AND HOW THE PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS WILL IMPROVE OR ALLEVIATE THE CONDITIONS DESCRIBED IN PART III

The CRL requires that a Preliminary Report include a description of the specific projects and programs to be undertaken by the Commission and how such projects and programs will alleviate blight in the Project Area. This section describes the Commission's proposed program of redevelopment and, when applicable, its relationship to blight alleviation in the Project Area. Existing blighting conditions within the Project area include the following: structural deterioration, defective design/physical construction, inadequate building size, parking deficiencies, site deficiencies, incompatible land uses, parcels that are irregular shape or form and inadequate size, decreasing or stagnant assessed values, low property sales, low lease rates, residential overcrowding, inadequate commercial services and a high crime rate. Also included are infrastructure improvement programs to provide the infrastructure to attract private sector investment and to facilitate the development of the biomedical industry.

A. REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The proposed redevelopment projects in the proposed Project Area include the following: 1) Land Assembly and Relocation Program; 2) Public/Private Development Program; 3) Targeted Business Recruitment Program; 4) Brownfields Program; 5) Infrastructure Improvements Program; 6) Streetscape and Gateway Improvements Program; 7) Traffic Circulation, Transit and Parking Improvement Projects; 8) Community Centers, Parks and Open Space Projects; 9) Housing Program; and 10) Community Business Revitalization Program. The projects and programs are designed to address the existing blighting conditions and provide infrastructure for future development within the proposed Project Area.

1. Land Assembly and Relocation Program

The purpose of this program is to assemble small, underutilized and/or poorly configured parcels of property into sites suitable for new development, and to thereafter sell and/or lease property for private development. The Commission's efforts in assembling land would be applied in selective cases. The Commission may assist in the selective assembly of land through voluntary purchase, negotiated purchase, or eminent domain.²⁰

By expanding existing buildings the Commission will help to reduce the number of inadequate sized buildings, which will in turn accommodate a wider variety of contemporary commercial and industrial uses, with a specific emphasis on low-rise office space. By assembling small parcels the Commission will reduce the number of

²⁰ Only applies to non-conforming residential uses within the Project Area as designated in the County's General Plan.

inadequate sized parcels in multiple ownership and provide adequate space to develop contemporary facilities or expand existing buildings to accommodate a wider variety of uses.

Land assembly would likely take place in response to property owner, developer or Commission initiated efforts to assemble property needed for the expansion of existing uses or for the creation of sites capable of development for new uses. The Commission may also choose to participate in the acquisition of property for infrastructure or public facilities purposes, which would primarily benefit the Project Area. The program may also include site preparation activities such as demolition and clearance, and assistance for environmental remediation.

The Commission will provide relocation assistance as required by California State Housing and Community Development Regulations and Commission Guidelines. This will ensure that uniform, fair, and equitable treatment is afforded to displaced businesses and residents as a result of the Commission's land assembly and relocation program. Specific details will be provided in the actual Relocation Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Relocation assistance may include the relocation of businesses or public/semi-public maintenance yards from outside the proposed Project Area into the proposed Project Area.

2. Public/Private Development Program

Public/private coordination occurs when the Commission participates in significant private development projects. Through an Owner Participation Agreement or Disposition and Development Agreement, the Commission may grant or loan money to assist new industrial/commercial development or expansion of existing development facilities. This program may fund construction, landscaping, parking lot improvements and County's Public Work's development requirements (e.g. fire hydrants or traffic mitigation projects, etc.). The implementation of this program will improve the overall quality and aesthetics of the Project Area by improving existing buildings or by developing new contemporary facilities, which will alleviate related blighting conditions such as structural deterioration, defective design/faulty construction, inadequate parking and inadequate building size while increasing the overall value of the property.

3. Targeted Business Recruitment

This program would create incentives for recruitment of specific types of businesses that which would provide goods and services that are desired by the local community.

In addition, the Commission would like to attract businesses that will create well paying jobs in industries with strong future growth potential. The Commission specifically

intends to work towards establishment of businesses engaged in biomedical research and production.

4. Brownfields

By utilizing the provisions of the California Polanco Act and federal Brownfields legislation, the Commission will be able to work with private developers and land owners to identify, investigate, remediate, and possibly acquire environmentally contaminated properties without incurring liability under state and local laws that might accompany such actions. This will allow properties that are currently vacant and contaminated to be redeveloped.

5. Infrastructure Improvements Program

Infrastructure improvements cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting utilities, traffic capacity projects and new streets, undergrounding overhead transmission lines, storm drainage and sanitary sewers, bridges and under or overcrossings, flood control improvements, creek stabilization and enhancements, freeway noise walls, and many other assorted capital projects.

Improving the infrastructure will help to attract development to the area by eliminating costs that might otherwise be born by the private sector. This should help to increase building activity and improve property values.

6. Streetscape and Gateway Improvements Program

The streetscape program includes constructing new curbs, gutters and sidewalks where they do not exist or where broken curbs, gutters and sidewalks require replacement; installing street trees and shrubs; constructing both decorative and handicapped accessible crosswalks; constructing new medians with landscaping; adding visual and safety improvements to existing medians; installing street furniture, such as trash receptacles and newspaper racks; and improving area lighting by increasing the number of luminaries, increasing the wattage of individual streetlights or adding pedestrian streetlights.

Like streetscapes, gateways into an area are desirable for announcing a transition from one area to another. Gateways can be accomplished through banners, entry features, public art, architecture or a variety of other ways. These improvements will improve the desirability of the neighborhoods and encourage development and rehabilitation.

7. Traffic Circulation, Transit and Parking Improvement Projects

The Commission will work with the County Department of Public Works to improve traffic circulation in the area to better accommodate new and existing development including traffic signal controls, signals and transportation management strategies. Transit

improvements include such things as bus shelters and bus stops, park and ride lots, bicycle facilities, and transit center and corridor improvements. Parking improvements include providing additional parking lots/garages for businesses and improving parking along public rights-of-way.

8. Community Centers, Park and Open Space Projects

Community-based projects focus on the need for new or improved community facilities such as parks, community centers, libraries, community gardens, open space and cultural facilities. Projects are anticipated for development using Commission and/or other funds from the County, State and Federal governments. These projects are intended to encourage further investment in their respective neighborhoods and make them more desirable places to visit and live.

9. Housing Program

As required by State law, 20 percent of the gross tax increment funds received by the Commission must be deposited into a fund that assists in the preservation and production of affordable housing. The Commission would use these funds for residential rehabilitation grants and to financially assist new housing construction designated for low- and moderate-income persons.

By increasing investment in neighborhoods there will be an added benefit of assisting the rehabilitation of deteriorated buildings and alleviate the existence of substandard structures. Also, by providing additional recreation facilities certain crimes related to gang activity should be reduced.

10. Community Business Revitalization Program

The Community Business Revitalization Program (CBR) provides grants with a cash match to businesses for the purposes of storefront improvements and façade treatments. This program provides assistance to businesses in Redevelopment Project Areas to encourage restoring, modernizing and improving the facades of commercial structures to enhance the attractiveness and visibility of the area. Typical improvements would include paint, signage, windows, doors, awnings, stucco, roof, lighting, and security grills.

By eliminating physical deterioration and improving the substandard (obsolete) appearance of the commercial/industrial buildings and surrounding sites, more patrons will be attracted which will improve declining retail sales. The increased business activity should slow the rate of business closures and attract new businesses to the Project Area. Also, by improving the buildings property values should increase.

V. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED METHOD OF FINANCING THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY, AND REASONS FOR INCLUDING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

Section 33344.5(d) of the CRL provides that the Preliminary Report for the adoption of the Project contain a preliminary assessment of the proposed method of financing the Project, including an assessment of economic feasibility and the reasons for including a provision for the division of taxes pursuant to Section 33670.

Economic feasibility, for purposes of this analysis, is defined to be a comparative analysis of anticipated costs for implementation of the proposed Plan to the resulting revenues projected for the Project. Under existing redevelopment law, the effectiveness of the Plan is limited to 30 years (except for payment of indebtedness and the enforcement of covenants) and the collection of tax increment to repay indebtedness may occur for an additional 15 years thereafter.

This analysis is intended to provide a preliminary assessment of the proposed method of financing the redevelopment of the Project as authorized under existing law. This Report is also intended to provide an assessment of the economic feasibility of the Project and reasons for including tax increment financing and other financing sources in the proposed Plan.

This section contains a general discussion of the costs associated with the proposed redevelopment program of activities, and an evaluation of the general financing methods that may be available to the Commission. Economic feasibility is determined through a summarized feasibility cash flow analysis for the Project as summarized on Table 20.

A. ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

A determination of economic feasibility requires an identification of the potential costs associated with redevelopment of the Project. Redevelopment could require significant participation from the Commission in activities to promote and achieve the goals and objectives of the Plan and to address blighting conditions. The feasibility cash flow projecting the available funding of the general fund programs of the Project (net of the housing set aside) is summarized on Table 20. The proposed activities and programs of the Project are as follows:

1. Land Assembly & Relocation;
2. Public/Private Development;
3. Targeted Business Recruitment;
4. Brownfields;
5. Infrastructure Improvements;

6. Streetscape & Gateway Improvement;
7. Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking;
8. Community Centers, Parks, etc.; and
9. Community Business Revitalization.

The Commission also anticipates other costs associated with meeting the financial obligations for implementing an effective redevelopment program. These include costs for administration, net interest costs on future bonded indebtedness, and repayment of any other future indebtedness of the Project.

The redevelopment program described in this Report outlines a set of activities to be implemented by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating private reinvestment in the Project and eliminating physical and economic blighting influences, and increasing, improving and preserving the community's supply of low and moderate income housing. Upon termination of the 30-year effectiveness of the Redevelopment Plan, the Commission can continue to receive tax increment to repay Project Area indebtedness. This feasibility cash flow assumes the debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 is proportionately allocated among the proposed redevelopment programs assumed to be implemented. The estimated cost of the proposed redevelopment programs over the term of the projection is as follows:

Redevelopment Programs:	
Land Assembly & Relocation	\$5,078,000
Public/Private Development	6,346,000
Targeted Business Recruitment	1,269,000
Brownfields	1,269,000
Infrastructure Improvements	5,078,000
Streetscape & Gateway Improvements	1,269,000
Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking	2,539,000
Community Centers & Parks	1,269,000
Community Business Revitalization	1,269,000
Bond Debt Service (assumed)	8,040,000
Administration	<u>3,700,000</u>
 Totals Estimated Costs	 \$37,126,000

1. Land Assembly and Relocation

The purpose of this program is to assemble small underutilized and/or poorly configured parcels of property into sites suitable for new development, and to thereafter sell and/or lease property for private development. The program may also include site preparation activities such as demolition and clearance, and assistance for environmental

remediation. The Commission will provide relocation assistance as required by California State Housing and Community Development Regulations and Commission Guidelines. It is assumed that 20 percent of annual Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$5,078,000.

2. Public/Private Development

Public/Private coordination occurs when the Commission participates in significant private development projects. Through an Owner Participation Agreement or Disposition and Development Agreement, the Commission may grant or loan money to assist new industrial/commercial development or expansion of existing development facilities. This program may fund construction, landscaping, parking lot improvements and County's Public Work's development requirements (e.g. fire hydrants or traffic mitigation projects, etc.). The implementation of this program will improve the overall quality and aesthetics of the Project Area by improving existing buildings or by developing new contemporary facilities, which will alleviate related blighting conditions such as structural deterioration, defective design/faulty construction, inadequate parking and inadequate building size while increasing the overall value of the property. It is assumed that 25 percent of annual Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$6,346,000.

3. Targeted Business Recruitment

The Commission seeks to attract businesses that will create well paying jobs in industries with strong future growth potential. This program would create incentives for recruitment of specific types of businesses that would provide goods and services desired by the local community. The Commission specifically intends to work towards establishment of businesses engaged in biomedical research and production. It is assumed that five percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$1,269,000.

4. Brownfields

The Commission intends to utilize the provisions of the California Polanco Act and federal Brownfields legislation to work with private developers and land owners to identify, investigate, remediate, and possibly acquire environmentally contaminated properties without incurring liability under state and local laws that might accompany such actions. This will allow properties that are currently vacant and contaminated to be redeveloped. It is assumed that five percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation

activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$1,269,000.

5. Infrastructure Improvements

The Commission intends to attract development to the area by eliminating costs that might otherwise be born by the private sector. This should help to increase building activity and improve property values. Infrastructure improvements cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting utilities, traffic capacity projects and new streets, undergrounding overhead transmission lines, storm drainage and sanitary sewers, bridges and under or over crossings, flood control improvements, creek stabilization and enhancements, freeway noise walls, and many other assorted capital projects. It is assumed that 20 percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$5,078,000.

6. Streetscape and Gateway Improvement

The Commission desires to improve the quality of the streetscape and gateway of the Project by constructing new curbs, gutters and sidewalks where they do not exist or where broken curbs, gutters and sidewalks require replacement; installing street trees and shrubs; constructing both decorative and handicapped accessible crosswalks; constructing new medians with landscaping; adding visual and safety improvements to existing medians; installing street furniture, such as trash receptacles and newspaper racks; and improving area lighting by increasing the number of luminaries, increasing the wattage of individual streetlights or adding pedestrian streetlights. It is assumed that five percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$1,269,000.

7. Traffic Circulation, Transit and Parking

The Commission will work with the County Department of Public Works to improve traffic circulation in the area to better accommodate new and existing development. Transit improvements include such things as bus shelters and bus stops, park and ride lots, bicycle facilities, and transit center and corridor improvements. Parking improvements include providing additional parking lots/garages for businesses and improving parking along public rights-of-way. It is assumed that 10 percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$2,539,000.

8. Community Centers, Parks, etc.

The Commission desires to implement community-based projects focused on the need for new or improved community facilities such as parks, community centers, libraries, community gardens, open space and cultural facilities to encourage further investment in their respective neighborhoods and make them more desirable places to visit and live. These projects will use Commission and/or other funds from the County, State and Federal governments. It is assumed that five percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$1,269,000.

9. Community Business Revitalization (CBR)

The Commission desires to eliminate physical deterioration and improve the substandard (obsolete) appearance of the commercial/industrial buildings and surrounding sites, attract more patrons, and thus improve declining retail sales. The Commission will provide assistance to businesses in Redevelopment Project Areas to encourage restoring, modernizing and improving the facades of commercial structures to enhance the attractiveness and visibility of the area. Typical improvements would include paint, signage, windows, doors, awnings, stucco, roof, lighting, and security grills. It is assumed that five percent of Project funding will be used to finance this implementation activity. Total estimated funding for this implementation activity over the anticipated life of the Project, including debt repayment in Years 31 to 45 as estimated on the attached feasibility cash flow, is projected to total \$1,269,000.

10. Tax Allocation Bond Debt Service (Assumed)

The feasibility cash flow projection assumes that the Commission will consider all funding alternatives allowable under the CRL to finance the anticipated redevelopment programs discussed above, including, for purposes of this analysis, the issuance of tax allocation bonds. The Commission may utilize tax increment revenues generated in the Project to secure the debt service of tax allocation bonds to assist in the financing of anticipated project costs. The issuance of tax-exempt bonds and the use of said proceeds are subject to certain federal tax restrictions. The financing of the identified implementation strategy costs incorporated on Table 20 could permit for the issuance of bonds or notes on a tax-exempt basis.

The feasibility cash flow assumes that the Commission will issue tax allocation bonds commencing in the fifth year after the plan adoption, in which tax increment revenues are projected to be sufficient to support net bond proceeds totaling \$11.1 million. Commencing in the tenth, fifteenth, and twentieth years after the plan adoption, net tax increment revenues are assumed to be used for the issuance of additional new bonds. The combined bonded indebtedness projected to be issued by the Commission over this period shown on Table 20 totals \$4.6 million. The aggregate principal and interest payments for the

combined bond series over the life of the Project is projected to total \$8 million and the resulting net interest cost totals approximately \$3.4 million (based upon an assumed bond interest rate of five percent, a coverage ratio of 40 percent, net proceeds factor of 12 percent, and capitalized over a maximum 30-year term or over the effective life of the Plan, whichever is sooner).

11. Administration

The projected cost to administer the redevelopment program over the life of the Project is assumed to be equivalent to 25 percent of gross available tax increment each year. Total projected cost to administer the redevelopment program over the life of the Plan is estimated to be \$3,700,000.

B. FINANCING METHODS AVAILABLE TO THE COMMISSION

The Plan is prepared with the intent of providing the Commission with the necessary legal authority and flexibility to implement the revitalization of the Project. The Plan authorizes the Commission to finance the Project with financial assistance from any or all of the following sources: (1) County of Los Angeles; (2) State of California; (3) federal government; (4) tax increment funds in accordance with provisions of the existing CRL; (5) Commission bonds; (6) interest income; (7) loans from private financial institutions; (8) lease or sale of Commission-owned property; (9) donations; and (10) any other legally available public or private sources.

Current provisions of the CRL provide authority to the Commission to create indebtedness, issue bonds, borrow funds or obtain advances in implementing and carrying out the specific intents of a redevelopment plan. The Commission is authorized to fund the principal and interest on the indebtedness, bond issues, borrowed funds or advances from tax increment revenue and any other funds available to the Commission. To the extent that it is able to do so, the City may also supply additional assistance through City loans or grants for various public facilities or other project costs.

Potential revenue sources to fund project costs, as assumed in this economic feasibility cash flow, include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) tax increment revenues; (2) proceeds from tax allocation bonds; and (3) interest earnings. The estimated resources available to finance the proposed redevelopment programs are summarized as follows:

Net Tax Increment Revenue (Yrs 1-45)	\$32,304,000
Net Bond Proceeds	4,590,000
Interest Earnings - General & Reserve Funds	<u>232,000</u>
Total Aggregate Resources	\$37,126,000

1. Tax Increment Revenues

A summary of the projection of the incremental taxable values and resulting tax increment revenues for the Project over the term of the Plan is shown on Table 21. The gross total tax increment revenues for the Project over the 45-year period during which the Commission could receive tax increment, is projected to amount to \$72 million, of which \$14.4 million would be required for deposit into the Housing Fund, \$1.4 million would be charged by the County for administrative overhead, and \$23.9 million would be allocated to affected taxing entities under the statutory pass through formula required under AB 1290. The net tax increment revenues available to the Commission over the 45-year term totals \$32.3 million.

Health and Safety Code Section 33333.2 permits the Commission to receive tax increment revenue for up to an additional 15 years after the 30-year Plan termination date to repay indebtedness. The projected amount of tax increment revenue available in this 15-year period is assumed to be expended by the Commission for the repayment of such indebtedness in amounts proportionate to the redevelopment programs assumed herein.

In addition, as previously stated, the Commission proposes to merge the Whiteside Project Area with the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area, of which, a portion of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area along with the Project Area will consist of the Focus Area as the primary location for future biomedical industry development. In the 2003-04 fiscal year, the tax increment generated from the portion of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area located within the Focus Area, totaled \$435,550. The Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area was adopted in 1999, therefore has 24 years (2029) remaining for project duration and 39 years (2043) to collect tax increment and repay debt. Based upon a modest three percent growth on the available net tax increment, the portion of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area proposed to be included in the Focus Area could conservatively generate \$72.4 million (\$24.3 million in today's dollars) over the remaining period to collect tax increment. A portion of this increment may be available to provide additional funding for programs in the Whiteside Project Area thereby expediting the attainment of the Commission's goals and elimination of blight.

Tax increment revenues are based upon increases in the annual incremental assessed valuation of the Project, which result from future transfers of property ownership or new construction activities and the two percent real property annual inflationary increase allowable under Article XIII A of the California Constitution. For purposes of this projection, (Whiteside only) the Commission has identified new developments in the Project that would result in value added to the property tax rolls. The projected value added from these new developments is calculated on Table 22.

2. Proceeds from Bonds

The Commission may pledge tax increment revenues to secure the principal and interest payments of tax allocation bonds issued to finance anticipated program costs. The issuance of tax-exempt bonds and the use of said proceeds are subject to federal tax restrictions. The economic feasibility of the financing plan reflected on Table 20 is based upon the Commission's issuance of potential tax allocation bonds generating approximately \$4.6 million in net proceeds. The feasibility cash flow assumes that the Commission will consider tax allocation bond financing and other loan financing alternatives.

3. Interest Income

The Commission may receive interest earnings generated from funds on deposit in the bond reserve funds, project operating funds and other special funds established for the Project. Since the issuance of tax allocation bonds is assumed in the Table 20 cash flow, interest earnings from monies deposited in a bond reserve fund are anticipated. Interest earnings are based upon an assumed three percent rate.

C. PROPOSED FINANCING METHOD, ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY, AND REASONS FOR INCLUDING TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

The anticipated costs to implement a program of revitalization in the Project will require significant participation from the Commission as it implements activities that promote and achieve the stated goals and objectives of the Plan. Economic feasibility of the Plan has been determined based upon a comparative cash flow analysis of the anticipated costs for implementation of the proposed redevelopment program to the resulting projected resources projected over the life of the Project.

The economic feasibility summarized on Table 20 was created to represent one scenario of economic feasibility. At the discretion of the Commission, other funding sources discussed above may also represent viable funding alternatives for economic feasibility of the Plan. Although the Commission may consider other funding sources permitted in the Plan, not all of the funding sources may be available or be feasible for the Commission to use in financing the anticipated costs and revenue shortfalls. In the event that neither the City nor the private market acting alone could fully bear the costs associated with revitalization of the Project, the implementation of a redevelopment program utilizing tax increment revenues must be considered as a viable financing tool.

No assurances are provided by KMA as to the certainty of the projected tax increment revenues shown in the attached tables. The projection reflects KMA's understanding of the assessment and tax apportionment procedures employed by the County. The County procedures are subject to change as a reflection of policy revisions or legislative mandate. Any State mandated payments resulting from current or proposed legislation, and incorporated herein, reflects State policies known to KMA at the present time and are subject to future legislative changes that could impact this projection.

While we believe our estimates to be reasonable, actual taxable values will vary from the amounts assumed in the projection. Actual revenues may be higher or lower than what has been projected and are subject to valuation changes resulting from new developments or transfers of ownership not specifically identified herein, actual resolution of outstanding appeals, future filing of appeals, or the non-payment of taxes due. A reasonable attempt has been made to forecast the redevelopment projects, programs and activities that could be undertaken in the Project. However, actual funding will be based upon actual revenues available to the Commission in future fiscal years. Therefore, the expenditure program reflected on Table 20 is presented as an "order of magnitude" estimate based upon the forecasted tax increment revenues.

D. BONDED INDEBTEDNESS LIMIT

Based upon the financing method discussed above, the following bond limit, as required by the CRL for inclusion in the Plan, has been determined. The total bonds supported in whole or in part by tax increment revenues, which may be outstanding at one time may not exceed \$70,000,000. This amount has been determined based on total projected redevelopment implementation and administrative costs.

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 20
Economic Feasibility Cash Flow
Proposed Whiteside Project
Los Angeles County
Community Development Commission
(000's Omitted)

	Base	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
I. Source of Funds																
Net Tax Increment (Table 2)	0	0	35	53	91	130	169	210	251	293	336	368	400	432	466	500
Net Future Bond Proceeds	0	0	0	0	0	1,149	0	0	0	0	1,618	0	0	0	0	1,067
Bond Reserve Interest at 3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	7	7	7	7	7
Total Sources	0	0	35	53	91	1,279	171	212	253	295	1,957	375	407	439	473	1,574
II. Use of Funds																
Future Bond Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	93	93	93	93	240	240	240	240	240
Administration at 25% (Yrs 1-30)	0	0	9	13	23	32	42	52	63	73	84	92	100	108	116	125
Redevelopment Program (Yrs 1-30)	0	0	26	40	68	1,247	36	67	98	129	1,780	42	66	91	116	1,209
Total Uses	0	0	35	53	91	1,279	171	212	253	295	1,957	375	407	439	473	1,574
Redevelopment Program Detail:																
Land Assembly & Relocation	0	0	5	8	14	249	7	13	20	26	356	8	13	18	23	242
Public/Private Development	0	0	7	10	17	312	9	17	24	32	445	11	17	23	29	302
Targeted Business Recruitment	0	0	1	2	3	62	2	3	5	6	89	2	3	5	6	60
Brownfields	0	0	1	2	3	62	2	3	5	6	89	2	3	5	6	60
Infrastructure Improvements	0	0	5	8	14	249	7	13	20	26	356	8	13	18	23	242
Streetscape & Gateway Improvement	0	0	1	2	3	62	2	3	5	6	89	2	3	5	6	60
Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking	0	0	3	4	7	125	4	7	10	13	178	4	7	9	12	121
Community Centers, Parks, etc.	0	0	1	2	3	62	2	3	5	6	89	2	3	5	6	60
Community Business Revitalization	0	0	1	2	3	62	2	3	5	6	89	2	3	5	6	60
Total Redevelopment Programs	0	0	26	40	68	1,247	36	67	98	129	1,780	42	66	91	116	1,209

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 20
Economic Feasibility Cash Flow
Proposed Whiteside Project
Los Angeles County
Community Development Commission
(000's Omitted)

	Debt Incurrence Limit												Plan Effective Limit			
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27		28	29	30
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33	2033-34	2034-35	2035-36	
I. Source of Funds																
Net Tax Increment (Table 2)	535	571	607	631	656	681	707	733	761	789	818	848	879	910	943	
Net Future Bond Proceeds	0	0	0	0	755	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bond Reserve Interest at 3%	10	10	10	10	10	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	11	
Total Sources	545	581	617	641	1,421	695	721	747	775	803	832	862	893	924	954	
II. Use of Funds																
Future Bond Debt Service	357	357	357	357	357	468	468	468	468	468	468	468	468	468	376	
Administration at 25% (Yrs 1-30)	134	143	152	158	164	170	177	183	190	197	205	212	220	228	236	
Redevelopment Program (Yrs 1-30)	54	81	108	126	900	56	76	96	116	138	159	182	205	228	343	
Total Uses	545	581	617	641	1,421	695	721	747	775	803	832	862	893	924	954	
Redevelopment Program Detail:																
Land Assembly & Relocation	11	16	22	25	180	11	15	19	23	28	32	36	41	46	69	
Public/Private Development	14	20	27	32	225	14	19	24	29	34	40	45	51	57	86	
Targeted Business Recruitment	3	4	5	6	45	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	17	
Brownfields	3	4	5	6	45	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	17	
Infrastructure Improvements	11	16	22	25	180	11	15	19	23	28	32	36	41	46	69	
Streetscape & Gateway Improvement	3	4	5	6	45	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	17	
Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking	5	8	11	13	90	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	23	34	
Community Centers, Parks, etc.	3	4	5	6	45	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	17	
Community Business Revitalization	3	4	5	6	45	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	17	
Total Redevelopment Programs	54	81	108	126	900	56	76	96	116	138	159	182	205	228	343	

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 20
Economic Feasibility Cash Flow
Proposed Whiteside Project
Los Angeles County
Community Development Commission
(000's Omitted)

	Repayment of Any Future Indebtedness Incurred for Redevelopment Programs in Years 31 to 45															Debt Repayment Limit
	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	
	2036-37	2037-38	2038-39	2039-40	2040-41	2041-42	2042-43	2043-44	2044-45	2045-46	2046-47	2047-48	2048-49	2049-50	2050-51	
I. Source of Funds																
Net Tax Increment (Table 2)	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	
Net Future Bond Proceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bond Reserve Interest at 3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Sources	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	
II. Use of Funds																
Future Bond Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Administration at 25% (Yrs 1-30)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Redevelopment Program (Yrs 1-30)	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	
Total Uses	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	
Redevelopment Program Detail:																
Land Assembly & Relocation	193	198	204	209	214	220	226	232	238	244	251	257	264	271	279	
Public/Private Development	242	248	255	261	268	275	282	290	297	305	313	322	330	339	348	
Targeted Business Recruitment	48	50	51	52	54	55	56	58	59	61	63	64	66	68	70	
Brownfields	48	50	51	52	54	55	56	58	59	61	63	64	66	68	70	
Infrastructure Improvements	193	198	204	209	214	220	226	232	238	244	251	257	264	271	279	
Streetscape & Gateway Improvement	48	50	51	52	54	55	56	58	59	61	63	64	66	68	70	
Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking	97	99	102	104	107	110	113	116	119	122	125	129	132	136	139	
Community Centers, Parks, etc.	48	50	51	52	54	55	56	58	59	61	63	64	66	68	70	
Community Business Revitalization	48	50	51	52	54	55	56	58	59	61	63	64	66	68	70	
Total Redevelopment Programs	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	

PRELIMINARY

Table 20
Economic Feasibility Cash Flow
Proposed Whiteside Project
Los Angeles County
Community Development Commission
(000's Omitted)

	Years 1-45		
	Totals Years 1-45	NPV 5%	% Total
I. Source of Funds			
Net Tax Increment (Table 2)	32,304	8,125	75.4%
Net Future Bond Proceeds	4,590	2,564	23.8%
Bond Reserve Interest at 3%	232	82	0.8%
Total Sources	37,126	10,771	100.0%
II. Use of Funds			
Future Bond Debt Service	8,040	2,893	26.9%
Administration at 25% (Yrs 1-30)	3,700	1,380	12.8%
Redevelopment Program (Yrs 1-30)	25,386	6,498	60.3%
Total Uses	37,126	10,771	100.0%
Redevelopment Program Detail:			
Land Assembly & Relocation	5,077	1,300	20.0%
Public/Private Development	6,346	1,625	25.0%
Targeted Business Recruitment	1,269	325	5.0%
Brownfields	1,269	325	5.0%
Infrastructure Improvements	5,077	1,300	20.0%
Streetscape & Gateway Improvement	1,269	325	5.0%
Traffic Circulation, Transit & Parking	2,539	650	10.0%
Community Centers, Parks, etc.	1,269	325	5.0%
Community Business Revitalization	1,269	325	5.0%
Total Redevelopment Programs	25,386	6,498	100.0%

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 21
 Tax Increment Projection
 Proposed Whiteside Project
 Los Angeles County
 Community Development Commission
 (000's Omitted)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Reported												
Project Year												
Fiscal Year	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Assessed Values												
Existing Real Property at 3%	98,794	101,758	104,811	107,955	111,194	114,530	117,965	121,504	125,150	128,904	132,771	136,754
Personal Property	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837
New Development Real	-	-	-	-	2,125	4,292	6,503	8,758	11,058	13,403	15,796	18,237
New Development Personal Prop	-	-	-	-	1,173	2,347	3,520	4,694	5,867	7,040	8,214	9,387
Total Assessed Values	126,631	129,595	132,648	135,792	142,329	149,005	155,825	162,792	169,911	177,185	184,618	192,215
Increment Over Base \$126,631	-	-	6,017	9,161	15,698	22,374	29,194	36,161	43,280	50,554	57,987	65,584
Project Revenues												
Tax Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Gross TI Revenue at 1%	-	-	60	92	157	224	292	362	433	506	580	656
County Admin Fee at 2%	-	-	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(12)	(13)
Net Tax Increment Revenue	0	0	59	90	154	219	286	354	424	495	568	643
Less Requirements:												
Housing Set-Aside at 20%	-	-	(12)	(18)	(31)	(45)	(58)	(72)	(87)	(101)	(116)	(131)
AB 1290 Payments	-	-	(12)	(18)	(31)	(45)	(58)	(72)	(87)	(101)	(116)	(144)
Net After Housing & Pass Through	-	-	35	53	91	130	169	210	251	293	336	368

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 21
 Tax Increment Projection
 Proposed Whiteside Project
 Los Angeles County
 Community Development Commission
 (000's Omitted)

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Project Year	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Fiscal Year												
Assessed Values												
Existing Real Property at 3%	140,857	145,083	149,435	153,918	158,536	163,292	168,191	173,236	178,433	183,786	189,300	194,979
Personal Property	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837
New Development Real	20,727	23,266	25,856	28,498	31,193	33,941	36,745	37,480	38,230	38,994	39,774	40,570
New Development Personal Prop	10,561	11,734	12,907	14,081	15,254	16,428	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601
Total Assessed Values	199,981	207,919	216,035	224,334	232,819	241,498	250,373	256,154	262,101	268,218	274,512	280,986
Increment Over Base \$126,631	73,350	81,288	89,404	97,703	106,188	114,867	123,742	129,523	135,470	141,587	147,881	154,355
Project Revenues												
Tax Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Gross TI Revenue at 1%	733	813	894	977	1,062	1,149	1,237	1,295	1,355	1,416	1,479	1,544
County Admin Fee at 2%	(15)	(16)	(18)	(20)	(21)	(23)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(30)	(31)
Net Tax Increment Revenue	719	797	876	957	1,041	1,126	1,213	1,269	1,328	1,388	1,449	1,513
Less Requirements:												
Housing Set-Aside at 20%	(147)	(163)	(179)	(195)	(212)	(230)	(247)	(259)	(271)	(283)	(296)	(309)
AB 1290 Payments	(173)	(202)	(232)	(262)	(293)	(325)	(358)	(379)	(401)	(424)	(447)	(471)
Net After Housing & Pass Through	400	432	466	500	535	571	607	631	656	681	707	733

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 21
 Tax Increment Projection
 Proposed Whiteside Project
 Los Angeles County
 Community Development Commission
 (000's Omitted)

	Project Year											
	24 2029-30	25 2030-31	26 2031-32	27 2032-33	28 2033-34	29 2034-35	30 2035-36	31 2036-37	32 2037-38	33 2038-39	34 2039-40	35 2040-41
Assessed Values												
Existing Real Property at 3%	200,828	206,853	213,059	219,451	226,034	232,815	239,800	246,994	254,403	262,035	269,896	277,993
Personal Property	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837
New Development Real	41,381	42,209	43,053	43,914	44,792	45,688	46,602	47,534	48,484	49,454	50,443	51,452
New Development Personal Prop	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601
Total Assessed Values	287,647	294,499	301,549	308,802	316,264	323,941	331,839	339,965	348,325	356,927	365,777	374,883
Increment Over Base \$126,631	161,016	167,868	174,918	182,171	189,633	197,310	205,208	213,334	221,694	230,296	239,146	248,252
Project Revenues												
Tax Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Gross TI Revenue at 1%	1,610	1,679	1,749	1,822	1,896	1,973	2,052	2,133	2,217	2,303	2,391	2,483
County Admin Fee at 2%	(32)	(34)	(35)	(36)	(38)	(39)	(41)	(43)	(44)	(46)	(48)	(50)
Net Tax Increment Revenue	1,578	1,645	1,714	1,785	1,858	1,934	2,011	2,091	2,173	2,257	2,344	2,433
Less Requirements:												
Housing Set-Aside at 20%	(322)	(336)	(350)	(364)	(379)	(395)	(410)	(427)	(443)	(461)	(478)	(497)
AB 1290 Payments	(495)	(520)	(546)	(573)	(600)	(629)	(658)	(697)	(737)	(778)	(821)	(864)
Net After Housing & Pass Through	761	789	818	848	879	910	943	967	992	1,018	1,045	1,072

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Table 21
 Tax Increment Projection
 Proposed Whiteside Project
 Los Angeles County
 Community Development Commission
 (000's Omitted)

	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	Debt Repayment Limit
Project Year	2041-42	2042-43	2043-44	2044-45	2045-46	2046-47	2047-48	2048-49	2049-50	2050-51	
Fiscal Year											
Assessed Values											
Existing Real Property at 3%	286,333	294,923	303,771	312,884	322,271	331,939	341,897	352,154	362,718	373,600	
Personal Property	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	27,837	
New Development Real	52,481	53,531	54,601	55,693	56,807	57,943	59,102	60,284	61,490	62,720	
New Development Personal Prop	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	17,601	
Total Assessed Values	384,252	393,892	403,810	414,015	424,515	435,320	446,437	457,876	469,646	481,757	
Increment Over Base \$126,631	257,621	267,261	277,179	287,384	297,884	308,689	319,806	331,245	343,015	355,126	
Project Revenues											
Tax Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	
Gross TI Revenue at 1%	2,576	2,673	2,772	2,874	2,979	3,087	3,198	3,312	3,430	3,551	
County Admin Fee at 2%	(52)	(53)	(55)	(57)	(60)	(62)	(64)	(66)	(69)	(71)	
Net Tax Increment Revenue	2,525	2,619	2,716	2,816	2,919	3,025	3,134	3,246	3,362	3,480	
Less Requirements:											
Housing Set-Aside at 20%	(515)	(535)	(554)	(575)	(596)	(617)	(640)	(662)	(686)	(710)	
AB 1290 Payments	(909)	(956)	(1,003)	(1,052)	(1,103)	(1,154)	(1,208)	(1,263)	(1,319)	(1,377)	
Net After Housing & Pass Through	1,100	1,129	1,159	1,189	1,221	1,253	1,287	1,321	1,356	1,393	

Table 22
 New Development Assumptions
 Proposed Whiteside Redevelopment Project
 Los Angeles County Community Development Commission

Scope	Total Value	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
1 Commercial - Real Property	50,000 sq ft	-	-	-	-	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333
2 Commercial - Personal Property	50,000 sq ft	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
3 Biotechnology - Real Property	82,023 sq ft	-	-	-	-	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733
4 Biotechnology - Personal Property	82,023 sq ft	-	-	-	-	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200
5 Industrial - Real Property	304,939 sq ft	-	-	-	-	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400
6 Industrial - Personal Property	304,939 sq ft	-	-	-	-	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200
7 Residential - Real Property	80,000 sq ft	-	-	-	-	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333
Total Potential Value Added per Year		0	0	0	0	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200
Total Real Property Value Added		0	0	0	0	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800
Cumulative New Value with Prop 13 Growth at		0	0	0	0	2,124,800	4,292,096	6,502,738	8,757,593	11,057,545
Total Personal Property Value Added		0	0	0	0	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400
Cumulative Personal Property Value		0	0	0	0	1,173,400	2,346,800	3,520,200	4,693,600	5,867,000

Table 22
 New Development Assumptions
 Proposed Whiteside Redevelopment Project
 Los Angeles County Community Development Commission

Scope	Total Value	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
1 Commercial - Real Property	4,250,000	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333	283,333
2 Commercial - Personal Property	750,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
3 Biotechnology - Real Property	4,511,000	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733	300,733
4 Biotechnology - Personal Property	9,228,000	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200	615,200
5 Industrial - Real Property	17,991,000	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400	1,199,400
6 Industrial - Personal Property	7,623,000	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200	508,200
7 Residential - Real Property	5,120,000	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333	341,333
Total Potential Value Added per Year	49,473,000	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200	3,298,200

Total Real Property Value Added
 Cumulative New Value with Prop 13 Growth at

2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800	2,124,800
13,403,495	15,796,365	18,237,093	20,726,634	23,265,967	25,856,087	28,498,008	31,192,768	33,941,424		

Total Personal Property Value Added
 Cumulative Personal Property Value

1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400	1,173,400
7,040,400	8,213,800	9,387,200	10,560,600	11,734,000	12,907,400	14,080,800	15,254,200	16,427,600		

Table 22
 New Development Assumptions
 Proposed Whiteside Redevelopment Project
 Los Angeles County Community Development Commission

	Scope	Total Value				
		27 2032-33	28 2033-34	29 2034-35	30 2035-36	
1	Commercial - Real Property	-	-	-	-	-
2	Commercial - Personal Property	4,250,000	-	-	-	-
3	Biotechnology - Real Property	750,000	-	-	-	-
4	Biotechnology - Personal Property	4,511,000	-	-	-	-
5	Industrial - Real Property	9,228,000	-	-	-	-
6	Industrial - Personal Property	17,991,000	-	-	-	-
7	Residential - Real Property	7,623,000	-	-	-	-
	Residential - Personal Property	5,120,000	-	-	-	-
	Total Potential Value Added per Year	49,473,000	0	0	0	0
Total Real Property Value Added		0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative New Value with Prop 13 Growth at		43,913,739	44,792,014	45,687,854	46,601,611	
Total Personal Property Value Added		0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Personal Property Value		17,601,000	17,601,000	17,601,000	17,601,000	17,601,000

APPENDIX A

**FIELD SURVEY
INSTRUCTIONS, SURVEY SHEET
AND METHODOLOGY**

Whiteside Project Keyser Marston Associates

Survey Methods

Development of the Web-based Survey Form

The survey of parcels and buildings within the Whiteside Project area was conducted by Consilium Associates, under the supervision of Hal Suetsugu, Vice President at Consilium. The survey methods and the survey instrument were based on written instructions provided by KMA and on discussions between KMA and Consilium Associates. The written instructions 1) defined the ratings to be applied to parcels and buildings, 2) defined the scope of the survey, and 3) included a sample survey form.

Using the sample survey form from KMA, Consilium Associates created a Web-based survey form that enabled data inputs to be saved directly to a database. The Web-based survey form utilized the rating scales and reproduced the relationships between variables provided on the sample form from KMA. Before the design was used in the field, KMA and Consilium Associates reviewed and discussed the Web-based survey form to ensure that it reflected KMA intentions and complied with KMA criteria.

Survey Data Collection, Processing, and Reporting

Consilium Associates collected data during on-site inspections on a parcel-by-parcel basis, using the Web-based survey form. Digital photographs were taken at most parcels; especially where maintenance or rehabilitation needs were observed. Details about each photo, such as subject, location, and direction, were entered into a photo-log. These entries were transferred to electronic files that were linked to the digital photos. Consilium later reviewed the photographs to determine which ones clearly depicted the need for maintenance, building deterioration, damaged building components or other problems. The selected photos were then linked to their respective online survey forms.

When all (or nearly all) parcels had been surveyed, KMA and Consilium Associates met in the field to compare a sample of completed survey forms to actual parcel conditions. This step ensured that Consilium Associates had rated the Whiteside parcels and buildings in accordance with the rating scheme intended by KMA.

After the preliminary field inspections were completed, the data was examined and cleaned by several processes. First, the data was checked for possible errors (i.e. impossibilities and inconsistencies). Then, data questions were resolved by referring to maps and photos, and by re-inspecting the parcel when necessary. Several trips were made to the field to verify the data accuracy of suspect data. Finally, the database was polished to correct misspellings and to ensure that land use and building categories were consistent among the properties surveyed.

During the field survey of parcels, Consilium set-up the means by which the online data could be viewed in detail on a parcel-by-parcel basis and in summary reports. Consilium also designed the linkage that would connect the online survey form and its photographs and captions (if any).

Concurrently with data cleaning, Consilium Associates devised a method for systematically determining the Overall Rating of each building. The Overall Rating classified each rated building into one of four categories based on the ratings that its individual elements received during the field survey. Consilium translated the definition of each category into criteria and applied the criteria to the building element ratings to produce in an Overall Rating for each building.

During the development of the Overall Rating system, Consilium and KMA had several discussions regarding the definitions of the Overall categories and how they would be applied to the building ratings. After the development of the Overall Rating system, KMA and Consilium also met in-person to ensure that the method for categorizing the buildings accurately reflected the definitions provided by KMA. The Overall Ratings are more fully described below.

Determination of the "Overall Rating"

As an element of the survey an overall building rating was provided for each building based on all of the rated building elements. The rating categories and their definitions for both the individual element ratings and the Overall Rating were provided by KMA. Consilium Associates devised a method for combining the individual building element ratings into an Overall Rating for each building.

To ensure consistent and reasonable rating from building to building, the method for determining the Overall Rating was carefully developed using a series of criteria. The criteria are based on

- Definitions provided by KMA for individual building elements:
 - Good, Minor, Major, Rehabilitation Infeasible; and
- Examples provided by KMA for each Overall Rating category:
 - Sound, Deferred Maintenance, Deteriorated, and Dilapidated.

Per the instructions provided by KMA for the Overall Building Rating, Consilium considered the extent (i.e. quantity) of conditions - in addition to severity (i.e. Minor, Major, or Infeasible to Repair). As instructed, the overall quality of maintenance and the quality of building materials and construction were also included in the Overall Rating, by consideration of those factors during the rating of the building elements while in the field.

The development of the criteria for the Overall Building Ratings consisted of interpreting the KMA definitions, and then applying the interpretations to the individual cases (i.e. buildings in the database).

Following is an outline of each Overall Rating category, including its definition, Consilium's interpretations, and the application of our assumptions to the individual ratings.

SOUND

KMA Definition:	Sound: "The building is in good condition and needs no repairs"
Assumptions:	a. No building element needs any maintenance ("needs no repairs"). b. Each building element must have a rating of "Good." ¹
Application:	When each and every building element has a rating of "Good."
Example:	When each one of the building's elements receives a rating of "Good" during the field inspection, the building's Overall Rating is "Sound."

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

KMA Definition:	Deferred Maintenance "The building is in need of only minor repairs, such as painting or replacement of a broken window."
Assumptions:	a. No element may have a rating below "Minor" ("only minor repairs") b. No limit on the number of elements that are rated "Minor Repair."
Application:	When one or more elements has a rating of "Minor," but no element is rated below "Minor Repair."
Example:	When a building is rated "Minor Repairs Needed" – for one or more building elements – and rated "Good" for the other elements, then the building's Overall Rating is "Deferred Maintenance."

DETERIORATED

KMA Definition:	Deteriorated: "The building is in need of a major repair and/or requires extensive maintenance; repairs to damaged building components are critical; or rehabilitation is considered necessary for continued safe and healthy occupancy of the building."
Assumptions:	a. A single rating of "Major Repair Needed" is sufficient ("a major repair")

¹ The Overall Rating of "Sound" appears to require perfection, that is, a rating of "Good" for each individual element. However, the rating "Good" did not require perfection.

- b. There is no upper limit on the number of elements rated "Major Repair Needed."
- c. One or more non-structural elements can be rated "Rehab' Infeasible."
- d. The building's condition must be potentially unsafe or unhealthy.

- Application:
- (1) When one or more elements are rated "Major Repair."
 - (2) Or, when one or more non-structural elements are rated "Rehabilitation Infeasible."

- Examples:
- (1) If a building has a rating of "Major Repair Needed" for one or more building elements, such as the windows and walls (usually due to deterioration from long-term exposure to the elements resulting from lack of maintenance as evidenced by extensively blistered and/or cracked paint), the building's Overall Rating is "Deteriorated."
 - (2) If a building has a rating of "Rehab' Infeasible" for one or more non-structural elements, such as the windows and walls (such as partially missing window frames and deteriorated wall stucco), the building would be given an Overall Rating of "Deteriorated."

DILAPIDATED

KMA Definition: Dilapidated: "This building has major damage or extensive deterioration; occupancy is considered unsafe. This category would include buildings with roofs that have collapsed or have fire damage."

- Assumptions:
- a. When one or more structural building elements are rated "Rehabilitation Infeasible."
 - b. Occupancy of the building is clearly unsafe or unhealthy.

- Application:
- (1) When one or more structural building elements are rated "Rehabilitation Infeasible."
 - (2) When a building's condition presents a clear danger to health or safety, even if it feasible to repair the condition or building.

- Examples:
- (1) If a building has a rating of "Rehab' Infeasible" for one structural element, such as a structural wall, the building's Overall Rating is "Dilapidated."
 - (2) If a building's stairway or porch is structurally damaged, rendering passage unsafe; or if there are cracks at the foundation line or apparent



uneven settling in the foundation, then the Overall Rating is "Dilapidated," even if it is feasible to repair these conditions.

Note: As described it gives the misimpression that simply missing a foundation screen would result in a building rating of dilapidated.

LACDC - WHITESIDE PROJECT ADOPTION

APN _____ Date _____ Signs on Property Sale [] Lease []
 Address _____ Agent Name _____
 Realty Name _____
 Telephone _____
 Bldg _____ of _____ L. Apx. Vacancy _____% K. No. Stories _____

LAND USE

Residential (# units) _____ Primary Use Code: _____
 Business (# of units) _____ [see page 3 for business/residential bldg names]
 Other (# units) _____ Description _____

Land Use:	%	Res'	Com'	Ind'	Public	Parking	Open /Rec'	Vacnt Lot	Other (specify)
Primary Use									
Secondary Use									

PARCEL ELEMENTS

A. Site Improvements	N/A	Not	Good	Obslte	Missing	Unimproved
		Viewd		Defic'nt	Deteriorated	
Driveway						
Vehicle Circulation						
Trash Facility						
Paving						
Sidewalks, Curbs, Gutters						
Streets						
Fencing						
General Parking						
Total no.spaces _____	Striped _____		Not striped _____			
Truck Parking						
Total no.spaces _____	Striped _____		Not striped _____			
Loading Area/ Docks						
Total no. docks _____	At-grade _____		Truck height _____		On-street _____	

- B. Parcel Utilization**
- Underutilized/Greatly under-developed lot
 - Use exceeds capacity
 - Evidence of residential overcrowding

- F. Incompatible Uses**
- Residential adjacent to industrial
 - Residential use adj' to commercial
 - Liquor sales/Adult Use near sensitive uses
 - Other incompatible & adjacent uses

- C. Site Conditions (circle all applicable)**
- Open storage
 - Open activity
 - Exposed equipment
 - Standing water/Poor drainage
 - Inadequate screening
 - Unimproved/Earth
 - Potent'l Hazardous Mater'ls
 - Weeds / Overgrown vegetation
 - Abandoned vehicle(s)
 - Litter / debris
 - Vandalism
 - Graffiti
 - Noise
 - Dust
 - Odors / Fumes

Description _____

APN _____

Bldg _____ of _____

Date _____

D. Substandard Site Design

Faulty / Inadequate Layout

Poor site access

Inadequate loading / docking

Utilities faulty (M.)

E. Parking Constraints

No on-site parking

Poor parking accessibility

Insufficient no. of spaces

Inadequate layout/design

BUILDING ELEMENTS

G. Building Conditions

	Not		Needs Repair		Rehab	
	N/A	Viewed	Good	Minor	Major	Unfs.
Roofing Materials						
Entry/Porch						
Wall surfaces						
Door & Windows						
Storefronts						
<u>Structural Elements</u>						
Foundation						
Walls						
Roof						

H. Design / Construction

Faulty Addition or Alteration

Illegal use (bootlegged units)

Poor Materials/Construction

Missing / Inadequate

building components

Inadequate Light or Ventilation

Garage Conversion

I. Obsolescence

Faulty / Inadequate layout

Inadequate bldg size 4 use

Inadqt design/shiftg use

Poor access to bldg.

LACDC - WHITESIDE PROJECT ADOPTION

FIELD SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

Create one form [entry] per building/parcel. ¹

For parcels with more than one building, create a separate entry for each building, but only create one entry for the parcel-related data.

For multiple parcels covered by one building, create a separate entry for each parcel, but only create one entry for the building.

I. OCCUPANT INFORMATION

The following items of information will be provided prior to the field survey. If the information is not available, you must input the information. Enter the parcel number as determined from available parcel maps.

Parcel Number: Each property is assigned a unique parcel number by the County Tax Assessor's Office. This number, often referred to as an "APN", will be used to track the survey results for each parcel.

Street Address: The street address should be verified during the field survey and any corrections noted. If a parcel has multiple addresses, each address should be recorded under "Occupant Information".

Owner's Name: The owner's name (if available) is included as it appears on the County Assessment Roll. This information may help to determine the type of business.

% Improved: Indicates the ratio of the building's square footage to the overall parcel square footage, based upon information provided on the County Assessment Roll.

Year Built: Will be provided if available. Otherwise, estimate as explained above.

Total Value: The total secured assessed valuation is included as it appears on the County Assessment Roll. This information may help to determine the scale of improvements on the property.

Parcel Size: Will be provided if available. Otherwise, omit.

Bldg. Sq. Ft.: Will be provided if available. Otherwise, omit.

Bldg.: _____ of _____: If there is more than one building on the parcel being surveyed, identify which building is being surveyed, i.e., "1 of 3". If there is only one building, enter "1 of 1". If the parcel has no buildings, indicate with an "0" in the first

¹ The survey is proposed to be conducted with handheld computers. "Form", for purposes of these instructions, refers to an individual computer entry.

blank. The building count should not include auxiliary buildings such as sheds, carports, or auto garages.

II. LAND USE INFORMATION

Estimate and indicate the land use(s) present on the parcel being surveyed. Buildings that are vacant should be categorized according to what they are designed to be used for. Utilize the following land use categories:

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Examples</u>
Res	Residential	Single family residences, apartments, condominiums, duplexes, triplexes, etc.
Com	Commercial	Retail, auto-related uses, office uses, hotels, motels and general commercial uses not otherwise classified.
Ind	Industrial	Stand-alone light or heavy industrial uses, and industrial park industrial tenants. Auto or commercial tenants in an industrial park are to be considered "commercial" uses.
Public	Public/Quasi-Public	Schools, hospitals, churches, fraternal organization meeting places, pre-schools/day care facilities, mortuaries, and public utility and transportation facilities (such as flood control channels, railroad right-of-ways, and telephone switching stations).
Open/Rec	Open/Recreational	Parks, golf courses, public pools, community centers, and gyms.
Vac Lot	Vacant Lot	Vacant lots not designed for use as parking areas.
Pkg	Parking	Paved or graded lots used for parking, either public or private.
Other	Other	Uses which do not fit into any of the other categories.

Predominate Land Use: Identify the primary or dominant use of the parcel as it is currently being used. If the parcel has only one use, only this category should be used. The description of land use categories to be used is provided below.

On parcels which have more than one land use present, the secondary land use should also be identified.

Secondary Land Use: the land use category, which represents the second largest percentage of land use on the parcel.

Signs on Property: If the parcel, building or tenant space is listed for sale or lease, identify the agent name, realty firm name and agent phone number.

III. PARCEL ELEMENTS

A. Site Improvements

To determine the level of inadequacies in site improvements, rate the condition of the following elements that exist on the parcel by checking the appropriate box.

- Driveway
- Vehicle Circulation
- Trash Facility
- Truck Parking
- Loading Area/Docks
- Sidewalks, Curbs, Gutters
- Streets
- Fencing

Indicate if the condition of these improvements falls into any of the following categories. At least one category should be identified for each item. More than one category might be applicable.

CBO-N/A (Could Not Be Observed-Not Applicable): Certain site improvements may not be observable or may not apply depending on the use of the parcel. For example, the parcel's parking, paving and loading areas may be obscured by fencing around the property. Or, a parcel may not have alley access, or a residential parcel will usually not have loading docks or truck parking.

Good: The site improvement exists on the parcel and serves the property well. No problems are associated with the improvement.

Obsolete/Deficient: Does not meet current usage norms, even if it does comply with applicable code requirements.

Missing: Does not exist or is not in place and would normally be expected to exist or be in place. For example, truck parking and loading facilities would be normally expected on an industrial property. This column would be checked if either of these features are absent.

Deteriorated: The site improvement is in poor condition, requiring maintenance or replacement.

Unimproved: An area of the site is being used for a specific purpose but is not improved. An example would be an unpaved alley that is being used for property access.

B. Parcel Utilization

Identify any of the following elements that appear on the parcel.

Underutilized/Substantially Underdeveloped Lot: Building and other improvements are not optimized given the size and the dimensions of the parcel.

Use Exceeds Capacity: Use of available open space or paved areas is at a higher level of density or intensity such that these areas cannot be successfully utilized for vehicles or pedestrians in the manner for which they were originally designed. Examples include parking areas used as storage yards or properties where there cars or trucks must double park for loading.

C. Site Conditions

Identify any of the following conditions that exist on the parcel:

Open Storage: Storage of materials that would normally be stored indoors or in covered areas stored in parking, loading, or other open areas normally used for other purposes.

Exposed Equipment: Equipment normally located or operated indoors or in a shed or storage facility kept or operated outdoors in the open.

Open Activity: Production, manufacturing, or other activities that would normally occur indoors are being conducted outside in the open.

Abandoned Vehicle: Motor vehicles that appear inoperable on site and that appear to have been in the same place for some time. Generally, such vehicles will appear to be rusting, covered in dust or dirt, or have tires, wheels, or other vital components missing.

Odors/Fumes: Noxious odors or fumes present or being generated from the parcel at the time of the survey.

Dust: Visible dust or particulate present or being generated from the parcel at the time of the survey.

Litter/Debris: Litter, trash, and/or debris are present on site.

Weeds/Overgrown Vegetation: excessive weeds or overgrown plants, un-pruned trees, etc. are present.

Vandalism: Evidence of vandalism (other than graffiti) present.

Graffiti: Evidence of graffiti is present.

Noise: Excessive noise from activities on the parcel at the time of the survey.

Unimproved/Earth: Unimproved, unpaved areas.

Inadequate Screening: Equipment or activities normally screened from view are evident.

Standing Water/Poor Drainage: Ponding or standing water in areas not designed as pools or water storage areas.

Potential Hazardous Waste: Note if any of the following uses or conditions are observed on the parcel. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

- Auto Service/Repair uses
- 55 Gal. Drums/Fuel Containers
- Wrecking Yard
- Railroad Uses
- Electrical Transformers
- Agricultural Pesticides
- Other Chemicals Users

D. Substandard Site Design

Identify if any of the following uses or conditions are observed.

Faulty/Inadequate Site Layout: Parcels that do not have adequate room to accommodate all uses on the site without conflicts of circulation, access, storage, or other amenities; parcels that do not have adequate loading or parking space for its current use. Examples would include retail or industrial properties without adequate unobstructed square footage, loading, parking or truck access. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

Poor Site Access: Access to the parcel or the use thereon is inconvenient, confusing, or difficult. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

E. Parking Constraints

Identify any of the following elements, which appear on the parcel.

No On-Site Parking: Parking on-site is not available.

Insufficient Number of Spaces: On-site parking is available, but the amount of parking or number of parking spaces does not appear to be enough to adequately serve the uses on the parcel. This is based on general observation only and does not require a count of parking spaces per se. Most commonly, this situation will be found with older commercial buildings which may have a few parking spaces at the rear of the building, but no off-street parking at the front or side of the building for patrons.

Poor Parking Accessibility: Parking is available to serve the uses of the parcel, but is situated in an awkward location whereby efficient access to uses is

hindered. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

Inadequate Layout/Design: Parking is available but is poorly designed and inefficient to serve the uses on the parcel. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

F. Incompatible Uses

This category includes neighboring land uses which, by their nature/sensitivity of use, conflict with nearby uses. Identify if any of the following conditions are observed. For "Other Adjacent Incompatible Uses", provide a brief description of the uses observed.

- Residential Uses Adjacent to Industrial
- Residential Adjacent to Intrusive Commercial Uses
- Liquor Store/Adult Use Near Sensitive Uses
- Other Adjacent Incompatible Uses

IV. BUILDING ELEMENTS

G. Building Conditions

Rate each of the following elements that are present and visible on the building(s). If the element is not visible, identify as "CBO-N/A". Be careful not to confuse the finish materials with the underlying structural elements. For example, do not confuse the wall finish (i.e. paint which is peeling) with the underlying material and its condition (such as brick or concrete block which is damaged or badly cracked).

Roofing Material: Visible portions of the roof surface.

Entry/Porch: Entry way or porch elements (predominantly found on residential buildings).

Wall Surfaces: Condition of exterior wall surfaces or non-painted finishes.

Doors/Windows: Condition of doors and windows including framing and fit.

Storefront: Storefront windows and framing (predominantly found on commercial buildings).

Structural Elements:

Foundation: Any portion of the foundation visible (predominantly found on residential buildings or buildings on a sloping site). Note evidence of damage or deterioration such as sagging or cracks.

Walls: Condition of walls, i.e., note sagging, cracks, deterioration and/or damage (not the wall finish).

Roof: Condition of roof structure, i.e. note sagging, deterioration and/or damage to the roof structure (not the roof surface).

Categories: Rate each building element using the following categories:

CBO-N/A (Not applicable): Certain building components may be observable or not apply, depending on the type of building.

Good: Building component is in good condition with no deferred maintenance evident.

Minor Repair: Building component requires minor repair or minor maintenance.

Major Repair: Building component requires major repair or replacement.

Rehabilitation Infeasible: Building component is severely damaged or deteriorated and repair is not feasible or component should be replaced rather than repaired.

H. Defective Design or Physical Construction

Identify if any of the following uses or conditions are observed. If this item is identified, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

Faulty Addition/Alteration: An addition to the main structure which is poorly designed and inadequately integrated with the rest of the building; an alteration which does not appear to meet building code requirements or normal construction standards or practices.

Illegal Use: Use of a building that does not appear to comply with code requirements. These include garages, commercial buildings or recreational vehicles being used for residential units.

Poor Quality Materials and/or Construction: Low-grade building materials have been improperly used to construct certain vital components of the structure. Examples include fiberglass or corrugated sheeting used as roofing material. The method of construction is considered inadequate or in violation of building code requirements.

Missing/Inadequate Building Components: Includes problems such as missing or deteriorated foundation, improper structural support (such as beams or columns), substantially deteriorated roofing materials, or missing steps in a stairway or at an entrance.

Inadequate Ventilation/Light: Buildings which have windows that have been infilled, boarded up or painted over which reduces or eliminates the nature light and ventilation that was originally an integral part of the building design.

Garage Conversion: Primarily occurs in single family dwellings. The garage is converted to a living space (i.e. family room, bedroom, and bootleg apartment). Evidenced by a driveway that dead-ends into house and is frequently coupled with a carports in front of the converted garage.

I. **Obsolescence**

Identify if any of the following conditions are observed. If observed, provide a brief description of what condition was observed.

Faulty/Inadequate Building Layout: The building is designed or has been modified in such a way that the overall layout of the building is not functional or obsolete for modern use standards. Special-use or single-purpose buildings that are vacant or under-utilized may also fall into this category. Older industrial buildings with limited floor-to-ceiling heights (as estimated from window placement, roof line, etc) fall into this category.

Inadequate Building Size for Current Use: Building(s) on parcel are considered too small to meet the needs of modern users.

Inadequate Design/Shifting Use: Building or property is poorly designed or was designed for a use for which it is no longer being used. Some examples of shifting uses include:

- Former house being used as a restaurant
- Store being used as a residence
- Warehouse being used for retail
- Retail or office space being used for manufacturing

Poor Building Access: The building is designed or located on the site in such a way that user or patron access is poorly located relative to the street or parking areas, or the building has other access problems.

J. **Overall Building Rating**

To determine the overall condition of a building, apply one of the following rating classifications based on the quantity and severity of conditions noted, including those noted above. Carefully consider the overall quality of the maintenance of the building and the quality of the building materials and construction when rating the building since these factors also have a major impact on the general condition of the building and its useful service life.

Sound: The building is in good condition and needs no repairs.

Deferred Maintenance: The building is in need of only minor repairs, such as painting or replacement of a broken window.

Deteriorated: The building is in need of a major repair and/or requires extensive maintenance; repairs to damaged building components are critical; or

rehabilitation is considered necessary for continued safe and healthy occupancy of building.

Dilapidated: This building has major damage or extensive deterioration; occupancy is considered unsafe. This category would include buildings with roofs that have collapsed, or have fire damage.

Not Ratable: The building could not be observed or was under construction or being renovated at the time of the field survey and therefore could not be rated.

K. Number of Stories

Indicate the total number of aboveground stories observed for the building.

L. Approximately Percentage Vacant

If the building appears to be fully or partially vacant, estimate or approximate the percentage of the building that is vacant.

M. Utilities

Faulty Utilities: Faulty utilities can be found in any building type (residential, commercial and industrial). Examples of faulty utilities include buildings with plumbing on the exterior (rather than within the walls), a concentration or multiple wires feeding into a structure (may include abandoned wire lines), wiring draped on the exterior of a structure or wire conduits on the exterior of a structure.

V. OCCUPANT INFORMATION

Provide business name, address, and use code for the residents, businesses, and other occupants of the building. Refer to the attached "Occupant Use Codes" list and select the use code(s) that most closely describes the uses on the property.

Number of Businesses: Note the total number of businesses within each building. If not evident from the street, the number of businesses may be estimated from signage, a building directory, or from counting mailboxes.

Number of Other Occupants: Note the total number of other occupants within the building not classified as a business or a resident. These are typically public or quasi-public occupants such as a school, library or non-profit/community service provider.

Number of Residential Units: Note the total number of residential units within the building. If not evident from the street, the number of residential units may be estimated from the building directory or from counting the number of mailboxes, mail slots, doors, or gas meters. Provide the address ranges for all residential units.

For each business on the parcel, enter the business name, street address and the type of business. Also note the names and addresses of non-business occupants and the address

ranges for multi-family residential. Include the corresponding "Use Code". Note any additional businesses.

Identify vacant units by their former use plus a "v" at the end of the use code. For example, a vacant unit in a duplex and a vacant commercial space in a shopping center would be identified on the form as follows:

No.	Name of Business/Apartment Complex (if vacant, list as "vacant")	Address	Use Code
1.	Vacant	235 1/2 Easy Street	121v
2.	Vacant	1250 Spend Ave	299v

VII. COMMENTS/NOTES

Provide comments on any aspect of the property or its use or provide greater explanation of conditions noted on the form.

Surveyor: Enter the first and last name of the person(s) conducting the field survey of the parcel.

Date: Enter the date on which the survey was conducted.

FIELD SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS.DOC
REV 02/17/04

APPENDIX B

**PHOTOGRAPHIC EXAMPLES OF
BLIGHTING CONDITIONS
WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA**

DETERIORATED AND DILAPIDATED BUILDINGS




PLATE 1 – A deteriorated building located on Fishburn Ave.




PLATE 2 – A residential structure located on Fowler St. Note the damaged roofline and the use of plastic sheets to prevent leakage.

DETERIORATED AND DILAPIDATED BUILDINGS




PLATE 3 – A deteriorated industrial building located on Medford St.




PLATE 4 – An industrial building located along the railroad on Worth St.

DEFECTIVE DESIGN
(Poor Materials and/or Construction)




PLATE 5 – An industrial building located on Whiteside St. Note the rusted corrugated steel roof.



PLATE 6 – Industrial building located on Whiteside St.

DEFECTIVE DESIGN
(Poor Materials and/or Construction)




PLATE 7 – A rusted corrugated steel industrial building located on Worth St.




PLATE 8 – A corrugated steel building located on Indiana St.

DEFECTIVE DESIGN
(Poor Materials and/or Construction)




PLATE 9 – The front of a commercial structure located on Fowler St.




PLATE 10 – A residential structure located on Fowler St.

INADEQUATE INDUSTRIAL PARKING



PLATE 11 – Inadequate parking for a business on Medford St.




PLATE 12 – Inadequate multi-family parking along Medford St.

INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES



PLATE 13 – Industrial land use located next to a multi-family building on Medford St.




PLATE 14 – Outdoor storage and debris located next to residential along Fowler St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 15 - No curbs, gutters or sidewalks at 4600 Worth St.




PLATE 16- Overhead utility lines above building at 4140 Whiteside St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 17- Overhead utility lines at 4140 Whiteside St.




PLATE 18- No sidewalk at 4160 Whiteside St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 19- Deteriorated sidewalk at 4200 Whiteside St.



PLATE 20- No sidewalk at 4000 Medford St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 21- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 4207 Whiteside St.




PLATE 22- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 4159 Whiteside St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 23— No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 4123 Whiteside St.




PLATE 24— No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1735 N. Eastern Ave.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES



PLATE 25– No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1636 N. Bonnie Beach




PLATE 26– No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1651 Miller Ave.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 27- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1651 Miller Ave.




PLATE 28- Deteriorated streets in alley west of Bonnie Beach, north of Medford St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 29– Missing segment of sidewalk and overhead utilities at 3709 Medford St.




PLATE 30– No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 3535 Medford St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 31- Overhead utilities and no sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1583 Fishburn Ave.




PLATE 32- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1583 Fishburn Ave.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 33— No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 3344 Medford St.




PLATE 34— No sidewalks, curbs or gutters in alley west of Bonnie Beach, between Medford St. & Whiteside St.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES



PLATE 35- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1561 N. Bonnie Beach




PLATE 36- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters at 1521 N. Bonnie Beach

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES




PLATE 37- No sidewalks, curbs or gutters on southeast corner of Bonnie Beach & Medford St.

APPENDIX C

REAL ESTATE BROKER INTERVIEWS

**REAL ESTATE BROKER INTERVIEWS
WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

**Reavis Realty – Eric Reavis
(213) 765-8488**

4/2/04 – Mr. Reavis only leases a handful of buildings in the Project Area and adjacent area. The lease rates range from \$0.35 to \$0.60/SF, depending on the size and quality of the building. Smaller buildings will lease for more per square foot. Mr. Reavis just leased two buildings, one for \$0.37/sf and one for \$0.57/sf, and they are only a few blocks away from the Project Area. The older buildings will usually have 12-foot ceilings, frame and stucco, and no dock hi-loading docks. The newer buildings (built in 1970's and 1980's) on Indiana Street have dock hi-loading docks, sprinkler systems, extra land for truck maneuvering, parking, etc. Most of this area consists of Class C buildings with some Class B buildings mixed in. The area is almost fully leased mainly because it's a small area, and there are not a lot of industrial buildings. The pros of the Project Area are that it has very good freeway access (60 seconds from 5 different freeways), and the close proximity to downtown Los Angeles and Monterey Park. This is an advantage especially for the Chinese-owned businesses that do business in downtown, and work in the San Gabriel Valley. The types of industrial use in the Project Area are mixed, but it tends to consist of primarily heavy industrial, only because the County is more lax in their standards than the City of Los Angeles. However, the area is not good, and not even close to being comparable to other industrial market areas. According to Mr. Reavis, it's a step down from Vernon and Commerce. There is no comparable market to the industrial located in the Project Area. In terms of crime, the murder rate in this area has decreased but the burglary/theft rate is pretty high, especially near the housing development to the west and southwest. The crime increases, as you get closer to the housing development.

**Remax – Art Giordani
(626) 229-2215**

4/5/04 – Mr. Giordani just leased out one building on Whiteside Avenue as a favor to a client. The building is zoned M1 (light manufacturing). He plans to sell the building eventually. The building is 2,500 SF and has an average rent of \$1,800. The leasing rate works out to be \$0.72/SF, which is at the very high end of rents in this area. There are very few vacancies in this area, and the smaller buildings tend to lease quickly and more easily at higher leasing rates. It is difficult to lease out the larger 10,000 SF buildings. The Project Area is a central point for Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, and it is close to downtown Los Angeles and the 710 Freeway. Mr. Giordani does not lease out industrial buildings in other areas; therefore, he didn't have much information on the comparable industrial market.

Heger Realty Corp. – Tom Holland
(323) 727-1144

4/6/04 – Mr. Holland is leasing out 6,900 SF (\$0.43 FSG) of a 13,900 SF building. It is the “best building on the street” and it is a Class B building built in 1963. It has been on the market for 3 months and Mr. Holland has had 2 or 3 prospective users come look at the space (import/export, light manufacturing). The previous use was a food processing plant. He thinks the drawback is the location. He thinks this area is on the wrong side of downtown Los Angeles and to far north. Industrial users tend to prefer locating along the Interstate 5 corridor so that they can access both Orange County and Los Angeles. Also, industrial businesses would prefer to be between downtown Los Angeles and the Long Beach ports or between downtown Los Angeles and Orange County.

There are very few vacancies and little turnover in the Project Area. Mr. Holland thinks that there are several long time users that just put up with the obsolete space either because of the cheap rent or because of the lax County standards. However, new users don't tend to locate here because the surrounding area is not attractive, buildings are obsolete, and there is quite a bit of crime due to the nearby housing project. The buildings in this area are not functional for bigger trucks, have no dock hi-loading, have heavy site coverage ratios, no parking, and the buildings are inadequate in size. Overall, the buildings in the Project Area are functionally obsolete.

There is also a mix of industrial use types. Mr. Holland's clients range from a set designer for Paramount studios to an auto parts distributor (40,000 SF) to several heavy manufacturers. The auto parts distributor prefers this area only because it is close to his home in San Marino. Mr. Holland doesn't think there is a comparable market except for maybe in Compton, small niche industrial areas right off of the freeway. The neighboring Alhambra market is not comparable either since it consists of primarily Asian users who are willing to pay a premium for industrial buildings. However, these types of areas don't have very much turnover, so it's difficult to pull comparable comps. The comparable class B run-down buildings in Commerce generally rent for \$.05 - \$.10 higher than the properties in Whiteside (City Terrace area).

4/23/04 – KMA asked Mr. Holland about the building at 1511-1525 Fishburn Ave. (disposal company) and why it sold for so much \$\$\$\$. Mr. Holland thinks it is because of the excess land. The building (8,600 SF) only requires a lot size of 17,200 SF (50 percent coverage). The excess land (31,034 SF) could be sold anywhere from \$12 - \$15/s.f., even for this area (Project Area). This ends up being anywhere from \$372,000 - \$465,000 extra. Mr. Holland stated the disposal company may also be willing to pay a premium due to the lax County standards or perhaps they increased their business accounts and needed to expand.

Grubb & Ellis – Bradford Boyles
(213) 596-2225

4/23/04 – Mr. Boyles is leasing a building at 4466 Worth St. for \$0.40/SF. This is actually overpriced considering it is in the middle of a five-acre compound (Roman Empire Furniture) and has no direct access from Worth or Medford Street. The rents have always been discounted in the Project Area, especially since it is not a “designated” industrial area like the garment and toy district in downtown Los Angeles. The Project Area is a mix of recyclers, heavy manufacturers, woodworkers, etc. These users have either been there for a while or they simply benefit from the lower rents. The vacancy is probably only about two percent in the Project Area. There is much more product for lease than for sale, and the rents range from \$.35 to \$.50/SF. The rents rarely exceed \$.50/SF. This is the least expensive industrial area close to downtown Los Angeles with the exception of some similar areas in East Los Angeles. The main drawbacks of the area are the age of the construction (very little new product) and there is not easy access via the freeway. Also, the mix of residential to the north and south does not make the Project Area attractive to industrial users. The standard clearance height is 12-16 feet in the downtown area and unless you’re in the nicer areas of Commerce, where the heights are 24-32 feet.

Most of the properties he leases are in downtown Los Angeles. Similar industrial buildings in downtown, on average, rent for \$0.10/SF higher. Mr. Boyles generally rents buildings for \$0.50 - \$0.75/SF. Mr. Boyles recommended that KMA call Mark Whitman (Dorin Realty), who also leases out industrial buildings in the Project Area.

Dorin Realty – Mark Whitman
(213) 627-0007

5/6/04 – Mr. Whitman used to lease out buildings in the Project Area, usually for around \$0.30 - \$0.40/SF. This area is “ok” and it doesn’t really share the characteristics of the Downtown industrial area or the San Gabriel Valley area. There is not enough of a concentration of one industry, but rather too much inner mixing of uses. Most of the area consists of owner-users that stay there because it is close to the freeway and downtown, and generally centrally located. The cons of the area are crime and vandalism, and its proximity to the residential areas and blighted commercial areas. The layout of the area is not very linear and inhibits people from locating there since it is not a “planned” industrial area.

EXHIBIT B

**REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT
PROJECT**

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

FOR

WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Adopted on _____, 2006

by

Ordinance No. ____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	[§100] INTRODUCTION	1
A.	[§101] PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES	2
II.	[§200] DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AREA	3
III.	[§300] PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT ACTIONS	3
A.	[§301] GENERAL	3
B.	[§302] PARTICIPATION OPPORTUNITIES; EXTENSION OF PREFERENCES FOR REENTRY WITHIN REDEVELOPED PROJECT AREA	4
1.	<i>[§303] Opportunities for Owners and Business Occupants</i>	4
2.	<i>[§304] Rules for Participation Opportunities, Priorities, and Preferences</i>	5
3.	<i>[§305] Participation Agreements</i>	5
4.	<i>[§306] Conforming Owners</i>	5
5.	<i>[§307] Implementing Rules</i>	5
C.	[§308] COOPERATION WITH PUBLIC BODIES	6
D.	[§309] PROPERTY ACQUISITION	6
1.	<i>[§310] Real Property</i>	6
2.	<i>[§311] Personal Property</i>	7
E.	[§312] PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	7
F.	[§313] PAYMENTS TO TAXING AGENCIES	7
G.	[§314] RELOCATION OF PERSONS, BUSINESS CONCERNS, AND OTHERS DISPLACED BY THE PROJECT	8
1.	<i>[§315] Relocation Housing Requirements</i>	8
2.	<i>[§316] Replacement Housing Plan</i>	8
3.	<i>[§317] Assistance in Finding Other Locations</i>	9
4.	<i>[§318] Relocation Payments</i>	9
H.	[§319] DEMOLITION, CLEARANCE, AND BUILDING AND SITE PREPARATION	9
1.	<i>[§320] Demolition and Clearance</i>	9
2.	<i>[§321] Preparation of Building Sites</i>	9
I.	[§322] PROPERTY DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT	10
1.	<i>[§323] Real Property Disposition and Development</i>	10
a.	[§324] General	10
b.	[§325] Disposition and Development Documents	10
c.	[§326] Development by the Commission	11
d.	[§327] Development Plans	12
2.	<i>[§328] Real Property Disposition and Development</i>	12
J.	[§329] REHABILITATION, CONSERVATION, AND MOVING OF STRUCTURES	12
1.	<i>[§330] Rehabilitation and Conservation</i>	12
2.	<i>[§331] Moving of Structures</i>	12
K.	[§332] LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING	12
1.	<i>[§333] Authority Generally</i>	12

2.	[§334] Replacement Housing	13
3.	[§335] Increase, Improve and Preserve the Supply.....	13
4.	[§336] New or Rehabilitated Dwelling Units Developed within the Project Area.....	14
5.	[§337] Duration of Dwelling Unit Availability and Commission Monitoring.....	15
L.	[§338] IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.....	15
IV.	[§400] USES PERMITTED IN THE PROJECT AREA.....	16
A.	[§401] PERMITTED LAND USES	16
B.	[§402] OTHER LAND USES	16
1.	[§403] Public Rights-of-Way.....	16
2.	[§404] Other Public, Semi-Public, Institutional, and Non-profit Uses	17
3.	[§405] Interim Uses.....	17
4.	[§406] Non-conforming Uses	17
C.	[§407] GENERAL CONTROLS AND LIMITATIONS.....	18
1.	[§408] Construction.....	18
2.	[§409] Rehabilitation and Retention of Properties	18
3.	[§410] Limitation on the Number of Buildings.....	18
4.	[§411] Number of Dwelling Units	18
5.	[§412] Limitation on Type, Size, and Height of Buildings	18
6.	[§413] Open Spaces, Landscaping, Light, Air, and Privacy	19
7.	[§414] Signs.....	19
8.	[§415] Utilities.....	19
9.	[§416] Incompatible Uses	19
10.	[§417] Non-discrimination and Non-segregation.....	19
11.	[§418] Minor Variations	19
D.	[§419] DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT	20
E.	[§420] BUILDING PERMITS	20
V.	[§500] METHODS OF FINANCING THE PROJECT	21
A.	[§501] GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED FINANCING METHOD	21
B.	[§502] TAX INCREMENT FUNDS.....	21
C.	[§503] BONDS, ADVANCES AND INDEBTEDNESS	22
D.	[§504] TIME LIMIT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS	23
E.	[§505] TIME LIMIT ON RECEIPT OF TAX INCREMENT	23
F.	[§506] OTHER LOANS AND GRANTS	24
VI.	[§600] ACTIONS BY THE COUNTY	24
VII.	[§700] ENFORCEMENT.....	25
VIII.	[§800] DURATION OF THIS PLAN.....	25
IX.	[§900] PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENT	26
X.	[§1000] MERGER	26

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment No. 1 Legal Description of the Project Area Boundaries
- Attachment No. 2 Project Area Map
- Attachment No. 3 Redevelopment Land Use Map
- Attachment No. 4 Potential Public Improvements
- Attachment No. 5 Legal Description of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment
Project Area
- Attachment No. 6 Map of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area

**REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

I. [§100] INTRODUCTION

This is the Redevelopment Plan ("Redevelopment Plan" or "Plan") for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project ("Project" or "Project Area") in unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles ("County"). This Plan was prepared by the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission") pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law of the State of California ("Community Redevelopment Law" or "CRL"; Health and Safety Code Section 33000 *et seq.*), the California Constitution, and all applicable local laws and ordinances. The proposed Project Area is located within the City Terrace portion of the County, unincorporated territory more commonly referred to as "Whiteside", which is located along the Interstate 10 Freeway, west of the Interstate 710 Freeway. The proposed Project Area is generally bounded by the City of Los Angeles communities of Boyle Heights on the west and Lincoln Heights on the north, including the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area of the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles ("LACRA"), unincorporated County territory to the south, and the City of Monterey Park on the east. The proposed Project Area primarily consists of industrial land uses.

The Commission's primary purpose for this Redevelopment Plan is to eliminate the conditions of blight within the Project Area as defined by the CRL, including buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy to live or work, incompatible land uses, depreciated or stagnant property values, impaired investments, low lease rates and a high crime rate, and to prevent the re-occurrence of such blight. The Redevelopment Plan will also provide the framework for the future planning, development, and rehabilitation of the Project Area. Furthermore, the Commission also intends to facilitate redevelopment of the area and in particular the biomedical technology industry. The Commission is considering a joint effort with the LACRA, which has adopted a redevelopment project area (Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area). The concept is that both entities would work cooperatively to attract and encourage development of the biomedical industry in the combined area. The joint effort would include merging all of the Project Area with the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area. The primary area of focus for future biomedical industry development would consist of the Project Area and approximately 750 acres of the 2,164-acre Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area, the combined area referred to as the "Focus Area". Both the LACRA and Commission would retain the respective redevelopment areas but a new "Joint Powers Authority" would be formed to govern the Focus Area. The adoption of the Project would be the first step in this joint effort, which would be followed by a merger of the Adelante Eastside and Whiteside Redevelopment Project Areas.

This Redevelopment Plan describes the Commission's authorities, responsibilities and limitations in implementing the redevelopment of the Whiteside Redevelopment Project Area. This Redevelopment Plan is a legal document that incorporates the required components of a Redevelopment Plan as defined by the CRL rather than a specific plan of actions. This Plan consists of the text, the legal description of the Whiteside Redevelopment Project Area Boundaries (Attachment No. 1), the Project Area Map (Attachment No. 2); the Redevelopment Land Use Map (Attachment No. 3), the Potential Public Improvements (Attachment No. 4), and the legal description and map of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area (Attachments No. 5 and 6).

This Plan provides the Commission with powers, duties, and obligations to implement and further the program generally formulated in this Plan for the redevelopment, rehabilitation, and revitalization of the area within the Project Area. Because of the long-term nature of this Plan and the need to retain the Commission's flexibility to respond to market and economic conditions, property owner and developer interests, and opportunities from time to time presented for redevelopment, this Plan does not present a precise plan or establish specific projects for the redevelopment, rehabilitation, and revitalization of the Project Area. Instead, this Plan presents a process and a basic framework within which specific plans will be presented, specific projects will be established, and specific solutions will be proposed and which provides tools to the Commission to fashion, develop, and proceed with such specific plans, projects, and solutions.

Sections of this Plan specifically refer to and reiterate existing Community Redevelopment Law statutes. In the event that any CRL statutes are amended from time to time by the State legislature, and such CRL statutes would result in the Plan being in conflict with State law, the State law shall be controlling.

A. §1011 Purposes and Objectives

The purposes and objectives of this Redevelopment Plan are to eliminate the conditions of blight, as defined by Community Redevelopment Law, existing in the Project Area and to prevent the recurrence of deteriorating conditions in the Project Area. The Commission proposes to eliminate such conditions and prevent their recurrence by providing, pursuant to this Plan, for the planning, development, re-planning, redesign, redevelopment, reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Project Area and by providing for such facilities as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare, in accord with the County of Los Angeles' General Plan and other planning documents promulgated pursuant thereto as may be adopted or amended from time to time. The Commission proposes to:

1. Encourage the redevelopment of the Project Area subject to and consistent with the County's General Plan and/or specific development plans as may be adopted

from time to time through the cooperation of private enterprise and public agencies.

2. Enhance the long-term economic well being of the Project Area.
3. Provide public infrastructure improvements and community facilities, such as the installation, construction, and/or reconstruction of streets, utilities, public buildings and facilities (such as facilities for pedestrian circulation and parking facilities), storm drains, utility undergrounding, street lighting, landscaping and other improvements which are necessary for the effective redevelopment of the Project Area.
4. Provide for participation in the redevelopment of property in the Project Area, where feasible, by owners who agree to so participate in conformity with this Redevelopment Plan.
5. Encourage joint efforts and cooperative efforts among property owners, businesses and public agencies to achieve desirable economic development goals and programs and to reduce or eliminate deteriorating conditions.
6. Increase, improve and preserve the community's supply of affordable housing within and outside of the Project Area.
7. Acquire real property.

The foregoing goals and objectives are to be pursued and accomplished, subject to and consistent with, the County General Plan, as amended from time to time.

II. [§200] DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AREA

The boundaries of the Project Area are described in the "Legal Description of the Project Area Boundaries," attached hereto as Attachment No. 1 and incorporated herein by reference, and are shown on the "Project Area Map," attached hereto as Attachment No. 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

III. [§300] PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

A. [§301] General

The Commission proposes to eliminate and prevent the spread of blight and deterioration in the Project Area by:

1. Permitting participation in the redevelopment process by owners of properties located in the Project Area consistent with this Plan and rules adopted by the Commission;
2. The acquisition of real property;
3. The elimination of areas experiencing economic dislocation and disuse;
4. The replanning, redesign and/or redevelopment of areas which are stagnant or improperly utilized, and which would not be accomplished by private enterprise acting alone without public participation and assistance;
5. The protection and promotion of sound development and redevelopment of blighted areas and the general welfare of citizens of the County by remedying such injurious conditions through the employment of appropriate means;
6. The installation of new or replacement of existing public improvements, facilities, and utilities in areas that are currently inadequately served with regard to such improvements, facilities and utilities;
7. The development and rehabilitation of improved housing opportunities outside of the Project Area including housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons and families;
8. Providing relocation assistance to displaced persons and business concerns;
9. The demolition or removal of certain buildings and improvements; and
10. The disposition of property for uses in accordance with this Plan.

In the accomplishment of these purposes and activities and in the implementation and furtherance of this Plan, the Commission is authorized to use all the powers provided in this Plan and all the powers now or hereafter permitted by law.

B. [§302] Participation Opportunities; Extension of Preferences for Reentry Within Redeveloped Project Area

1. [§303] Opportunities for Owners and Business Occupants

In accordance with this Plan and the rules for participation adopted by the Commission pursuant to this Plan and the Community Redevelopment Law, persons who are owners of real property in the Project Area shall be given a reasonable opportunity to participate in the redevelopment of the Project Area consistent with the objectives of this Plan.

The Commission shall extend reasonable preferences to persons who are engaged in business in the Project Area to remain or reenter into business within the redeveloped Project Area if they otherwise meet the requirements prescribed in this Plan and the rules adopted by the Commission.

2. §304] Rules for Participation Opportunities, Priorities, and Preferences

In order to provide opportunities to owners to participate in the redevelopment of the Project Area and to extend reasonable preferences to businesses to reenter into business within the redeveloped Project Area, the Commission shall promulgate rules for participation by owners and the extension of preferences to business tenants for reentry within the redeveloped Project Area.

3. §305] Participation Agreements

The Commission shall require, as a condition of financial participation in development, that each participant shall enter into a binding agreement with the Commission by which the participant agrees to rehabilitate, develop, use and maintain the property in conformance with this Plan and to be subject to the provisions hereof. In such participation agreements, participants may be required to join in the recordation of such documents as may be necessary to ensure the property will be developed and used in accordance with this Plan and the participation agreement. Whether or not a participant enters into a participation agreement with the Commission, the provisions of this Plan are applicable to all public and private property in the Project Area.

4. §306] Conforming Owners

The Commission may, at its sole and absolute discretion, determine that certain real property within the Project Area presently meets the requirements of this Plan, and the owner of such property will be permitted to remain as a conforming owner without a participation agreement with the Commission provided such owner continues to operate, use, and maintain the real property within the requirements of this Plan.

5. §307] Implementing Rules

The provisions of Sections 302 through 306 shall be implemented according to the rules adopted by the Commission prior to the approval of this Plan, and the same may be from time to time amended by the Commission. Where there is a conflict between the participation and re-entry preference provisions in this Plan and such rules adopted by the Commission, the Plan shall prevail.

C. §308 Cooperation with Public Bodies

Certain public bodies are authorized by state law to aid and cooperate, with or without consideration, in the planning, undertaking, construction, or operation of this Project. The Commission shall seek the aid and cooperation of such public bodies and shall attempt to coordinate this Plan with the activities of such public bodies in order to accomplish the purposes of redevelopment and the highest public good.

The Commission, by law, is not authorized to acquire real property owned by public bodies without the consent of such public bodies. The Commission, however, will seek the cooperation of all public bodies which own or intend to acquire property in the Project Area. Any public body which owns or leases property in the Project Area will be afforded all the privileges of owner and tenant participation if such public body is willing to enter into a participation agreement with the Commission. All plans for development of property in the Project Area by a public body shall be subject to County approval.

The Commission may impose on all public bodies the planning and design controls contained in this Plan to insure that present uses and any future development by public bodies will conform to the requirements of this Plan. To the extent now or hereafter permitted by law, the Commission is authorized to financially (and otherwise) assist any public entity in the cost of public land, buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements that are or would be of benefit to the Project.

D. §309 Property Acquisition

1. §310 Real Property

Except as specifically exempted herein, the Commission may acquire, but is not required to acquire, any real property located in the Project Area by gift, devise, exchange, lease, purchase or any other lawful method, including eminent domain, except that eminent domain shall not be utilized to acquire property on which any persons reside.

It is in the public interest and is necessary in order to execute this Plan for the power of eminent domain to be utilized by the Commission to acquire property in the Project Area, except that eminent domain shall not be utilized and eminent domain is not authorized under this Plan to acquire property on which any persons reside. Subject to the limitations and exceptions thereto contained in this Plan, no eminent domain proceeding to acquire non-residential property within the Project Area shall be commenced after twelve (12) years following the effective date of the ordinance approving and adopting the Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project. Such time limitation may be extended only by amendment of this Plan.

The Commission shall not acquire real property to be retained by an owner pursuant to a participation agreement if the owner fully performs under the participation agreement. The Commission is authorized to acquire structures without acquiring the land upon which those structures are located. The Commission is authorized to acquire either the entire fee or any other interest in real property less than a fee.

The Commission shall not acquire real property on which an existing building is to be continued on its present site and in its present form and use without the consent of the owner unless: (a) such building requires structural alteration, improvement, modernization, or rehabilitation; (b) the site, or lot on which the building is situated, requires modification in size, shape, or use; or (c) it is necessary to impose upon such property any of the controls, limitations, restrictions, and requirements of this Plan and the owner fails or refuses to execute a participation agreement in accordance with the provisions of this Plan.

The Commission is not authorized to acquire real property owned by public bodies which do not consent to such acquisition. The Commission is authorized, however, to acquire public property transferred to private ownership before redevelopment of the Project Area is completed, unless the Commission and the private owner enter into a participation agreement and the owner completes his responsibilities under the participation agreement.

2. §311 Personal Property

Generally, personal property shall not be acquired. However, where necessary in the execution of this Plan, the Commission is authorized to acquire personal property in the Project Area by any lawful means, consistent with Section 310 of this Plan.

E. §312 Property Management

During such time as property, if any, in the Project Area is owned by the Commission, such property shall be under the management and control of the Commission. Such property may be rented or leased by the Commission pending its disposition for redevelopment, and such rental or lease shall be pursuant to such policies as the Commission may adopt.

F. §313 Payments to Taxing Agencies

Pursuant to Section 33607.5 of the Community Redevelopment Law, the Commission is required to and shall make payments to affected taxing entities to alleviate the financial burden and detriment that the affected taxing entities may incur as a result of the adoption of this Plan. The payments made by the Commission shall be calculated and paid in accordance with the requirements of Section 33607.5.

G. §314 Relocation of Persons, Business Concerns, and Others Displaced by the Project

1. §315 Relocation Housing Requirements

No persons or families of low and moderate income shall be displaced unless and until there is a suitable housing unit available and ready for occupancy by such displaced person or family at rents comparable to those at the time of their displacement. Such housing units shall be suitable to the needs of such displaced persons or families and must be decent, safe, sanitary, and otherwise standard dwellings. The Commission shall not displace such persons or families until such housing units are available and ready for occupancy.

Permanent housing facilities shall be made available within three years from the time occupants are displaced. Pending the development of such facilities, adequate temporary housing facilities shall be made available to such displaced occupants at rents comparable to those in the community at the time of their displacement.

2. §316 Replacement Housing Plan

Not less than thirty days prior to the execution of an agreement for acquisition of real property, or the execution of an agreement for the disposition and development of property or the execution of an owner participation agreement, which agreement would lead to the destruction or removal of dwelling units from the low and moderate income housing market, the Commission shall adopt, by resolution, a replacement housing plan.

The replacement housing plan shall include: (1) the general location of housing to be rehabilitated, developed, or constructed pursuant to Section 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law; (2) an adequate means of financing such rehabilitation, development, or construction; (3) a finding that the replacement housing does not require the approval of the voters pursuant to Article XXXIV of the California Constitution, or that such approval has been obtained; (4) the number of dwelling units housing persons and families of low or moderate income planned for construction or rehabilitation; and (5) the timetable for meeting the plan's relocation, rehabilitation, and replacement housing objectives. A dwelling unit whose replacement is required by Section 33413 shall not be destroyed or removed from the low and moderate income housing market until the Commission has by resolution adopted a replacement-housing plan.

Nothing in this section shall prevent the Commission from destroying or removing from the low and moderate income housing market a dwelling unit which the Commission owns and which is an immediate danger to health and safety. The Commission shall, as

soon as practicable, adopt by resolution, a replacement-housing plan with respect to such dwelling unit.

3. **§317] Assistance in Finding Other Locations**

The Commission shall assist all persons (including individuals and families), business concerns, and others displaced by Commission action in the Project Area in finding other locations and facilities. In order to carry out the Project with a minimum of hardship to persons (including individuals and families), business concerns, and others, if any, displaced from their respective places of residence or business, the Commission shall assist such persons (including individuals and families), business concerns and others in finding new locations that are decent, safe, sanitary, within their respective financial means, in reasonably convenient locations, and otherwise suitable to their respective needs. Such assistance shall be provided pursuant to the California Relocation Assistance Law (Government Code Section 7260 *et seq.*) and Commission rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto as such may be amended from time to time. The Commission may provide housing outside the Project Area for displaced persons.

4. **§318] Relocation Payments**

The Commission shall make all relocation payments required by law to persons (including individuals and families), business concerns, and others displaced by the Commission from property in the Project Area. Such relocation payments shall be made pursuant to the California Relocation Assistance Law (Government Code Section 7260 *et seq.*) and Commission rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto as such may be amended from time to time. The Commission may make such other payments as it may deem appropriate and for which funds are available.

H. **§319] Demolition, Clearance, and Building and Site Preparation**

1. **§320] Demolition and Clearance**

The Commission is authorized to demolish and clear buildings, structures, and other improvements from any real property in the Project Area as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Plan.

2. **§321] Preparation of Building Sites**

The Commission is authorized to prepare, or cause to be prepared, as building sites any real property in the Project Area owned by the Commission. In connection therewith, the Commission may cause, provide for, or undertake the installation or construction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other public improvements necessary to carry out this Plan.

Prior consent of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles is required for the Commission to develop sites for commercial or industrial use by providing streets, sidewalks, utilities, or other improvements which an owner or operator of the site would otherwise be obligated to provide.

I. **§322 Property Disposition and Development**

1. **§323 Real Property Disposition and Development**

a. **§324 General**

For the purposes of this Plan, the Commission is authorized to sell, lease, exchange, subdivide, transfer, assign, pledge, encumber by mortgage or deed of trust, or otherwise dispose of any interest in real property. To the extent permitted by law, the Commission is authorized to dispose of real property by negotiated lease, sale, or transfer without public bidding. Property acquired by the Commission for rehabilitation and resale shall be offered for resale within one (1) year after completion of rehabilitation or an annual report concerning such property shall be published by the Commission as required by law.

Real property acquired by the Commission may be conveyed by the Commission without charge to the County and, where beneficial to the Project Area, without charge to any public body. All real property acquired by the Commission in the Project Area shall be sold or leased to public or private persons or entities for development for the uses permitted in this Plan.

All purchasers or lessees of property acquired from the Commission shall be obligated to use the property for the purposes designated in this Plan, to begin and complete development of the property within a period of time which the Commission fixes as reasonable, and to comply with other conditions which the Commission deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Plan.

b. **§325 Disposition and Development Documents**

To provide adequate safeguards to ensure that the provisions of this Plan will be carried out and to prevent the recurrence of blight, all real property sold, leased, or conveyed by the Commission, as well as all property subject to participation agreements, is subject to the provisions of this Plan.

The Commission shall reserve such powers and controls in the disposition and development documents as may be necessary to prevent transfer, retention, or use of

property for speculative purposes and to ensure that development is carried out pursuant to this Plan.

Leases, deeds, contracts, agreements, and declarations of restrictions of the Commission may contain restrictions, covenants, covenants running with the land, rights of reverter, conditions subsequent, equitable servitudes, or any other provisions necessary to carry out this Plan. Where appropriate, as determined by the Commission, such documents, or portions thereof, shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Los Angeles County.

All property in the Project Area is hereby subject to the restriction that there shall be no discrimination or segregation based upon race, color, creed, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, or ancestry in the sale, lease, sublease, transfer, use, occupancy, tenure, or enjoyment of property in the Project Area. All property sold, leased, conveyed, or subject to a participation agreement shall be expressly subject by appropriate documents to the restriction that all deeds, leases, or contracts for the sale, lease, sublease, or other transfer of land in the Project Area shall contain such non-discrimination and non-segregation clauses as required by law.

c. §326] Development by the Commission

To the extent now or hereafter permitted by law, the Commission is authorized to pay for, develop, or construct any publicly-owned building, facility, structure, or other improvement either within or without the Project Area, for itself or for any public body or entity, which buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are or would be of benefit to the Project Area. Specifically, the Commission may pay for, install, or construct the buildings, facilities, structures, and other improvements identified in Attachment No. 4, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and may acquire or pay for the land required therefore.

In addition to the public improvements authorized under Section 321 and the publicly-owned improvements identified in Attachment No. 4 of this Plan, the Commission is authorized to install and construct, or to cause to be installed and constructed, within or without the Project Area, for itself or for any public body or entity for the benefit of the Project Area, public improvements and public utilities, including, but not limited to, the following: (1) sewers; (2) natural gas distribution systems; (3) water distribution systems; (4) parks, plazas, and pedestrian paths; (5) parking facilities; (6) landscaped areas; (7) street improvements; and (8) storm water facilities.

The Commission may enter into contracts, leases, and agreements with the County or other public body or entity pursuant to this Section 326, and the obligation of the Commission under such contract, lease, or agreement shall constitute an indebtedness of the Commission which may be made payable out of the taxes levied in the Project Area and allocated to the Commission under subdivision (b) of Section 33670 of the

Community Redevelopment Law and Section 502 of this Plan or out of any other available funds.

d. **§327 Development Plans**

All development plans (whether public or private) shall be submitted to the County for approval. All development in the Project Area must conform to County design review standards.

2. **§328 Real Property Disposition and Development**

For the purposes of this Plan, the Commission is authorized to lease, sell, exchange, transfer, assign, pledge, encumber, or otherwise dispose of personal property which is acquired by the Commission.

J. **§329 Rehabilitation, Conservation, and Moving of Structures**

1. **§330 Rehabilitation and Conservation**

The Commission is authorized to rehabilitate and conserve, or to cause to be rehabilitated and conserved, any building or structure in the Project Area owned by the Commission. The Commission is also authorized and directed to advise, encourage, and assist in the rehabilitation and conservation of property in the Project Area not owned by the Commission.

2. **§331 Moving of Structures**

As necessary in carrying out this Plan, the Commission is authorized to move, or to cause to be moved, any standard structure or building or any structure or building which can be rehabilitated to a location within or outside the Project Area.

K. **§332 Low and Moderate Income Housing**

1. **§333 Authority Generally**

The Commission may, inside or outside the Project Area, acquire land, improve sites, or construct or rehabilitate structures in order to provide housing for persons and families of low or moderate income. The Commission may also provide subsidies to or for the benefit of, such persons and families or households to assist them in obtaining housing. The Commission may also sell, lease, grant, or donate real property owned or acquired by the Commission to non-profit or for-profit housing developers in carrying out the provisions of Section 334 herein below.

2. §334] Replacement Housing

In accordance with Sections 33334.5 and 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law, whenever dwelling units housing persons and families of low or moderate income are destroyed or removed from the low and moderate income housing market as part of a redevelopment project that is subject to a written agreement with the Commission or where financial assistance has been provided by the Commission, the Commission shall, within four years of such destruction or removal, rehabilitate, develop, or construct, or cause to be rehabilitated, developed, or constructed, for rental or sale to persons and families of low or moderate income, an equal number of replacement dwelling units which have an equal or greater number of bedrooms as those destroyed or removed units at affordable housing costs, as defined by Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, within the territorial jurisdiction of the Commission, in accordance with all of the provisions of Sections 33413 and 33413.5 of the Community Redevelopment Law. All (100%) of the replacement dwelling units shall be available at affordable housing cost to persons in the same or a lower income category (low, very low or moderate), as the persons displaced from those destroyed or removed units.

3. §335] Increase, Improve and Preserve the Supply

Pursuant to Section 33334.2 of the Community Redevelopment Law, not less than 20 percent of all taxes which are allocated to the Commission pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 33670 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 502 of this Plan shall be used by the Commission for the purposes of increasing, improving and preserving the County's supply of low and moderate income housing available at affordable housing costs, as defined by Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health & Safety Code, to persons and families of low or moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health & Safety Code, lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health & Safety Code, very low income households, as defined in Section 50105 of the Health & Safety Code, and extremely low income households, as defined in Section 50106 of the Health & Safety Code, unless one of the findings permitted by Section 33334.2 is made annually by resolution.

The Commission may use these funds to meet, in whole or in part, the replacement housing provisions in Section 334 above. These funds may be used inside or outside the Project Area provided, however, that such funds may be used outside the Project Area only if findings of benefit to the Project are made as required by said Section 33334.2 of the Community Redevelopment Law.

The funds for these purposes shall be held in a separate Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund until used. Any interest earned by such Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund and any repayments or other income to the Commission for loans, advances, or grants, of any kind, from such Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund,

shall accrue to and be deposited in, the fund and may only be used in the manner prescribed for the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund.

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 33334.12 of the Community Redevelopment Law, upon failure of the Commission to expend or encumber surplus in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund within one year from the date the moneys become excess surplus, within the meaning defined in Section 33334.12 of the Community Redevelopment Law, the Commission shall either disburse that excess surplus to the County Housing Authority or to another public agency in accordance with said Section 33334.12, or expend or encumber the excess surplus within two additional years. A housing authority or other public agency shall utilize the moneys for the purposes of, and subject to, the same restrictions that are applicable to the Commission under the Community Redevelopment Law, and for that purpose may exercise all of the powers of a housing authority under the Housing Authorities Law (Section 34200 *et seq.* of the Health and Safety Code) to the extent not inconsistent with these limitations.

4. [§336] New or Rehabilitated Dwelling Units Developed within the Project Area

At least thirty percent (30%) of all new and substantially rehabilitated dwelling units developed by the Commission, if any, shall be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families of low or moderate income. Not less than fifty percent (50%) of the dwelling units required to be available at affordable housing cost to persons and families of low or moderate income shall be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, very low income households.

At least fifteen percent (15%) of all new and substantially rehabilitated dwelling units developed within the Project Area by public or private entities or persons other than the Commission, if any, shall be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families of low or moderate income. Not less than forty percent (40%) of the dwelling units required to be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families of low or moderate income shall be available at affordable housing costs to, and occupied by, very low income households.

The Commission may satisfy the provisions of the above paragraphs, in whole or in part, by any of the methods described in Community Redevelopment Law Section 33413(b) or any other method permitted by law.

The percentage requirements set forth in this Section 336 shall apply independently of the requirements of Section 334 and in the aggregate to housing made available pursuant to the first and second paragraphs, respectively, of this Section 336 and not to each individual case of rehabilitation, development or construction of dwelling units, unless the Commission determines otherwise.

If all or any portion of the Project Area is developed with low or moderate income housing units, the Commission shall require by contract or other appropriate means that such housing be made available for rent or purchase to the persons and families of low and moderate income displaced by the Project. Such persons and families shall be given priority in renting or buying such housing; provided, however, failure to give such priority shall not affect the validity of title to real property.

5. [§337] Duration of Dwelling Unit Availability and Commission Monitoring

The Commission shall require that the aggregate number of replacement dwelling units and other dwelling units rehabilitated developed, constructed, or price-restricted pursuant to Sections 334 and 336 shall remain available at affordable housing cost to persons and families of low income, moderate income and very low income households, respectively, for the longest feasible time, as determined by the Commission, but for not less than 55-years for rental units and 45-years for ownership units, except to the extent a longer or shorter period of time is permitted or required by other provisions of the CRL or other law.

Pursuant to Section 33418 of the Community Redevelopment Law, the Commission shall monitor, on an ongoing basis, any housing affordable to persons and families of low or moderate income developed or otherwise made available pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law. As part of this monitoring, the Commission shall require owners or managers of the housing to submit an annual report to the Commission. The annual reports shall include for each rental unit the rental rate and the income and family size of the occupants, and for each owner-occupied unit whether there was a change in ownership from the prior year and, if so, the income and family size of the new owners. The income information required by this section shall be supplied by the tenant in a certified statement on a form provided by the Commission.

L. [§338] Implementation Plans

In accord with the provisions of Section 33490(b) of the Community Redevelopment Law, the Commission has prepared an initial implementation plan as part of the adoption of the Project. Commencing with the fifth year after the first implementation plan was adopted, and each five years thereafter, the Commission shall adopt, after a public hearing, succeeding implementation plans that shall contain the specific goals and objectives of the Commission for the Project Area, the specific program, including potential projects, and estimated expenditures proposed to be made during the next five years, and an explanation of how the goals and objectives, programs, and expenditures will eliminate blight within the Project Area and implement the requirements of Sections 33334.2, 33334.4, 33334.6, and 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law. The parts of future implementation plans that address Sections 33334.2, 33334.4, 33334.6, and 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law shall be adopted every five years

either in conjunction with the General Plan Housing Element cycle or the implementation plan cycle. The Commission may adopt implementation plans that include more than one project area, and may amend the implementation plan after conducting a public hearing on the proposed amendment.

At least once within the five-year term of each plan adopted by the Commission, no earlier than two years and no later than three years after adoption of each plan, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing and hear testimony of all interested parties for the purpose of reviewing this Plan and the implementation plan and evaluating the progress of the Project. The hearing may be for two or more project areas if those project areas are included within the same implementation plans.

IV. [§400] USES PERMITTED IN THE PROJECT AREA

A. [§401] Permitted Land Uses

The "Redevelopment Land Use Map", attached hereto as Attachment No. 3 and incorporated herein by reference, illustrates the location of the Project Area boundaries, major streets within the Project Area, and the land uses authorized within the Project Area by the current County General Plan. The County will from time to time update and revise the County General Plan. It is the intention that the Redevelopment Plan land uses and overall street layout to be permitted within the Project Area shall be as provided within the County's General Plan, as it currently exists or as it may from time to time be amended, and as implemented and applied by County ordinances, resolutions and other laws. Uses other than those designated in the County General Plan and its land use map may be authorized by the County from time to time by amendments to the County General Plan as authorized by law.

B. [§402] Other Land Uses

1. [§403] Public Rights-of-Way

As illustrated on the Redevelopment Land Use Map (Attachment No. 3), the major public streets/roadways within the Project Area include Whiteside Street, Herbert Avenue, Medford Street, Fowler Street, Eastern Avenue, Indiana Street, Fishburn Avenue, Ditman Avenue, Miller Avenue, Bonnie Beach Place, and Knowles Avenue.

Additional public streets, alleys, and easements may be created in the Project Area as needed for proper development. Existing streets, alleys, and easements may be abandoned, closed, or modified as necessary for proper development of the Project.

Any changes in the existing interior or exterior street layout shall be in accordance with the County's General Plan, the objectives of this Plan, and the County's design standards, and shall be effectuated in the manner prescribed by state and local law, and shall be guided by the following criteria:

- a. The requirements imposed by such factors as topography, traffic safety and aesthetics;
- b. The potential need to serve not only the Project Area and new or existing developments but to also serve areas outside the Project by providing convenient and efficient vehicular access and movement; and
- c. The potential need or desire to accommodate the facilities and/or equipment of mass transportation modes.

The public rights-of-way may be used for vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic, as well as for public improvements, public and private utilities, and activities typically found in public rights-of-way.

2. **[§404] Other Public, Semi-Public, Institutional, and Non-profit Uses**

For any area of the Project Area, the Commission, per the land use designations and regulations within the County's General Plan, is authorized to permit the maintenance, establishment, or enlargement of public, semi-public, institutional, or non-profit uses, including park and recreational facilities, libraries, educational, fraternal, employee, philanthropic, religious and charitable institutions, utilities, railroad rights-of-way, and facilities of other similar associations or organizations. All such uses shall, to the extent possible, conform to the provisions of this Plan applicable to the uses in the specific area involved. The Commission may impose such other reasonable requirements and/or restrictions as may be necessary to protect the development and use of the Project Area.

3. **[§405] Interim Uses**

Pending the ultimate development of land by developers and participants, the Commission is authorized to use or permit the use of any land in the Project Area for interim uses that are not in conformity with the uses permitted in this Plan.

4. **[§406] Non-conforming Uses**

The Commission may permit an existing use to remain in an existing building in good condition which use does not conform to the provisions of this Plan, provided that such use is generally compatible with existing and proposed developments and uses in the Project Area.

The Commission may authorize additions, alterations, repairs, or other improvements in the Project Area for uses which do not conform to the provisions of this Plan where such improvements are within a portion of the Project where, in the determination of the Commission, such improvements would be compatible with surrounding Project uses and development.

C. [\$407] General Controls and Limitations

All real property in the Project Area is made subject to the controls and requirements of this Plan.

1. [\$408] Construction

All construction in the Project Area shall comply with all applicable state and local laws and codes in effect from time to time. In addition to applicable codes, ordinances, or other requirements governing development in the Project Area, additional specific performance and development standards may be adopted by the Commission to control and direct redevelopment activities in the Project Area.

2. [\$409] Rehabilitation and Retention of Properties

Any existing structure within the Project Area approved by the Commission for retention and rehabilitation shall be repaired, altered, reconstructed, or rehabilitated in such a manner that it will be safe and sound in all physical respects and be attractive in appearance and not detrimental to the surrounding uses.

3. [\$410] Limitation on the Number of Buildings

The approximate number of buildings in the Project Area shall not exceed the number of buildings permitted under the County's General Plan.

4. [\$411] Number of Dwelling Units

The number of dwelling units permitted in the Project Area shall not exceed the number of dwelling units permitted under the County's General Plan as it now exists or may be amended.

5. [\$412] Limitation on Type, Size, and Height of Buildings

Except as set forth in other sections of this Plan, the type, size, and height of buildings shall be as limited by applicable federal, state, and local statutes, ordinances, and regulations.

6. §413] Open Spaces, Landscaping, Light, Air, and Privacy

The approximate amount of open space to be provided in the Project Area is the total of all areas, which will be in the public rights-of-way, the public ground, the space around buildings, and all other outdoor areas not permitted to be covered by buildings.

Landscaping shall be provided to enhance open spaces in the Project Area and create a high-quality aesthetic environment.

Sufficient space shall be maintained between buildings in all areas to provide adequate light, air, and privacy.

7. §414] Signs

All signs shall conform to County sign ordinances and other requirements as they now exist or are hereafter amended.

8. §415] Utilities

The Commission shall require that all utilities be placed underground whenever physically and economically feasible.

9. §416] Incompatible Uses

No use or structure which by reason of appearance, traffic, smoke, glare, noise, odor, or similar factors, as determined by the Commission, would be incompatible with the surrounding areas or structures shall be permitted in any part of the Project Area.

10. §417] Non-discrimination and Non-segregation

There shall be no discrimination or segregation based upon race, color, creed, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, or ancestry permitted in the sale lease, sublease, transfer, use, occupancy, tenure, or enjoyment of property in the Project Area.

11. §418] Minor Variations

Under exceptional circumstances, the Commission is authorized to permit a variation from the limits, restrictions, and controls established by this Plan. In order to permit such variation, the Commission must determine that:

- a. The application of certain provisions of this Plan would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of this Plan;

- b. There are exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to the intended development of the property which do not apply generally to other properties having the same standards, restrictions, and controls;
- c. Permitting a variation will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the area; and
- d. Permitting a variation will not be contrary to the objectives of this Plan or the County's General Plan.

No variation shall be granted which changes a basic land use or which permits other than a minor departure from the provisions of this Plan. In permitting any such variation, the Commission shall impose such conditions as are necessary to protect the public peace, health, safety, or welfare and to assure compliance with the purposes of this Plan. Any variation permitted by the Commission hereunder shall not supersede any other approval required under applicable County codes and ordinances.

D. §419 Design for Development

Within the limits, restrictions, and controls established in this Plan, the Commission is authorized to establish heights of buildings, land coverage, setback requirements, design criteria, traffic circulation, traffic access, and other development and design controls necessary for proper development of both private and public areas within the Project Area. Such limitations, restrictions and controls are subject to the County's General Plan and zoning standards.

No new improvement shall be constructed, and no existing improvement shall be substantially modified, altered, repaired, or rehabilitated, except in accordance with this Plan and any such controls and, in the case of property which is the subject of a disposition and development or participation agreement with the Commission and any other property, at the discretion of the Commission, in accordance with architectural, landscape, and site plans submitted to and approved in writing by the Commission. One of the objectives of this Plan is to create an attractive and pleasant environment in the Project Area. Therefore, such plans shall give consideration to good design, open space, and other amenities to enhance the aesthetic quality of the Project Area. The Commission shall not approve any plans that do not comply with this Plan.

E. §420 Building Permits

No permit shall be issued for the construction of any building or for any construction on an existing building in the Project Area from the date of adoption of this Plan until the application for such permit has been approved as consistent with all County requirements. An application shall be deemed consistent with this Plan if it is consistent

with the County's General Plan, applicable zoning ordinances and any adopted design for development.

The Commission is authorized to review and approve all permits for projects receiving Commission financial assistance.

V. [§500] METHODS OF FINANCING THE PROJECT

A. [§501] General Description of the Proposed Financing Method

The Commission is authorized to finance this Project with financial assistance from the County, the State of California, the federal government, tax increment funds, interest income, Commission bonds, donations, loans from private financial institutions, the lease or sale of Commission-owned property, or any other available source, public or private.

The Commission is also authorized to obtain advances, borrow funds, and create indebtedness in carrying out this Plan. The principal and interest on such advances, funds, and indebtedness may be paid from tax increments or any other funds available to the Commission. Advances and loans for survey and planning and for the operating capital for nominal administration of this Project may be provided by the County until adequate tax increment or other funds are available, or sufficiently assured, to repay the advances and loans and to permit borrowing adequate working capital from sources other than the County. The County, as it is able, may also supply additional assistance through County loans and grants for various public facilities.

The County or any other public agency may expend money to assist the Commission in carrying out this Project. As available, gas tax funds from the state and County may be used for street improvements and public transit facilities.

B. [§502] Tax Increment Funds

All taxes levied upon taxable property within the Project Area each year, by or for the benefit of the State of California, the County of Los Angeles, any district, or any other public corporation (hereinafter sometimes called "taxing agencies"), after the effective date of the ordinance approving this Plan shall be divided as follows:

1. That portion of the taxes which would be produced by the rate upon which the tax is levied each year by or for each of said taxing agencies upon the total sum of the assessed value of the taxable property in the Project as shown upon the assessment roll used in connection with the taxation of such property by such taxing agency, last equalized prior to the effective date of such ordinance, shall be allocated to and when collected shall be paid into the funds of the respective

taxing agencies as taxes by or for the taxing agencies on all other property are paid (for the purpose of allocating taxes levied by or for any taxing agency or agencies which did not include the territory of the Project on the effective date of such ordinance but to which such territory is annexed or otherwise included after such effective date, the assessment roll of the County of Los Angeles, last equalized on the effective date of said ordinance, shall be used in determining the assessed valuation of the taxable property in the Project on said effective date).

2. Except as provided in subdivision 3 of this Section 502, below, that portion of said levied taxes each year in excess of such amount shall be allocated to and when collected shall be paid into a special fund of the Commission to pay the principal of and interest on loans, moneys advanced to, or indebtedness (whether funded, refunded, assumed, or otherwise) incurred by the Commission to finance or refinance, in whole or in part, this Project. Unless and until the total assessed valuation of the taxable property in the Project exceeds the total assessed value of the taxable property in the Project as shown by the last equalized assessment roll referred to in subdivision 1 of this Section 502, above, all of the taxes levied and collected upon the taxable property in the Project shall be paid into the funds of the respective taxing agencies as taxes on all other property are paid.
3. That portion of the taxes in excess of the amount identified in subdivision 1 of this Section 502, above, which are attributable to a tax rate levied by a taxing agency which was approved by the voters of the taxing agency on or after January 1, 1989, for the purpose of producing revenues in an amount sufficient to make annual repayments of the principal of, and the interest on, any bonded indebtedness for the acquisition or improvement of real property shall be allocated to, and when collected shall be paid into, the fund of that taxing agency.

The portion of taxes mentioned in subdivision 2 of this Section 502, above, are hereby irrevocably pledged for the payment of the principal of and interest on the advance of moneys, or making of loans or the incurring of any indebtedness (whether funded, refunded, assumed, or otherwise) by the Commission to finance or refinance the Project, in whole or in part. The Commission is authorized to make such pledges as to specific advances, loans, and indebtedness as appropriate in carrying out the Project.

C. §503 Bonds, Advances and Indebtedness

The Commission is authorized to issue bonds from time to time, if it deems appropriate to do so, in order to finance all or any part of the Project. Neither the officers, employees and agents of the Commission, nor any persons executing the bonds are liable personally on the bonds by reason of their issuance.

The bonds and other obligations of the Commission are not a debt of the County or the state, nor are any of its political subdivisions liable for them, nor in any event shall the bonds or obligations be payable out of any funds or properties other than those of the Commission, and such bonds and other obligations shall so state on their face. The bonds do not constitute an indebtedness within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory debt limitation or restriction.

The amount of bonded indebtedness to be repaid in whole or part from the allocation of taxes described in subdivision 2 of Section 502 above which can be outstanding at any one time for the Project Area shall not exceed seventy million dollars (\$70,000,000) in principal amount, except by amendment of this Plan. This limit, however, shall not prevent the Commission from issuing additional bonds in order fulfill the Commission's obligations under Section 33413 of the Health and Safety Code.

D. [\$504] Time Limit on Establishment of Indebtedness

The Commission shall not establish or incur loans, advances, or indebtedness to finance in whole or in part the Project Area beyond twenty (20) years from the date of adoption of the ordinance approving and adopting the Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project.

Loans, advances, or indebtedness may be repaid over a period of time beyond said time limit. This time limit shall not prevent the Commission from incurring debt to be paid from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund established pursuant to Section 33334.2 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 335 of this Plan, or establishing more debt in order to fulfill the Commission's obligations under Section 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 334 of this Plan. The above limit shall not prevent the Commission from refinancing, refunding or restructuring indebtedness after the time limit if the indebtedness is not increased and the time during which the indebtedness is to be repaid is not extended beyond the time limit contained in this Section 504.

E. [\$505] Time Limit on Receipt of Tax Increment

The Commission may not receive and shall not repay indebtedness with the proceeds from property taxes received pursuant to 33670 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 502 of this Plan beyond 45 years from the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project, except to repay debt to be paid from the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund established pursuant to Section 33334.2 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 335 of this Plan, or debt established in order to fulfill the Commission's obligations under Section 33413 of the Community Redevelopment Law and Section 334 of this Plan.

F. §506 Other Loans and Grants

Any other loans, grants, guarantees, or financial assistance from the United States, the State of California, or any other public or private source will be utilized if available.

VI. §600 ACTIONS BY THE COUNTY

The County shall aid and cooperate with the Commission in carrying out this Plan and shall take all actions necessary to ensure the continued fulfillment of the purposes of this Plan and to prevent the recurrence or spread in the area of conditions causing blight. Actions by the County shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- A. Institution and completion of proceedings for opening, closing, vacating, widening, or changing the grades of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way and for other necessary modifications of the streets, the street layout, and other public rights-of-way in the Project Area. Such action by the County shall include the requirement of abandonment, removal, and relocation by the public utility companies of their operations of public rights-of-way as appropriate to carry out this Plan provided that nothing in this Plan shall be construed to require the cost of such abandonment, removal, and relocation to be borne by others than those legally required to bear such cost.
- B. Provision of advances, loans, or grants to the Commission or the expenditure of funds for projects implementing this Plan as deemed appropriate by the County and to the extent funds are available therefore.
- C. Institution and completion of proceedings necessary for changes and improvements in private and publicly-owned public utilities within or affecting the Project Area.
- D. Revision of zoning (if necessary) within the Project Area to permit the land uses and development authorized by this Plan.
- E. Imposition wherever necessary (by conditional use permits or other means) of appropriate controls within the limits of this Plan upon parcels in the Project Area to ensure their proper development and use.
- F. Provision for administrative enforcement of this Plan by the County after development. The County and the Commission shall develop and provide for enforcement of a program for continued maintenance by owners of all real property, both public and private, within the Project Area throughout the duration of this Plan.

- G. Performance of the above actions and of all other functions and services relating to public peace, health, safety, and physical development normally rendered in accordance with a schedule which will permit the redevelopment of the Project Area to be commenced and carried to completion without unnecessary delays.
- H. The undertaking and completing of any other proceedings necessary to carry out the Project.

The forgoing actions to be taken by the County do not involve or constitute any commitment for financial outlays by the County unless specifically agreed to and authorized by the County.

VII. [§700] ENFORCEMENT

The administration and enforcement of this Plan, including the preparation and execution of any documents implementing this Plan, shall be performed by the Commission and/or the County.

The provisions of this Plan or other documents entered into pursuant to this Plan may also be enforced by court litigation instituted by either the Commission or the County. Such remedies may include, but are not limited to specific performance, damages, reentry, injunctions, or any other remedies appropriate to the purposes of this Plan. In addition, any recorded provisions which are expressly for the benefit of owners of property in the Project Area may be enforced by such owners.

VIII. [§800] DURATION OF THIS PLAN

Except for the non-discrimination and non-segregation provisions imposed by the Commission which shall run in perpetuity, and the affordable housing covenants imposed by the Commission which shall continue in effect for a period as may be determined and specified by the Commission and the CRL, the provisions of this Plan shall be effective, and the provisions of other documents formulated pursuant to this Plan may be made effective for a period of thirty (30) years from adoption of the Redevelopment Plan for the Whiteside Redevelopment Project provided, however, that, subject to the limitations and exceptions thereto set forth in Sections 504 and 505 of this Plan, the Commission may issue bonds and incur obligations pursuant to this Plan which extend beyond the termination date, and in such event, this Plan shall continue in effect for the purpose of repaying such bonds or other obligations until the date of retirement of such bonds or other obligations.

IX. [§900] PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENT

This Plan may be amended by means of the procedure established in Sections 33354.6 and/or 33450 *et seq.* of the Community Redevelopment Law or by any other procedure hereafter established by law.

X. [§1000] MERGER

Upon the effective date of the ordinance adopting this Redevelopment Plan, and provided a City of Los Angeles ordinance becomes effective amending and merging the Redevelopment Plan for the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area (located within the City of Los Angeles and the jurisdiction of the LACRA) with the Whiteside Redevelopment Project, the Whiteside Redevelopment Project may be merged immediately with the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area (collectively referred to as the "Merged Redevelopment Projects") by actions of the Board of Supervisors of the County consistent with the Community Redevelopment Law adopting the Redevelopment Plan and merging projects. The boundaries of the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area are described in Attachment No. 5 and shown by a diagram (map) in Attachment No. 6 per Section 33333 of the Community Redevelopment Law. Combined, the legal description prepared for the Project Area (Attachment No. 1) and the legal description for the Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Project Area (Attachment No. 5) are the legal descriptions for the Merged Redevelopment Projects.

GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

WHITESIDE BOUNDARY

A parcel of land, in the Unincorporated Territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of Fowler Avenue, 60 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 6333, partly in the City of Los Angeles and partly in the Unincorporated Territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 71, Pages 11 through 14, inclusive of Maps, Records of said Records, with the easterly line of the City Boundary of the City of Los Angeles as established on April 4, 1850, and from said intersection CORS Station ELSC, National Geodetic Survey Point Identifier (PID) AJ1861 whose NAD83 California Coordinate System Zone 5, Epoch 2000.35, values are 1,833,266.27 feet (Northing) and 6,498,517.73 feet (Easting), bears South 26 degrees 37 minutes 31 seconds West 10,750.30 feet;

1. thence North 00 degrees 18 minutes 07 seconds West 2,036.68 feet along said easterly line of the City of Los Angeles, being the center line of Indiana Street, 60 feet wide, as shown on said Tract No. 6333, to the southerly line of the City Boundary of the City of Los Angeles as established by Ordinance Number 32360 on June 10, 1915 and from which point CORS Station OXYC, National Geodetic Survey Point Identifier (PID) AJ1907 whose NAD83 California Coordinate System Zone 5, Epoch 2000.35, values are 1,869,322.06 feet (Northing) and 6,498,930.77 feet (Easting), bears North 10 degrees 12 minutes 18 seconds West 24,801.18 feet;
2. thence South 89 degrees 51 minutes 58 seconds East 3,429.33 feet along said southerly boundary to an angle point in said southerly line;
3. thence continuing along said southerly line, North 00 degrees 08 minutes 05 seconds East 198.04 feet;

4. thence continuing along said southerly line South 89 degrees 49 minutes 26 seconds East 998.06 feet to the southwesterly corner of Lot 144 of Tract No. 9552, partly in said City and partly in the Unincorporated Territory of said County, as per map recorded in Book 142, Pages 18, 19, and 20 of said Maps;
5. thence leaving said southerly line, South 74 degrees 56 minutes 27 seconds East 74.33 feet to the most southerly corner of said Lot 144;
6. thence North 72 degrees 55 minutes 28 seconds East 27.74 feet to the northwesterly corner of Lot 121 of said Tract No. 9552;
7. thence South 87 degrees 08 minutes 48 seconds East 75.57 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 121;
8. thence North 89 degrees 42 minutes 06 seconds East 88.14 feet to the northeasterly corner of Lot 124 of said Tract No. 9552;
9. thence South 43 degrees 44 minutes 17 seconds East 17.83 feet;
10. thence South 03 degrees 28 minutes 29 seconds East 36.66 feet;
11. thence North 88 degrees 50 minutes 19 seconds East 293.49 feet;
12. thence North 88 degrees 51 minutes 57 seconds East 247.95 feet;
13. thence South 85 degrees 01 minutes 11 seconds East 36.08 feet;
14. thence South 67 degrees 32 minutes 08 seconds East 46.72 feet to the northwesterly corner of Lot 88 of Tract No. 10366, in the Unincorporated Territory of said County; as per map recorded in Book 155, Pages 22 through 25, inclusive, of said Maps;
15. thence North 65 degrees 28 minutes 32 seconds East 88.59 feet to the most northerly corner of said Lot 89;
16. thence South 37 degrees 25 minutes 33 seconds East 7.94 feet to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 89;
17. thence South 78 degrees 35 minutes 34 seconds East 77.23 feet;
18. thence South 89 degrees 15 minutes 17 seconds East 86.45 feet from which point CORS Station CIT1, National Geodetic Survey Point Identifier (PID) AI4471 whose NAD83 California Coordinate System Zone 5, Epoch 2000.35, values are

- 1,872,155.50 feet (Northing) and 6,523,154.06 feet (Easting), bears North 27 degrees 44 minutes 06 seconds East 30,634.98 feet;
19. thence South 00 degrees 48 minutes 06 seconds West 40.77 feet;
 20. thence South 03 degrees 07 minutes 21 seconds East 58.28 feet;
 21. thence South 09 degrees 37 minutes 34 seconds East 67.41 feet;
 22. thence South 18 degrees 05 minutes 38 seconds East 64.33 feet;
 23. thence South 24 degrees 51 minutes 49 seconds East 117.68 feet;
 24. thence South 29 degrees 25 minutes 03 seconds East 53.80 feet from which point
CORS Station SGHS, National Geodetic Survey Point Identifier (PID) AJ1924 whose
NAD83 California Coordinate System Zone 5, Epoch 2000.35, values are
1,854,650.72 feet (Northing) and 6,528,675.40 feet (Easting), bears North 63 degrees
04 minutes 17 seconds East 22,060.52 feet;
 25. thence South 60 degrees 37 minutes 48 seconds West 46.23 feet to the most easterly
corner of Lot 15, Block L, of Tract No. 6479, in the Unincorporated Territory of said
County, as per map recorded in Book 75, Pages 1 through 5, inclusive of said Maps;
 26. thence South 61 degrees 10 minutes 33 seconds West 3,033.65 feet to the most
southerly corner of Lot 4, Block 10, of Tract No. 6332, in the Unincorporated
Territory of said County, as per map recorded in Book 67, Pages 89 through 97,
inclusive, of said Maps;
 27. thence South 62 degrees 19 minutes 03 seconds West 100.75 feet;
 28. thence South 63 degrees 39 minutes 57 seconds West 43.06 feet;
 29. thence South 69 degrees 52 minutes 17 seconds West 36.78 feet;
 30. thence South 54 degrees 16 minutes 01 seconds West 60.51 feet;
 31. thence South 63 degrees 32 minutes 36 seconds West 69.88 feet to the southeasterly
corner of Lot 2, Block 4 of Tract No. 6332, in the Unincorporated Territory of said
County, as per map recorded in Book 67, Pages 89 through 97, inclusive, of said
Maps;
 32. thence North 02 degrees 58 minutes 23 seconds East 16.27 feet;

33. thence South 63 degrees 49 minutes 36 seconds West 68.74 feet to the southwesterly line of Lot 3, Block 4 of said Tract No. 6332;
34. thence North 24 degrees 05 minutes 58 seconds West 139.18 feet to the most westerly corner of said Lot 3;
35. thence North 23 degrees 35 minutes 51 seconds West 27.52 feet;
36. thence North 62 degrees 23 minutes 28 seconds East 124.76 feet to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 2, Block 2 of said Tract No. 6332;
37. thence North 28 degrees 20 minutes 48 seconds West 145.35 feet to the most westerly corner of said Lot 2;
38. thence North 61 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds East 8.74 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 5, Block 2 of said Tract No. 6332;
39. thence North 19 degrees 02 minutes 33 seconds East 10.83 feet to the angle point in the center line of that certain alley, 15 feet wide, lying within said Block 2 as shown on said Tract No. 6332;
40. thence North 25 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds West 275.29 feet along said center line to an angle point therein;
41. thence North 50 degrees 41 minutes 08 seconds West 517.50 feet along said center line to the beginning of a curve, concave to the south and having a radius of 147.50 feet;
42. thence along said center line, westerly 179.21 feet along said curve through a central angle of 69 degrees 36 minutes 43 seconds and a chord bearing and distance of North 85 degrees 29 minutes 30 seconds West 168.39 feet;
43. thence along said center line, South 59 degrees 42 minutes 10 seconds West 423.72 feet to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 48, Block 2, of said Tract No. 6332;
44. thence North 31 degrees 17 minutes 22 seconds West 6.73 feet to the most southerly corner of said Lot 48;
45. thence South 59 degrees 49 minutes 24 seconds West 205.72 feet to an angle point in the southeasterly line of Lot 42, Block 2 of said Tract No. 6332;

- 46. thence South 57 degrees 47 minutes 25 seconds West 76.98 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 41, Block 2 of said Tract No. 6332;
- 47. thence South 54 degrees 55 minutes 04 seconds West 50.22 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 28, Block 3 of said Tract No. 6332;
- 48. thence South 55 degrees 23 minutes 36 seconds West 1,079.76 feet; along the southeasterly line of said Lot 28, and along the southeasterly lines of Lots 3 through 27, inclusive, and its southwesterly prolongation;
- 49. thence North 88 degrees 59 minutes 20 seconds West 262.53 feet;
- 50. thence South 00 degrees 52 minutes 27 seconds East 36.34 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 66, Block 4, of said Tract No. 6332;
- 51. thence along the easterly line of said Lot 66, South 01 degrees 47 minutes 39 seconds West 132.60 feet;
- 52. thence North 88 degrees 10 minutes 25 seconds West 97.90 feet;
- 53. thence South 89 degrees 32 minutes 18 seconds West 29.92 feet to said center line of Indiana Street and the easterly line of the City Boundary of the City of Los Angeles;
- 54. thence along said center line and easterly boundary line, North 00 degrees 18 minutes 07 seconds West 74.95 feet to the point of beginning.

This geographic description is delineated on accompanying "Exhibit Map" and is made a part hereof for reference purposes.

Prepared under the direction of



Robert C. Olson, PLS 5490

PSOMAS

4.28.2005



ATTACHMENT NO. 2

PROJECT AREA MAP

ATTACHMENT NO. 3

REDEVELOPMENT LAND USE MAP

ATTACHMENT NO. 4

POTENTIAL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

**ATTACHMENT NO. 4
WHITESIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
POTENTIAL PROJECTS/PROGRAM LIST**

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM..... \$5,078,000

1. Street construction, widening, reconstruction and surfacing (arterial highways, collector roads, local roads, alleys)
2. Storm drain facilities and systems
3. Flood control
4. Extension of utilities and utilities undergrounding
5. Water systems
6. Sanitary sewers
7. Miscellaneous infrastructure projects

STREETSCAPE AND GATEWAY IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM..... \$1,269,000

1. Construction / repair of curbs, gutters and sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities
2. Installation of street trees and shrubs
3. Construction of decorative and handicapped accessible crosswalks
4. Construction of new medians with landscaping
5. Installation of additional lighting in the Project Area
6. Miscellaneous programs and improvements

TRAFFIC CIRCULATION, TRANSIT AND PARKING PROJECTS..... \$2,539,000

1. Traffic signal controls, signals and transportation management strategies
2. Provision of bus shelters, park and ride lots, bicycle facilities and other improvements
3. Construction of parking lots / garages and on-street parking

LAND ASSEMBLY AND RELOCATION PROGRAM..... \$5,078,000

1. Relocation assistance (residential, commercial and industrial)
2. Land assembly
3. Property acquisition
4. Site preparation activities (demolition and clearance)

PUBLIC/PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM..... \$6,346,000

1. Economic / Industrial development
2. Expansion of existing development facilities
3. Construction, landscaping and parking lot improvements
4. Miscellaneous improvement / development projects

TARGETED BUSINESS RECRUITMENT PROGRAM..... \$1,269,000

1. Recruitment of businesses involved in the biotechnology industry
2. Recruitment of businesses providing goods and services to the local community

COMMUNITY BUSINESS REVITALIZATION PROGRAM..... \$1,269,000

1. Storefront improvements and façade treatments
2. Graffiti abatement
3. Marketing/promotions
4. Miscellaneous community business revitalization improvement programs

BROWNSFIELD PROGRAM..... \$1,269,000

1. Identify, investigate and remediate environmentally contaminated properties
2. Acquire environmentally contaminated properties

COMMUNITY CENTERS, PARK AND OPEN SPACE PROJECTS \$1,269,000

1. Public Facilities Improvements (fire, police, library, community center, recreation and parks)
2. Miscellaneous programs and improvements

HOUSING PROGRAMS \$14,400,000

In addition to those Projects/Programs identified above, the Commission will use no less than twenty percent (20%) of all tax increment received to increase, preserve and improve the community's supply of low and moderate income housing.

TOTAL..... \$39,786,000

ATTACHMENT NO. 5

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE
ADELANTE EASTSIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA**

ATTACHMENT NO. 5

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE

PROPOSED ADELANTE EASTSIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

PARCEL 1

A parcel of land in the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of North Main Street, 80.00 feet wide, formerly Kuhrts Street, as shown on Kuhrts Bridge Tract, in said City, County and State, as per Map filed in Book 25, Page 93 of Miscellaneous Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County and the curved easterly line of the Official Bed of the Los Angeles River, of variable width, shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 28.2, as having a radius of 1243.57 feet; thence southerly 258.45 feet along said curved easterly line, through a central angle of $11^{\circ}48'35''$, to a point on the southerly line of Lot 7 of said Tract; thence southerly 1623.47 feet along the easterly lines of Lots 7 through 60 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 60, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue, 115.00 feet wide, formerly Mission Street, as shown on said Map; thence southerly 128.37 feet along the easterly line of the Official Bed of the Los Angeles River, as shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 29.1 and on Tract No. 9520, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 147, Pages 27 and 28, to the southerly right-of-way line of said Alhambra Avenue; thence southerly 119.34 feet along said easterly line of the Official Bed of the Los Angeles River to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 845.34 feet; thence southerly 387.93 feet along said easterly line through a central angle of $26^{\circ}02'01''$ to a point of tangency; thence southerly 1394.15 feet along said easterly line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave westerly and having a radius of 1241.70 feet; thence southerly and southwesterly 852.88 feet along said easterly line, through a central angle of $39^{\circ}21'06''$ to the northerly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, formerly Macy Street, as shown on said map; thence southwesterly 80.48 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 2, of Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, in said city, as per map filed in Recorder's Filed Map No. 604-R, said corner being on the southerly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, thence southwesterly along the northwesterly line of said Lot 2 the following five (5) courses: southwesterly 82.6 feet to an angle point therein; southwesterly 80.10 feet to an angle point therein; southwesterly 142.5 feet to an angle point therein; southeasterly 6.92 feet to an angle point therein; southwesterly 154.61 feet to the most southerly corner of said lot, said corner being on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Elliot Street, 50 feet wide (vacated), as shown on said map; thence southwesterly 53.81 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 1, of said map, said corner being on the southerly right-of-way line of said Elliot Street (vacated), said corner also being on the northerly line of the Santa Ana Freeway, as shown on Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-1as prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence southwesterly 49.37 feet along said northerly right-of-way line to an angle point therein; thence westerly 39.06 feet along said northerly line to the easterly line of said Official Bed of the Los Angeles River; thence southwesterly 109.89 feet along said easterly line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 655.64 feet; thence southerly 287.47 feet along said easterly line through a central angle of $25^{\circ}08'03''$ to a point of tangency; thence southerly 1617.65 feet along said easterly line as shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 29.2 to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 655.62 feet; thence southerly 259.55 feet along said easterly line through a central angle of $22^{\circ}40'56''$ to a point of tangency with a curve concave easterly and having a radius of 655.45 feet; thence southerly 149.70 feet along said easterly line to a point of tangency; thence southerly 2088.03 feet along said easterly line of the Official Bed of the Los Angeles River to the centerline of Fourth Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 30.1; thence southerly 1175.96 feet along said easterly line to the centerline of Whittier Boulevard, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 30.1; thence southerly 1421.43 feet along said easterly line to the centerline of Seventh Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 30.1; thence southerly 3323.19 feet along said easterly line to the centerline of Olympic Boulevard, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map No. 19-RW 31.1; thence southerly 2644.45 feet along said easterly line to the northerly right-of-way line of Butte Street, 30.00 feet wide, as shown on Los Angeles County Flood Control District

Map No. 19-RW 33.1; thence easterly 106.27 feet along said northerly right-of-way line of Butte Street to the easterly terminus thereof, said terminus being also the generally westerly line of Parcel B, of Parcel Map L.A. No. 2309, in said city, as per map filed in Book 43, Page 61, of said parcel maps; thence southwesterly 366.37 feet along said generally westerly line of Parcel B and the westerly line of Lot 14, of Tract No. 2495, in said city, as per map filed in Book 36, Pages 20 and 21, of said maps, and its southwesterly prolongation, to the northerly right-of-way line of Washington Boulevard, 100 feet wide, as it presently exists; thence continuing southwesterly 55.23 feet along said prolongation to the northerly prolongation of the westerly line of Parcel A, of Parcel Map L.A. No. 6263, in said city, as per map filed in Book 220, Pages 44 and 45, of said parcel maps; thence southerly 48.34 feet along said northerly prolongation to the northwesterly corner of said Parcel A, said corner being also the southerly line of said Washington Boulevard; thence southerly 239.38 feet along the westerly line of said Parcel A to an angle point therein; thence southerly 94.04 feet to the southwesterly corner of said parcel, said corner being also the northerly line of the Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Right-of-Way, 100 feet wide, as shown on said map; thence southerly 100.02 feet to the northwesterly corner of Lot 1, of Tract No. 3257, in said city, as per map filed in Book 35, Page 75, of said maps, said corner being also the southerly line of said Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Right-of-Way; thence easterly 6.52 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 1 to the northeasterly line of a 100.00 feet wide easement of the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power; thence southeasterly 507.44 feet along said northeasterly line to the City of Los Angeles Boundary Line as shown on said Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map; thence 584.97 feet along said City of Los Angeles Boundary Line to the westerly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 100 feet wide, as shown on said Los Angeles County Flood Control District Map; thence easterly 80.00 feet along said City of Los Angeles Boundary Line to the easterly line of the westerly 5.00 feet of Felipa Lugo de Vejar 5.80 Acres as shown on said Partition of the Tract of Land in Rancho San Antonio, said line being the easterly line of Soto Street, 80 feet wide; thence northerly 50.63 feet along said easterly line to a point; thence easterly 503.34 feet to the southerly line of said Felipa Lugo de Vejar 5.80 Acres; thence easterly 304.00 feet along said southerly line of Felipa Lugo de Vejar 5.80 Acres, to the westerly line of Maria Antonio Lugo de Sepulveda 7.34 Acres as shown on said Partition of Tract of Land in Rancho San Antonio; thence northerly 195.80 feet along said westerly line to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of Atchinson & Santa Fe Railway right-of-way, 100.00 feet wide; thence southeasterly 512.96 feet along said Atchinson & Santa Fe Railway right-of-way to the most easterly corner of said Maria Antonio Lugo de Sepulveda 7.34 Acres; thence easterly 263.67 feet to a point on the northeasterly line of Atchinson & Santa Fe Railway right-of-way, said point being distant southeasterly 233.29 feet from the most southerly corner of Lot 1 of Tract No. 13269, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 269, Page 50 of Maps; thence southeasterly 479.95 feet along said northeasterly line of Atchinson & Santa Fe Railway right-of-way to the westerly line of Lot 1 of the Subdivision of the Martinez Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 55, Page 24 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 182.09 feet along said northeasterly line of said Atchinson & Santa Fe Railway right-of-way to the easterly line of O.R. 42618, Page 152; thence northerly 523.48 feet along said easterly line to the southwesterly right-of-way line of Washington Boulevard, 90 feet wide; thence southeasterly 229.82 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line to an angle point therein; thence northerly 11.08 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line to an angle point therein; thence southeasterly 422.31 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line to the Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles; thence easterly 184.94 feet to a point on the northwesterly line of Lot 2 of Tract No. 9432, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 181, Page 42 and 43 of Maps, said point being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Washington Boulevard, said point being also distant westerly 92.46 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot 2; thence northwesterly 83.40 feet along said northeasterly right-of-way line to the northwesterly line of Lot 3, of Licensed Surveyor's Map, as per map filed in Book 26, Page 5, of said maps; thence northeasterly 407.62 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 3 through 5, of said Licensed Surveyor's Map, to the northeasterly line of said Lot 5; thence southeasterly 55.21 feet to an angle point therein; thence southeasterly 10.46 feet to the southerly right-of-way line of the City of Los Angeles Department, 71.84 feet wide; thence southeasterly 208.55 feet along said southerly right-of-way line to the westerly right-of-way line of Grande Vista Avenue, 100 feet wide; thence southeasterly 55.23 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of said right-of-way line to the centerline of said Grande Vista Avenue; thence southerly 127.87 feet along said centerline to an angle point therein; thence southeasterly 835.47 feet along said prolongation and said centerline to the easterly prolongation of a line parallel with and distant southerly 30.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southerly line of Tract No. 6224, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 74, Page 39 of Maps, said parallel line being also the southerly right-of-way line of Holabird Avenue, 30.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 486.84 feet along said parallel line to the westerly right-of-way line of Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company right-of-way, 80.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 115.56 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 13 of Tract No. 8626,

in said City, as per Map filed in Book 121, Pages 96 through 100 of Maps; thence northerly 285.55 feet along the easterly of said Lot 13 to the northeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Washington Boulevard, 120.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 121.59 feet to a point on the westerly line of Lot 15 of said Tract No. 8626, said point being distant southerly 283.30 feet from the northwesterly corner of Lot 14 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Washington Boulevard; thence northerly 283.30 feet along the westerly lines of said Lots 14 & 15 to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 14, said corner being also the beginning of non-tangent curve concave northerly and having a radius of 5694.6 feet, a radial to said point bears S20°04'39"W, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 1418.47 feet along said curve, said curve being also the northerly line of Lots 14, 16 and A, of said Tract, through a central angle of 14°16'19" to the a point on the northerly line of said Lot 16; thence easterly 2532.64 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 16 and its easterly prolongation to the centerline of Indiana Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 1426.36 feet along the centerline of said Indiana Street to the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 18, Tract No. 3840, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 42 Pages 16 and 17 of said Maps; thence westerly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 18, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Indiana Street; thence westerly 122.55 feet along the northerly line of said Lot to the northwesterly corner thereof; thence southerly 40.00 feet along the westerly line of said Lot to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also the southeasterly corner of Lot 37 of said Tract; thence westerly 120.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of La Puerta Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 30.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot to the centerline of said La Puerta Street; thence northerly 40.00 feet along said centerline to the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 56 of said Tract; thence westerly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said La Puerta Street; thence westerly 240.00 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 56 and 75 of said Tract to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 75, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Prado Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 30.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of said northerly line of said Lot 75, to the centerline of said Prado Street; thence southerly 40.00 feet along said centerline to the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 95 of said Tract; thence westerly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Prado Street; thence westerly 240.00 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 95 and 114 of said Tract to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 114, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Los Palos Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 30.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of said Lot 114 to the centerline of said Los Palos Street; thence northerly 526.58 feet along said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 142.97 feet; thence northerly and northwesterly 107.51 feet along said curve through a central angle of 43°07'40" to the beginning of a reverse curve concave northeasterly and having a radius of 140.00 feet; thence northwesterly and northerly 105.38 feet along said curve through a central angle of 43°07'40" to the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 96 of said Tract, said southerly line being also the southerly right-of-way line of Olympic Boulevard, 100.00 feet wide, (formerly Mines Avenue, 60.00 feet wide); thence northerly 50.00 feet, tangent to said curve to a line parallel with and distant northerly 50.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northerly line of said Lot 96; thence easterly 364.35 feet along said parallel line to the southwesterly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 112 of Tract No. 941, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 16 Pages 194 and 195, said easterly line being also the centerline of Prado Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 106.43 feet along said prolongation and the southeasterly lines of Lots 112 and 113 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 113, said corner being also on said centerline of Prado Street; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot to the northwesterly line of said Prado Street; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said to the southeasterly line of an alley 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot to the northwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the centerline of said alley; thence southwesterly 80.00 feet along said centerline to the most easterly corner of Lot 156, said corner being also on said centerline; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said alley; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said northeasterly line to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Los Palos Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said northeasterly line of said Lot to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 162 of said Tract and on the centerline of said Los Palos Street; thence southwesterly 160.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 160 through 163 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 160, said corner being also on the centerline of said Los

Palos Street; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 160 to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Los Palos Street; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said southwesterly line to the southeasterly line of an alley 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along said southwesterly line of Lot 160 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 211 of said Tract and on the centerline of said alley; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 211 to the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said southwesterly line to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Calzona Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said southwesterly line of Lot 211 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 219 of said Tract, and on the centerline of said Calzona Street; thence southwesterly 40.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 219 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said centerline of Calzona Street; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 219 to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Calzona Street; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 219 to the southeasterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 10.00 feet along said southwesterly line to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the centerline of said alley; thence southwesterly 120.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 216 through 218 inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 216, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 270 of said Tract and on said centerline of said alley; thence northwesterly 10.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 270 to the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 134.59 feet along said southwesterly line to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Calada Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said southwesterly line of Lot 270 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 308 of said Tract and on the centerline of Calada Street; thence southwesterly 130.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 308 through 310 to a point on a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 7.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of said Lot 310, said point being also on the centerline of said Calada Street; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Calada Street, said parallel line being also the northeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of said Lot 310, said northwesterly line being also a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 317 of said Tract, parallel with and distant northeasterly 7.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of said Lot 317, said line being also the centerline of said alley; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mirasol Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to the most northwesterly line of said Lot 317 of said Tract, said line being also a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 360 of said Tract, parallel with and distant northeasterly 7.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of said Lot 317 and the centerline of said Mirasol Street; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mirasol Street; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of said Lot 360, said line being also on the point on the southeasterly line of Lot 367 of said Tract, parallel with and distant northeasterly 7.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of said Lot 367, said line being also the centerline of said alley; thence northwesterly 7.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Esperanza Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of Lot 367 of said Tract, said line being also the centerline of said Esperanza Street; thence southwesterly 180.48 feet along said centerline to the centerline of 8th Street 82.50 feet wide, (formerly Hollenbeck Avenue), as shown on Tract No. 4838, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 51 Page 31 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 146.94 feet along said centerline of 8th Street, to the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 167 of said Tract; thence southerly 47.01 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 167, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said 8th Street; thence southerly 101.50 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 167 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northerly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 700.63 feet along the southerly lines of Lot 154 through 167 inclusive, of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 154, said corner being also on the northerly line of said alley and on the easterly right-of-way line of Spence Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 60.00 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 117 of said Tract, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Spencer Street and on the northerly line of an alley 14.00 feet wide, as shown on

said Tract; thence westerly 659.60 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 104 through 117 inclusive, of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 104, said corner being also on the northerly line of said alley and on the easterly right-of-way line of Velasco Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 50.57 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 92, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Velasco Street; thence westerly 164.17 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 92 of said Tract to the most westerly corner thereof, thence northeasterly 346.72 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 92 through 98 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 98, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Hunter Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 50.01 feet to the southwesterly corner of Lot 72 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Hunter Street; thence northeasterly 210.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 72 and 45 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 45, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Estrada Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 25.00 feet along the northerly prolongation of the northwesterly line of said Lot 45 to the centerline of said Estrada Street; thence southeasterly 22.79 feet along said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 36 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 36, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Estrada Street; thence northeasterly 210.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 36 and 3 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of 8th Street, 82.50 feet wide, (formerly Hollenbeck Avenue), as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 41.25 feet along the northerly prolongation of the southeasterly line of said Lot 3 to the centerline of said 8th Street; thence southeasterly 14.19 feet along said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 190 of the Young & Adams Sunrise Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 137 of Maps; thence northeasterly 41.25 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 190, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said 8th Street; thence northeasterly 251.29 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 190 and 163 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 163, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Opal Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 30.00 feet along the northeasterly prolongation of said northwesterly lines to the centerline line of said Opal Street; thence northwesterly 225.73 feet along said centerline to a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 3.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the northerly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lots 25 through 30 inclusive, Block 4, of Tract No. 4307, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 47 Pages 44 and 45, of Maps; thence southwesterly 322.39 feet along said parallel line to the centerline of said 8th Street; thence northwesterly 136.19 feet along said centerline to the northeasterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 20 of Tract No. 4447, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 49 Page 29 of Maps; thence southwesterly 41.25 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said 8th Street and on the northwesterly line of an alley 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 125.74 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 20 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the said northwesterly line of the alley and on the northeasterly line of an alley 15.00 wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 15.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 33 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the said northwesterly line of the alley 15.00 feet wide; thence southwesterly 125.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 33 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northwesterly line of the alley and on the northeasterly line of Estrada Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, thence southwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 41 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Estrada Street and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 122.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 41 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northwesterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly line of an alley 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 15.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 66 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the said northwesterly line of the alley; thence southwesterly 122.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 66 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the said northwesterly line of the alley and on the northerly line of Hunter Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of said Lot 66 to the centerline of said Hunter Street; thence southeasterly 140.34 feet along said centerline to the northeasterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 1 of Tract No 16148, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 514 Page 13 and 14 of Maps; thence southwesterly 49.77 feet along said prolongation to a point on the southeasterly line of said Lot 1, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Lorena Street, 82.50 feet Wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 285.46 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also the northeasterly

corner of Lot 2 of said Tract and on said northwesterly right-of-way line of said Lorena Street; thence southwesterly 122.35 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 2 to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 20.00 feet, said beginning being also on the westerly line of Lorena Street; thence southwesterly and westerly 21.13 feet along the southeasterly and the most southerly line of said Lot 2, through a central angle of $60^{\circ}32'06''$, said southerly line being also the northerly line of Olympic Boulevard, 100.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 101.04 feet along said most southerly line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly and having a radius of 324.46 feet, said beginning being also on the northerly line of said Olympic Boulevard; thence westerly 170.74 feet along the southerly and southwesterly line of said Lot 2, through a central angle of $30^{\circ}09'16''$, said southwesterly line being also the northeasterly line of said Olympic Boulevard; thence northwesterly 915.49 feet along said southwesterly line to the beginning of the curved westerly line of said Lot 2, said curve being concave easterly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with the southeasterly line of Grande Vista Avenue, 60 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 100.00 feet to the northwesterly terminus of the curved southerly line of Lot 2, of Tract No. 22165, in said city, as per map filed in Book 612, Pages 93 to 94, inclusive, of said maps, said curve being concave northerly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with northwesterly line of said Grande Vista Avenue, said terminus being the northeasterly line of said Olympic Boulevard; thence northwesterly 514.24 feet to the beginning of the curved westerly line of said Lot 2, said curve being concave easterly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with the southeasterly line of Dacotah Street, 60 feet wide; thence northwesterly 100.00 feet to the northwesterly terminus of the curved southerly line of Lot 5, of Tract No. 11606, in said city, as per map filed in Book 213, Pages 10 through 14, inclusive, of said maps, said curve being concave northerly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its at its northeasterly terminus with the northwesterly line of said Dacotah Street; thence northwesterly 718.46 feet along said prolongation and said southwesterly line to an angle point on said southwesterly line [CMC1]; thence northwesterly 390.43 feet along said southwesterly line to the centerline of Camulos Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 78.07 feet along said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve concave westerly and having a radius of 160.00 feet; thence northerly 57.25 feet along said centerline and its continuation thereof, through a central angle of $20^{\circ}30'$, to a point of tangency on said centerline; thence northerly 6.30 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the centerline of an alley 20.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 704.22 feet along said centerline of alley to the centerline of Orme Avenue, 60.00 feet wide; as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 239.02 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Hostetter Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 673.93 feet along said centerline to the centerline of an alley 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 925.42 feet along the centerline of said alley to the centerline of 8th Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 27.26 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of that certain course shown as $S27^{\circ}20'21''W$, 7.53' on D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1777; thence northeasterly 41.25 feet along said prolongation to a point on said northeasterly right-of-way line of said 8th Street; thence along the general southwesterly boundary of the Santa Monica Freeway (Route 10) as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1777 the following courses: thence $N27^{\circ}20'21''E$, 7.53 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $S62^{\circ}42'27''E$, 21.70 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N27^{\circ}17'33''E$, 279.77 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N61^{\circ}58'43''W$, 225.95 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence westerly 114.01 feet to a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 6 of Tract No. 9296, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 137, Page 20 of Maps, said point being distant northeasterly 47.13 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 6; thence northeasterly 375.03 feet to a point on the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1777, said point being the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as $S45^{\circ}54'09''E$, 9.74 feet as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map F-1777; thence northwesterly along the general southwesterly boundary of the Santa Monica Freeway (Route 10) as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1777 the following courses: $N45^{\circ}54'09''W$, 9.74 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N46^{\circ}43'42''W$, 68.25 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N44^{\circ}30'21''W$, 29.66 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N40^{\circ}38'33''W$, 36.01 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N37^{\circ}33'35''W$, 47.69 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N41^{\circ}34'06''W$, 7.23 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence northwesterly 84.71 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence $N25^{\circ}39'30''W$, 95.31 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway to a point on the southwesterly right-of-

way line of Garnet Street, 60.00 feet Wide, as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map; thence northwesterly, 49.59 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence northwesterly, 58.56 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway to a point on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said northwesterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue, said point being the southeasterly terminus of that certain course shown as 17.21 feet on D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. 1281 prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highway; thence northeasterly along the general southwesterly boundary of the Santa Monica Freeway (Route 10) as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1281 the following courses: thence northwesterly 22.55 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway to the northwesterly terminus of that certain course shown as S85 Garnet Street; thence N62°53'23"W, 46.65 feet along said northeasterly right-of-way line to a point on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue; thence northeasterly 196.67 feet to a point on the 44°24'E, 16.21 feet as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map; thence northwesterly N85°44'24"W, 83.23 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence N38°07'25"W, 115.89 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence N35°02'02"W, 55.73 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence N31°57'46"W, 128.57 feet along the general southwesterly boundary of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence N31°54'49"W, 144.20 feet along the general southwesterly right-of-way line of said Santa Monica Freeway; thence northwesterly 628.36 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way line of 7th Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. 1281, said point being also the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as S1°15'20"E, 202.19 feet as shown on said Map; thence N1°15'20"E, 202.19 feet along the westerly right-of-way line of the Santa Ana Freeway as shown on said Freeway Right-of-Way Map No. F1281; thence N9°09'10"E, 80.82 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N18°57'53"W, 42.16 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N9°13'11"E, 108.41 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N9°12'51"W, 9.49 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N80°47'29"W, 37.00 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N9°12'31"E, 7.81 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence N88°08'30"W, 5.20 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence northerly 140.52 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence northerly 212.85 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line; thence northerly 114.46 feet along said general westerly right-of-way line to the southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard, of variable width, as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. 1281; thence southeasterly 80.75 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard; thence S62°38'47"E, 198.44' along said southwesterly right-of-way line; thence S27°21'13"W, 45.00' along said southwesterly right-of-way line; thence S62°12'E, 571.57' along said southwesterly right-of-way line; thence S8°36'28"W, 169.76 feet along the easterly right-of-way line of said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F1281 prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence S2°42'25"W, 162.65 feet along said general easterly right-of-way line; thence S82°08'37"E, 92.94 feet along said general easterly right-of-way line, to the westerly right-of-way line of Boyle Street, of variable width, as shown on J.N. Gibson to Anna N. Gibson sold as Hollenbeck Park Tract No. 2, DDS 2285-50; thence southerly 81.37 feet along said westerly right-of-way line of Boyle Street to the easterly right-of-way line of said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F1281 prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence N85°41'03"W, 78.60 feet along said easterly right-of-way line; thence S1°42'16"E, 160.93 feet along said easterly right-of-way line; thence southeasterly 108.21 feet along said easterly right-of-way line to the westerly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue; thence southeasterly 40.00 feet perpendicular to the centerline of said Boyle Avenue to said centerline; thence southwesterly 153.63 feet along the centerline of said Boyle Avenue to the centerline of 7th Street, 60.00 feet Wide, as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. 1281; thence southeasterly 125.48 feet along the centerline of said 7th Street to the southwesterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 21 of said J.N. Gibson to Anna N. Gibson sold as Hollenbeck Park Tract No. 2, DDS 2285-50; thence northeasterly 30.04 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of Lot 21 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said 7th Street; thence northeasterly 120.70 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 21 through 23 inclusive, of said Tract to an angle point on the northwesterly line of said Lot 23; thence northerly 499.35 feet along the westerly lines of Lots 23 through 35 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 35; thence southeasterly 143.32 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 35 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Hollins Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 46 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Hollins Street; thence southeasterly 117.57 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 46 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of Lot 4 of Metropolitan Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Page 77 of Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 10.00 feet along said northwesterly line

and its northerly prolongation to the centerline of an alley 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 110.00 feet along said centerline of alley to the northwesterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, (formerly Boston Street) 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.02 feet to the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street and its intersection with the centerline of an alley 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 180.00 feet along said centerline to the centerline of an alley 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 157.50 feet along said centerline of alley to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 40 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 7.50 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 40, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 172.50 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 40 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, of variable width (formerly 80.00 feet wide), as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 40.00 feet along the prolongation of said southwesterly line of said Lot 40 to the centerline of said Soto Street; thence southwesterly 504.05 feet along said centerline to the centerline of 7th Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on Tract No. 5299, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 59 Page 48 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 894.05 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide as shown on M.L. Wicks Stephenson Avenue Tract No. 2, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 10 Page 33 of said Maps; thence northeasterly 643.00 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 22 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 22, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 135.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 22 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 10.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 45 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 135.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 45 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Orme Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of said northeasterly line of said Lot 45 to the centerline of said Orme Avenue; thence northeasterly 33.22 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 73 of Tract No. 2047, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Pages 146 and 147 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 73, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Orme Avenue and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 297.07 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 73 and 4 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 4, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Marietta Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 35 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Marietta Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 139.75 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 35 to the northwesterly terminus of the curved easterly line of said lot, said curve being concave westerly, having a radius of 5.00 feet, and being tangent at its southwesterly terminus with the northwesterly line of an alley, 12 feet wide; thence southeasterly 22.00 feet to the southeasterly terminus of the curved northerly line of Lot 43, of said tract, said curve being concave southerly, having a radius of 5.00 feet, and being tangent at its southwesterly terminus with the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 139.75 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 43 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Camulos Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 43 to the centerline of said Camulos Street; thence southwesterly 27.71 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1, Block "E", of Highland Villa Park in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 2 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Camulos Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 146.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 3 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly line of Lot 3 of Hancock Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 2 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 8.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 3 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of an alley 8.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 189.82 feet along the

southwesterly line of said Lot 3 to an angle point therein, said angle point being also the southeasterly terminus of said alley; thence southwesterly 20.83 feet along said southwesterly line of Lot 3; thence southeasterly 120.76 feet along said southwesterly line; thence southwesterly 70.25 feet along said southwesterly line; thence southeasterly 113.56 feet along said southwesterly line to the most southerly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of Lot 12 of Sun Rise Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 17 Page 28 of Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 89.08 feet along said northwesterly line of Lot 12 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 15.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 1 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 293.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Euclid Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 6 to the centerline of said Euclid Avenue; thence northeasterly 31.79 feet thence along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 12 of Pioneer Investment & Trust Company's Euclid Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 6 Page 9 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Euclid Avenue and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 10 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 250.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 12 through 16 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Dacotah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 16 to the centerline of said Dacotah Street; thence northeasterly 123.00 feet along said centerline of Dacotah Street to a point on the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 39 of said Tract, said intersection being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 39, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard; thence southeasterly 250.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 39 through 43 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 43, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Fresno Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 5 of the Fresno Terrace Tract in said City, as per Map filed in Book 13 Page 152 of said Maps, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Fresno Street; thence southeasterly 190.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 5 inclusive, of said Tract and the northeasterly line of the Amended Charnock Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 83 Pages 83 and 84 of Miscellaneous Records to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 40.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southeasterly line of said Lot 1; thence southwesterly 123.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 8 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 40.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 8; thence northwesterly 25.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the northeasterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 65 of said Pioneer Investment & Trust Company's Euclid Terrace Tract, said intersection being also on the northeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 10.00 feet to the most easterly corner of said Lot 65, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 144.95 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 62 through 65 inclusive, of said Tract to the southerly southwesterly terminus of that certain course of $S77^{\circ}11'48''W$, 270.49 feet as shown on D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1778 prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence easterly along the general northerly boundary of the Pomona Freeway (Route 60) as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1778 the following courses: thence $N77^{\circ}11'48''E$, 270.49 feet along said general right-of-way line; thence $N77^{\circ}03'56''E$, 151.86 feet along said general right-of-way line to the southerly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard; thence southeasterly 754.77 feet along the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard to the centerline of Bernal Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on La Rosa Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 12 Page 160 of said Maps; thence southwesterly 159.00 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Siskiyou Street, 58.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 337.23 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Lorena Street, 82.50 feet, as shown on said Tract; thence southerly 20.76 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the centerline of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on M.L. Wicks Subdivision of Blocks 1, 2 & 3 of the Spence Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 26 Page 30 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 848.54 feet along said prolongation and the centerline of said alley to the centerline of Spence Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract;

thence southwesterly 29.62 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 16 of M. L. Wicks Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 8 Page 39 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Spence Street; thence southeasterly 150.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 16 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 27.22 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the intersection of the centerline of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 477.43 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly line of Lot 32 of said Tract, said northwesterly line being also the southeasterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 27.08 feet along said northwesterly line of Lot 32 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 150.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 32 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Esperanza Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 32 to the northwesterly line of Lot 7 of Spence Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 14, of said Maps, said northwesterly line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Esperanza Street; thence northeasterly 116.99 feet along said northwesterly line to a line parallel with and distant southwesterly 90.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northeasterly line of said Lot 7; thence southeasterly 132.00 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant 132.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of said Lot 7; thence northeasterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant southwesterly 60.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northeasterly line of said Lot 7; thence southeasterly 28.00 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 160.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of said Lot 7; thence northeasterly 60.00 feet along said parallel line to the northeasterly line of said Lot 7, said northeasterly line being also the southwesterly line of Whittier Boulevard, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 648.00 feet along said northeasterly line to the most northerly corner of Lot 637 of Tract No. 941, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 16 Pages 194 and 195 of said Maps; thence southwesterly 130.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 637 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 14.00 feet to the intersection with northwesterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 265 of said Tract, said intersection being also on the southwesterly line of said 14.00 foot wide alley and on the northwesterly line of an alley, 10 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 10.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 265 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said 10 foot wide alley and on the southwesterly line of said 14.00 foot wide alley; thence southeasterly 125.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 265 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said 14.00 foot wide alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Calzona Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 8 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Calzona Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 329.10 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 8 through 16 of said Tract to a point on a line parallel with and distant westerly 30.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the easterly line of said Lot 16, said point being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the westerly right-of-way line of Indiana Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 34.08 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the centerline of said Indiana Street; thence northerly 454.78 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the centerline of an alley, 19.00 feet wide, as shown on The Schmitt Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 41 and 42, of said Maps; thence northwesterly 1142.60 feet along said prolongation and said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 1, Block 9, of said Tract, said prolongation being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of Esperanza Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the intersection with the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 15, Block 4, of said Tract, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Esperanza Street, and the centerline of an alley, 19.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 778.00 feet along said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 1 of said Tract, said prolongation being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of Spence Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the intersection with the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 15, Block 3, of said Tract, said prolongation being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Spence Street, and the centerline of an alley, 19.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 819.75 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Lorena Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 164.09 feet along the centerline of said Lorena Street to the southerly right-of-way line of the

Pomona Freeway (Route 60) as shown on Freeway Right-of-Way Map No. F1778 prepared by the State of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highway; thence northwesterly 48.59 feet to a point on the general southerly right-of-way line of the Pomona Freeway as shown on D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. 1778, said point being the easterly terminus of that certain course shown as N83°32'17"W, 49.87 feet on said Map; thence along said general southerly line of the Pomona Freeway, as shown on said Map, the following courses: thence N83°32'17"W, 49.87 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence S80°30'57"W, 126.55 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence N86°36'26"W, 24.33 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence N61°44'50"W, 18.00 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence S78°15'21"W, 48.23 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence S69°02'32"W, 21.43 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence S68°33'37"W, 139.23 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway; thence S81°05'44"W, 114.26 feet along the general southerly right-of-way line of said Pomona Freeway to the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard, 82.50 feet as shown on said D.O.T. Map; thence northwesterly 458.07 feet along said northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard to a point on the southwesterly line of Lot 22 of Tract No. 5156, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 57 Page 50, of said Maps, said point being distant southeasterly 1.82 feet from the most westerly corner of said Lot 22; thence northwesterly 175.50 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lot 22 to 29 inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 29, said corner being also on said northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 10.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 6 of Valley Vista Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 55 Page 42 of Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard; thence northwesterly 150.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fresno Street, 54.00 feet wide (formerly 25.00 feet wide); thence northwesterly 25.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 23 of Alta Vista Tract Being a Subdivision of Lot 26, Workman & Hellman Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 26 Page 33 of said Miscellaneous Records thence northeasterly 121.52' feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 23 to the most easterly corner thereof; thence northwesterly 431.57 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 10 through 23 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Albertine Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 25.00 feet to the centerline of said Albertine Street; thence southwesterly 121.58 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1 of Tract No. 23001, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 805, Pages 38 and 39 of said Maps, said southwesterly line being also the northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Albertine Street and on said northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard; thence northwesterly 400.09 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Euclid Avenue, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Euclid Avenue; thence northeasterly 147.00 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 43 of Euclid Crest, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 47 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 43.00 feet along said prolongation to a point on the southwesterly line of said Lot 43, said point being distant northwesterly 13.00 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 43, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Euclid Avenue and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 117.04 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 43 to the southeasterly terminus of the curved westerly line of said lot, said curve being concave easterly, having a radius of 5.00 feet, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with the southeasterly line of an alley, 15 feet wide; thence northwesterly 25.00 feet to the northwesterly terminus of the curved southerly line of Lot 40, of said tract, said curve being concave northerly, having a radius of 5.00 feet, said northwesterly terminus being on the northeasterly line of an alley, 15 feet wide, as shown on said tract, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 747.49 feet along the southwesterly line of Lots 33 through 40, of said tract, and the southwesterly line of Lots 8 through 14, of Kraner Tract, in said city, as per map filed in Book 15, Page 163, of said maps, to the most westerly corner of Lot 8, of said Kraner Tract, said corner also being the intersection of the northeasterly line of said 15 foot wide alley and the southeasterly line of Camulos Street, 50 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 50.10 feet to the most

easterly corner of Lot 4 of Stephenson Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 6 Page 94 of said Maps, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Camulos Street; thence northwesterly 170.00 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 4 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 16.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 7 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 144.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 7 through 9 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 9, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Lot 4 of Tract No. 3113, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 32 Page 52 of said Maps; thence southwesterly 13.40 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 4 to the most southerly corner thereof; thence northwesterly 100.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 4 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Orme Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.21 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 11 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said Orme Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 130.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 11 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 20.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 17 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 130.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 17 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.91 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 13 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street; thence northwesterly 190.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lots 13 through 17 inclusive, to the most northerly corner of said Lot 17, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street, 45.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 46.73 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 17, Block F of Tract No. 4887, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 51 Page 20 of said Maps, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Fickett Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 18.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 249.97 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lot 17 and 8, Block F of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mathews Street, 45.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 45.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 17, Block D of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mathews Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 18.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 17, Block D, to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 8, Block D of Tract No. 4433, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 48 Page 48 of said Maps and on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 110.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Penrith Drive, 45.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 45.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 16, Block C of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Penrith Drive and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 18.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 225.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 16 and 8 of said Tract to a point on the southerly line of said Lot 8, said point being distant southeasterly 10.00 feet from the most westerly corner thereof, said point being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 80.00 feet wide, (formerly 60.00 feet wide), as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 40.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the centerline of said Soto Street; thence northeasterly 244.10 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 57 of Hollenbeck Park Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 6 Page 84 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 40.00 feet along said prolongation to a point on the southwesterly line of said Lot 57, said point being distant northwesterly 10.00 feet from the most southerly corner thereof and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 110.00 feet along said southwesterly line of Lot 57 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 2.60 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 57 to the northeasterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 19 of Hollenbeck Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 2 Page 98 of said Maps; thence southwesterly 10.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner said Lot 19, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 116.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 19 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Rogers Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly

60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 24, of said tract, said corner being also the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Rogers Avenue; thence southwesterly 190.00 feet to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also the northeasterly right-of-way line of Whittier Boulevard, 82.50 feet, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 837.50 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 25 through 44, of said tract, to the most westerly corner of said Lot 44, said corner being also the intersection of the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Whittier Boulevard and the southeasterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 60 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northeasterly 194.88 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 44 to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 49, of said tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet along said southeasterly prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 49, said corner being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street; thence northwesterly 76.75 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 49 to the most westerly corner of said Lot 49; thence northerly 15.61 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 49 to the most southerly corner of Lot 32 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 111.70 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 32 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the easterly line of Boyle Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 40.96 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 32 to the centerline of said Boyle Avenue; thence northerly 93.17 feet along the centerline to an angle point therein; thence northwesterly 423.08 feet along said centerline to the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 1 of Hollenbeck Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 3, Page 95 of Maps; thence 44.84 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue; thence easterly 278.47 feet along the northerly line of Lot 1 through 6 inclusive, of said Hollenbeck Tract, to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide; thence easterly 49.06 feet along the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of said Lot 6 to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 30.00 feet from the northwesterly line of Lot 6, Block 59 of Hancock Survey, in said City as per map filed in Book 1, Pages 483 and 484 of Miscellaneous Records, said parallel line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street; thence northeasterly 521.71 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant southwesterly 30.00 feet from the northeasterly line of said Lot 6, said parallel line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of 6th Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Workman Park Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 54 Pages 11 through 13 of Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 13 of said Workman Park Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said 6th Street; thence northeasterly 1079.55 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 13, Block M and Lots 9 through 18, Block I of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 9, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 15.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 8, Block I of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street and on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northeasterly 130.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 361.83 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said 4th Street and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Chicago Street; thence southwesterly 161.53 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 22 of The Bush Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 53 Page 13 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to a point on the northeasterly line of said Lot 22, said point being distant 4.01 feet from the most northerly corner thereof, said point being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street; thence southeasterly 165.99 feet along said northeasterly line of Lot 22 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 20.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 7 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 170.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 7 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 7 to the centerline of said Breed Street; thence southwesterly 172.49 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1 of Tract No. 27017, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 711 Page 97 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said

Breed Street; thence southeasterly 366.27 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 1 to a point distant northwesterly 10.00 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, of variable width; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Soto Street; thence northeasterly 133.60 feet along the centerline of said Soto Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 1 of Hellar's Subdivision Part of Lot 4, Block 72 H.S., in said City, as per Map filed in Book 59 Page 3 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 40.00 feet along said prolongation to a point on the northeasterly line of said Lot 1, said point being distant 1.65 feet southeasterly from the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said point being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence southeasterly 311.10 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 and 10 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Mathews Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 10 to the centerline of said Mathews Street; thence northeasterly 191.35 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 1 of Tract No. 34758, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 967 Pages 99 and 100 of said Maps, said northeasterly line being also the southwesterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 924.55 feet along the southwesterly right-of-way line of said 4th Street to the centerline of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 121.29 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1 of Bowens & Dolton's Boyle Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 8 Page 38 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street; thence southeasterly 497.09 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 12 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of Lot 12 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Camulos Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 15 of Joseph Hyans Subdivision, Lot 9 Workman & Hellman Sub, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 21 Page 60 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Camulos Street, said corner being also the northeasterly corner of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 300.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 10 through 15 inclusive, of said subdivision to the most southerly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Savannah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 10 to a point on the northwesterly line of Lot 1 of Tract, No. 16744, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 441 Pages 8 and 9 of said Maps, said point being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street; thence northeasterly 106.11 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 1 to an angle point thereon, said angle point being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Savannah Street; thence northeasterly 21.21 feet to a point on a line parallel with and distant southwesterly 8.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the northeasterly line of said Lot 1, said point being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 269.36 feet along said parallel line to a point distant northwesterly 13.30 feet from the southeasterly line of said Lot 3, said point being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence southeasterly 16.00 feet to a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 2.00 feet from the southeasterly line of said Lot 3, said parallel line being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 40.00 feet along said parallel line to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 1 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 2.00 feet along said northeasterly line to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue; thence southwesterly 115.06 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 11 of Euclid Place Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 10 Page 100 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on thence the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue; thence southeasterly 240.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 11 and 6 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Euclid Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 6 to the centerline of Euclid Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 40.04 feet along said centerline of Euclid Avenue to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of the southwesterly 15.00 feet Lot 17 of E. A. Miller's Subdivision of Lots 33, 34, 35 of Workman and Hellman Subdivision, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 16 Page 51 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of the southwesterly 15.00 feet of Lot 17 of E. A. Miller's

Subdivision of Lots 33, 34, 35 of said Workman and Hellman Subdivision, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Euclid Avenue; thence southeasterly 145.50 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 5.50 feet, measured at right angles, from the southeasterly line of said Lot 17; thence northeasterly 10.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 20 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 544.50 feet along said prolongation and the northeasterly lines of Lots 20 through 30 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 30, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Fresno Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 31 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Fresno Street; thence southeasterly 133.20 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 31, 32 and 33 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 33, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 4, Block F, of Mountain View Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 24, Page 95 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 130.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 4 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Grande Vista Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet wide to the most westerly corner of Lot 8, Block A, of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Grande Vista Avenue; thence southeasterly 76.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 7 and 8 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of the northwesterly 28.00 feet of said Lot 7; thence northeasterly 125.00 feet along the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 28.00 feet of said Lot 7 to the most easterly corner of said northwesterly 28.00 feet of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 41.25 feet along the northeasterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of said northwesterly 28.00 feet of said Lot 7 to the centerline of said 4th Street; thence northwesterly 114.47 feet along said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 11 of Ogilvie's Grand View Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 6 Pages 58 and 59 of said Maps; thence northeasterly 41.25 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said 4th Street; thence northeasterly 125.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 11 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 122.44 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 9, 10 and 11 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 9, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fresno Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 62.00 feet to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 8 said Tract, said point being distant northwesterly 2.00 feet from the most easterly corner of said Lot 8, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Fresno Street and on the southeasterly line of an alley 16.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 319.37 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly line of Lot 24 of Dacotah Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 75 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 16.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 24 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also the most northerly corner of said alley; thence northeasterly 145.44 feet along the northeasterly line of Lot 22, 23 and 24 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 22, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Dacotah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 12 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Dacotah Street; thence northwesterly 145.43 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 10, 11 and 12 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 10; thence southwesterly 8.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 10 to the most easterly corner of Lot 13 of the Map of a Portion of Fremont Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5, Page 109 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 524.25 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 13 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 24 of Davin and Jullien's Subdivision of Part of Lots 6 and 7 Block 23 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 54 Page 49 of said Miscellaneous Records, said point being distant 15.63 feet from the most easterly corner of said Lot 24, said point being also on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue; thence northeasterly 15.50 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 24 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue; thence northeasterly 12.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 25 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue; thence northeasterly 409.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 25 through 32 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly

corner of said Lot 32, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 124.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 32 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said 2nd Street and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 12.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 22 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley and on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street; thence northwesterly 124.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 22 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Savannah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, now vacated; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 11 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street and on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street; thence northwesterly 150.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 11 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street; thence southwesterly 59.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 11 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 10 of Hellman and Stassforth's Subdivision of Lot 5 of Workman and Hellman's Subdivision of Block 73 Hancock's Survey, in said City as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 43 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 100.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 9 and 10 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of Lot 9 of said Tract, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Davin and Jullien's Subdivision of Part of Lots 6 and 7, Block 73 Hancock's Survey; thence southwesterly 150.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 6, 7 and 8 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 5 of said Hellman and Stassforth's Subdivision of Lot 5 of Workman and Hellman's Subdivision of Block 73 Hancock's Survey; thence southwesterly 100.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 4 and 5 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 4, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 12.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 1 of said Davin and Jullien's Subdivision of Part of Lots 6 and 7, Block 73 Hancock's Survey, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 10.50 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the most easterly corner of Lot 22 of Peterson's Subdivision of Lot 6 Workman & Hellman's Subdivision of Block 73 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 10 Page 72 of said miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 243.80 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 22 through 26 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 26, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 16 of said Survey; thence northeasterly 125.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 3rd Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 97.52 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 16 and 15 to the most northerly corner of said Lot 15, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of 3rd Street and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Saratoga Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 125.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 15 to the most westerly corner of said Lot 15, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Saratoga Street; thence northwesterly 50.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 7, Block B of Pauly's Subdivision of Lot 7 of Workman & Hellman's Subdivision of Block 73 Hancock's Survey, as per Map filed in Book 10, Page 35 of miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Saratoga Street; thence northwesterly 316.53 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 7 through 12 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.95 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 9, Block B, of Blanchard's Subdivision, in said City as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 56 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street, and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 10.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 404.32 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 9 through 16 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.98 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 8, Block B of Atwood's Subdivision, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 57 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Fickett Street; thence northwesterly 389.25 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mathews Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 25 of Heaver Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 11 Page 17 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mathews Street; thence northwesterly 200.40 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 25, 23, 21 and 19 of said Tract to the most

westerly corner of said Lot 19, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Lot 16 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 21.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the most easterly corner thereof; thence northwesterly 135.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 82.50 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 2, Block A of Boyle Heights Moore and Kelleher's Subdivision, of a Part of Lots 5 and 6, Block 60 and Stevenson's Subdivision, of a Part of Lot 6, Block 60 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 568 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence northwesterly 360.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12, Block A, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 1, Block B of said Survey, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street; thence southwesterly 148.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, 82.50 feet as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 360.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 of said Survey to the most westerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said 4th Street and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 9, Block D of Workman Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 54 Pages 11 through 13 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street and on said northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence northwesterly 360.85 feet along the southwesterly line of Lots 9 through 16 inclusive, of Block D of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on said northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most southerly of Lot 9, Block E of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street, said corner being also on said northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence northwesterly 180.25 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 9 through 12 inclusive, of Block E of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on said northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence northeasterly 140.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 12 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 13 of said Tract and said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 178.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 13 through 16 inclusive, of Block E of said Tract to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 2.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of said Lot 16, said parallel line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of Cummings Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 19.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 16 to a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 17.00 feet from the northwesterly line of said Lot 16; thence southwesterly 140.03 feet along said parallel line to the northeasterly right-of-way line of 4th Street, 82.50 feet wide; thence northwesterly 285.12 feet along the northeasterly right-of-way line of said 4th Street to a point on the southerly line of Lot 18, Block G of said Workman Park Tract, said point being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said 4th Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 64.30 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 18 to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northerly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence northerly 8.75 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 18 to a line parallel with and distant northerly 8.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the southerly line of said Lot 18; thence westerly 50.00 feet along said parallel line to a point on the easterly line of Lot 20, Block G of said Tract; thence southerly 8.75 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 20 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northerly right-of-way line of 4th Street; thence westerly 180.00 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 20 through 23 inclusive, of Block G of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 23, said corner being also on said northerly right-of-way line of 4th Street and on the easterly right-of-way line of State Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 60.30 feet to the southeasterly corner of Lot 1 of Tract No. 5575, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 60 Page 64 of said Maps, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said State Street and on the northerly right-of-way line of said 4th Street; thence westerly 124.66 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 1, 2 and 3 of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said 4th Street and on the easterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 15.00 feet to the southeasterly corner Lot 15, Block H of said Workman Park Tract, said corner being also on the westerly line of said alley and on the northerly right-of-way line of said 4th Street; thence westerly 140.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 15 to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said 4th Street and on the

easterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 40.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot 15 to the centerline of said Boyle Avenue; thence southerly 232.50 feet along the centerline of said Boyle Avenue to the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of Lot 3, Block L of said Tract; thence easterly 40.00 feet along said prolongation to the southwest corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue; thence easterly 130.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 3 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the westerly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 12.50 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 3 to the westerly prolongation of the centerline of an alley 15.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 325.36 feet along said centerline to the general westerly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway as shown on Freeway Right-of-Way Map F-1282 prepared by the State of California, Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence southerly along the westerly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway as shown on said D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1282, the following courses: thence S23°07'07"W, 8.36 feet to the southerly line of said alley; thence S24°53'23"W, 236.52 feet to the northerly right-of-way line of State Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map F-1282; thence S24°39'29"W, 285.49 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence S24°38'40"W, 58.21 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence S28°34'54"W, 151.37 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence S29°49'01"W, 53.85 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence S28°59'56"W, 126.42 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence easterly 1.52 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence S26°13'39"W, 108.17 feet to the northerly right-of-way line of 6th Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence S15°32'21"W, 61.47 feet to the southerly right-of-way line of said 6th Street; thence westerly 54.23 feet along the southerly right-of-way line of said 6th Street to the curved easterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue, 80.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map, said easterly right-of-way having a radius of 1390.00 feet as shown on Right-of-Way Map F-1281 prepared by the State of California, Department of Public Works, Division of Highways, a radial to said point bears N81°10'34"W; thence southerly 330.57 feet along said curved easterly right-of-way line through a central angle of 13°37'33"; thence southwest 91.14 feet to the southeasterly corner of Parcel B as per Map filed in Parcel Map Book 206, Pages 17 and 18; thence westerly 28.96 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence southwest 70.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence southwest 20.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence westerly 18.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence southerly 15.66 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence westerly 221.23 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence westerly 63.68 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to an angle point therein; thence westerly 30.88 feet along the southerly line of said Lot B to the southwest corner of said Lot B, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of the Santa Ana Freeway as shown on said Right-of-Way Map F-1281, said point being distant southerly 17.00 feet from the northerly terminus of that certain course shown as N1°05'00"E, 238 feet on said Right-of-Way Map; thence westerly 172.47 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of the Santa Ana Freeway as shown on D.O.T. Right-of-Way Map No. F-1281, said point being the easterly terminus of that certain course shown as N88°53'17"W, 30.02 feet as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1281; thence N88°53'17"W, 30.02 feet to the easterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1281; thence westerly 20.00 feet to an angle point on the easterly line of Lot 14, Block C of Strong & Dickinson's Salt Lake Railroad Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 7 Page 104, of said Miscellaneous Records, said point being also on the westerly line of said alley; thence westerly 215.51 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 12, 13 and 14 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the southerly line of said alley and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Clarence Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 26.83 feet along the westerly prolongation of said northerly lines to the centerline of said Clarence Street; thence northerly 154.72 feet along said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave westerly and having a radius of 70.00 feet; thence northerly 27.90 feet along said curve and along said centerline through a central angle of 16°45'43"; thence northwest 28.51 feet tangent to said curve and along said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 130.00 feet; thence northerly 67.95 feet along said curve and along said centerline through a central angle of 29°56'57"; thence northerly 1231.53 feet tangent to said curve and along said centerline to the centerline of 4th Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on the Fourth Street Bridge Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 3 Page 67, of said Maps; thence northerly 901.34 feet along the centerline of said Clarence Street to the centerline of 3rd Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 18851, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 506, Page 50, of said Maps; thence westerly 242.99 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Utah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 16574, in said City,

as per Map filed in Book 505 Page 17 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 305.43 feet along said centerline of Utah Street to an angle point thereon; thence westerly 86.50 feet along said centerline of Utah Street to an angle point thereon; thence northerly 614.36 feet along said centerline of Utah Street to the centerline of First Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 191.24 feet along said centerline of Utah Street to the centerline of Via Las Vegas, 42.00 feet wide, as shown on Clement Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 17 Page 41 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence westerly 717.25 feet along the centerline of said Via Las Vegas to the southerly prolongation of the westerly line of Lot 2, of Tract 12658, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 342 Pages 14 through 16 inclusive, of said Maps, said westerly line being also the easterly right-of-way line of Mission Road, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 474.52 feet along said prolongation and said westerly line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 500.00 feet; thence northerly 84.72 feet along said curve and along said westerly line through a central angle of $9^{\circ}42'30''$ to a point of tangency; thence northeasterly 391.20 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 2 to the southerly terminus of the curved northwesterly line of said lot, said curve being concave southwesterly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its easterly terminus with the southerly line of Kearney Street, 55 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northerly 95.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the curved southwesterly line of Lot 1, of said tract, said curve being concave northeasterly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its easterly terminus with the northerly line of said Kearney Street; thence northerly 17.79 feet along the westerly line of said lot to an angle point therein; thence northeasterly 13.88 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot to an angle point therein; thence northerly 172.41 feet to a point on the southerly line of Lot 19 of the Map of the Cannery Tract as per Map filed in Book 16, Page 65 of Miscellaneous Records, said point being the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as $N15^{\circ}20'08''E$, 172.18 feet as shown on Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-2, issued by the State of California Transportation Department; thence $N15^{\circ}20'08''E$, 172.18 feet to the northerly right-of-way line of the Santa Ana Freeway as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-2; thence easterly along the general northerly right-of-way line of said Freeway the following courses: thence $S83^{\circ}10'11''E$, 58.02 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway; thence $N74^{\circ}39'52''W$, 16.31 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway; thence $S83^{\circ}10'11''E$, 26.38 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway; thence $S19^{\circ}08'52''E$, 2.59 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway; thence $S83^{\circ}10'11''E$, 477.58 feet along the general right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly and having a radius of 290.00 feet; thence easterly 150.76 feet along said curve, and along said general right-of-way line, through a central angle of $25^{\circ}50'06''$ to the beginning of a non-tangent curve having a radius of 565.00 feet, a radial bearing to said point bears $S19^{\circ}00'18''E$; thence northeasterly 142.24 feet along said curve, and along said general right-of-way line, through a central angle of $14^{\circ}25'29''$ to the southerly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, of variable width (formerly Macy Street, 80.00 feet wide); thence southeasterly 247.95 feet along said southerly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue to the westerly line of Pleasant Avenue, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-2; thence southerly 74.36 feet along the westerly right-of-way line of said Pleasant Avenue to the most northerly corner of Lot 10, Block V of Mt. Pleasant Tract, as per Map filed in Book 32, Page 58 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 109.19 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 10 to a point distant northeasterly 25.00 feet from the most westerly corner of said Lot 10; thence southerly 90.46 feet to the northerly line of Progress Place, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-2, said point being also the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 50.00 feet; thence westerly and southerly 62.32 feet along said curve and along the general easterly right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway through a central angle of $71^{\circ}24'45''$ to a non-tangent point on said easterly right-of-way line; thence southerly 31.25 feet along the general easterly right-of-way line of said Santa Ana Freeway to the southwesterly line of Aliso Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1849-2; thence southeasterly 153.97 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line of Aliso Street to the westerly line of said Pleasant Street; thence southeasterly 65.83 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Aliso Street to a point on the westerly line of Lot 4, Block R of the Subdivision of Blocks O & R of the Mount Pleasant Tract, as per Map filed in Book 23, Page 99 of Miscellaneous Records, said point being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Pleasant Street; thence northerly 179.85 feet along the westerly line of Lots 1 through 4 inclusive, of said Tract to the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Progress Place; thence northeasterly 137.81 feet along said southeasterly right-of-way line of Progress Place to a non-tangent point on the curved southerly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, of variable width, (formerly Macy Street 80.00 feet wide) said curved southerly right-of-way line having a radius of 994.93 feet; thence easterly 87.69 feet along said curved southerly right-of-way line through a central angle of $5^{\circ}03'00''$; thence easterly 76.69 feet along said southerly right-of-way line to the westerly right-of-way line of Pennsylvania Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Subdivision of Blocks

O & R of the Mount Pleasant Tract; thence easterly 54.60 feet to a point on the westerly line of Lot 1 Block O of said Tract, said point being distant southerly 22.23 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot, said point being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Pennsylvania Avenue; thence southeasterly 89.23 feet along the westerly lines of Lots 1, 2 and 3 Block O of said Tract to a line parallel with and distant southerly 20.00 feet from the northerly line of said Lot 3, said point being also on easterly right-of-way line of Pennsylvania Avenue; thence northeasterly 113.00 feet along said parallel line to the easterly line of said Lot 3, Block O; thence southeasterly 130.00 feet along the easterly lines of Lots 3, 4 and 5, Block O of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 5, said corner being also the most westerly corner of Lot 17, Block O of said Tract; thence northeasterly 119.50 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 17 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Warren Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 50.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 2 of Mount Pleasant Tract, as per Map filed in Book 32, Page 58 of Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Warren Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez; thence southeasterly 73.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 2 to a point distant northwesterly 42.00 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 2; thence southeasterly 62.42 feet to a point on the southeasterly line of said Lot 2, said point being distant northeasterly 46.00 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 2; thence northeasterly 76.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 2 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue; thence southeasterly 54.69 feet along the southwesterly right-of-way of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 4, Block N, said point being distant northwesterly 28.66 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot 4; thence southerly 143.04 feet to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 10.00 feet from the southeasterly line of said Lot 4, said parallel line being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of Kearny Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 152.33 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 1, of Tract No. 12132 as per Map filed in Book 244, Pages 14 and 15 of Maps; thence southeasterly 167.94 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue; thence southeasterly 186.10 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of Lot 3, Block C of the Subdivision of Block C of a Part of Lot 3 Block 60 of Hancock Survey as per Map filed in Book 16, Page 17 of Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 148.00 feet along said northwesterly line of Lot 3, Block C to the most westerly corner thereof; thence southeasterly 150.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 3 inclusive, of Block C of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Boyle Avenue; thence southwesterly 1092.71 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly lines of Lot 1, Block L of the Resubdivision of Lots 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 & 13 in Block L of George Cummings Subdivision, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 15 Page 11 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 30.96 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 35.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on said southwesterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 141.51 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 1 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Pleasant Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Subdivision; thence southwesterly 84.75 feet to a point on the northeasterly Boundary Line of the City Land of Los Angeles, distant southeasterly 210.00 feet from the most easterly corner of Cummings Home Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 52 Page 38 of said Miscellaneous Records, said point being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Pleasant Avenue; thence southwesterly 124.00 feet to a point; thence westerly 31.65 feet to a line parallel with and distant northerly 100.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southerly line of said Tract, said southerly line being also the northerly right-of-way line of 1st Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence westerly 66.65 feet along said parallel line to a point on the general easterly line of the Santa Ana Freeway as shown on said Right-of-Way Map F-2013, said point being the northerly terminus of that certain course shown as S4°25'37"W, 100.00 feet; thence S4°25'37"W, 100.00 feet along said general easterly line to the northerly right-of-way line of said 1st Street; thence southerly 80.04 feet along said general easterly line to a point on the southerly right-of-way line of said 1st Street, said point being the northerly terminus of that certain course shown as 149.70 feet on said Right-of-Way Map; thence southerly 110.43 feet along said last mentioned course; thence easterly 99.45 feet to a line parallel with and distant southerly 100.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southerly right-of-way line of 1st Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way

Map F-2013; thence easterly 50.00 feet along said parallel line to a line shown as having a bearing of S1°45'21"E on said Right-of-Way Map F-2013; thence southerly 30.71 feet along said line to a line parallel with and distant southerly 130.00 feet from said southerly right-of-way line of said 1st Street; thence easterly 146.98 feet along said parallel line to a line parallel with and distant westerly 3.00 feet from the easterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map F-2013; thence easterly 88.69 feet to a point on the northerly line of Lot 8 of Workman and Hollenbeck Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Pages 426 and 427 of said Miscellaneous Records, said point being distant easterly 3.00 feet from the northwesterly corner thereof, said point being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Avenue; thence easterly 117.00 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 8 to the northeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the westerly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 26.15 feet to the southwesterly corner of Lot 12 of said Tract, said corner being also on the easterly line of said alley and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 506.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 12 through 21 inclusive, of said Tract, to the most southerly corner of said Lot 21, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of State Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 55 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said State Street, and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 495.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 55 through 64 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 64, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northeasterly 20.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 64 to the southwesterly corner of Lot 65 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 7.84 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 65; thence northeasterly 120.26 feet to a point on the northeasterly line of said Lot 65, distant southeasterly 14.82 feet from the most northerly corner thereof, said point being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of 1st Street, of variable width; thence southeasterly 305.96 feet along the southwesterly right-of-way line of said First Street to the centerline of Cummings Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Boyle Heights Moore and Kelleher's Subdivision, of a Part of Lots 5 and 6 Block 60 and Stevenson's Subdivision, of a Part of Lot 6 Block 60 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 568, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 148.00 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 11, Block G of said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Cummings Street; thence southeasterly 360.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 11, 9, 7, 5, 3 and 1, Block G of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Street. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 11, Block I of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street; thence southeasterly 190.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 11, 9, 7 and 5, of said Block I to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 10.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of said Lot 5; thence southwesterly 148.00 feet along said parallel line to the southwesterly line of said Lot 5, said southwesterly line being also the northeasterly right-of-way line of 2nd Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly prolongation of said parallel line to the centerline of said 2nd Street; thence southeasterly 200.00 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Chicago Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 278.00 feet along the centerline of said Chicago Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 3, Block 1 of Tract, in said City, as per map filed in Book 29, Page 86 of said maps; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of said 2nd Street; thence southeasterly 148.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 3 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 100.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said alley to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 12, Block 1 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 12.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 200.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 12 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 4, Block 2, of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street; thence southeasterly 148.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 4 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 12.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 12, Block 2, of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 100.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 12 to the most northerly corner of the

southeasterly 100.00 feet of said lot; thence southwesterly 2.00 feet to the most westerly corner of the northeasterly 2.00 of the southeasterly 100.00 feet of said lot; thence southwesterly 100.00 feet to the most southerly corner of the northeasterly 2.00 feet of said lot, said corner being the northwesterly line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide; thence southeasterly 83.17 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 4 of Hutchins Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 7 Page 60 of said Maps, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence southeasterly 150.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 4 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 16.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 4 to the northwesterly line of Lot 27 of said Tract, said northwesterly being also the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 2.14 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 27 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 23 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 168.67 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 23 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Mathews Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 65.70 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 5 of Conant's Subdivision, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 12 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Mathews Street; thence southeasterly 273.00 feet along the northeasterly right-of-way line lines of Lots 1 through 5 inclusive, of said Subdivision to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1; thence southwesterly 115.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Gleason Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 1 to the centerline of said Gleason Avenue; thence southeasterly 153.47 feet along the centerline of said Gleason Avenue to the centerline of Fickett Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 145.00 feet along said centerline of Fickett Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 8 of Mrs. Gleason Subdivision, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 9 Page 8 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to a point on the northeasterly line of said Lot 8 distant southeasterly 28.11 feet from the most northerly corner of said Lot 8, said point being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street; thence southeasterly 390.22 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 8 through 1 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Mott Street; thence southwesterly 258.22 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Parcel B of Parcel Map, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 122 Pages 48 and 49 of Parcel Maps; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Parcel B, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street; thence southeasterly 512.97 feet along the southeasterly line of said Parcel B to the most southerly corner thereof, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of Lot A of Tract No. 8733, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 112 Page 5 and 6 of said Maps; thence northeasterly 431.23 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot A to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of First Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 185.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot A to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said First Street, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 48 of Davin and Jullien's Subdivision of Part of Lots 6 and 7 Block 73 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 54 Page 49 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southwesterly 120.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 48 to the most westerly corner thereof; thence southeasterly 163.60 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 48 through 51 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 51, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Savannah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 55 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street; thence southwesterly 45.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 55 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street; thence southeasterly 260.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 55, 76 and 77 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 77, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 62.18 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 1 of Wheeler and Heils Subdivision of Lot 1 of Subdivision of the North Half of Lot 7 Block 73 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 54 Page 1 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue; thence southeasterly 200.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 4 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 4, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Jullien

Street, 27.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 13.75 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 4 to the centerline of said Jullien Street; thence northeasterly 190.00 feet along said centerline to the centerline of First Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 237.76 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Evergreen Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Mappa Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 11 Page 48 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 166.50 feet along the centerline of said Evergreen to the centerline of an alley, 13.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 420.00 feet along the centerline of said alley to the centerline of Savannah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 21.00 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 1 of Workman's Subdivision of Lots 9 and 10 Mathews and Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 53 Page 99 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street; thence northwesterly 174.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 3 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 12.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 4 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 174.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 4 through 6 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 6 said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Saratoga Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 6 to the centerline of said Saratoga Street; thence southwesterly 147.50 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1 of Workman's Subdivision of Lot 8 Mathews & Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 436 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Saratoga Street and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of First Street, 83.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 174.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1, 2 and 3 of said Tract, to the most westerly corner of said Lot 3, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 16.28 feet to a point on a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 3.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of Lot 4 of said Tract, said point being also distant 4 feet from the southeasterly line of said Lot 4, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 112.00 feet along said parallel line to a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 6 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 3.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 6 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said First Street; thence northeasterly 58.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 6 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said First Street and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 6 to the centerline of said Mott Street; thence northeasterly 120.90 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 8, Block B of J. W. Browning's Subdivision of Lots 4 & 5 of the Mathews & Fickett Tract, in said City as per Map filed in Book 10 Page 50 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 363.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, of Block B of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 8, Block A of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Fickett Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 360.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, of Block A of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mathews Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Mathews Street; thence northeasterly 19.10 feet along the centerline of said Mathews Street to the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 9 of L. N. Breed's Subdivision of Lot 1 of the Mathews & Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 509 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 9, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mathews Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 12.5 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 361.25 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 9 through 14 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly

corner of said Lot 14, said corner being also on said southwesterly line of the alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 82.68 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 1 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence northwesterly 331.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 68 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street; thence northwesterly 161.40 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 66 through 68 inclusive, of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 66, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Lot 57 of Spence's Addition to Boyle Heights, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 503 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northeasterly 75.70 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 57 to the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 59 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 227.72 feet along said prolongation and the northeasterly line of said Lot 59 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said northeasterly line of Lot 59 to the centerline of said Chicago Street; thence southwesterly 250.00 feet along the centerline of said Chicago Street to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 50 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 50, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street; thence northwesterly 361.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 50 through 52, inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 52, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.51 feet to a point on the southeasterly line of Lot 1, Block J of Boyle Heights Moore and Kelleher's Subdivision, of a Part of Lots 5 and 6 Block 60 and Stevenson's Subdivision, of a Part of Lot 6 Block 60 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 568 of said Miscellaneous Records, said point being distant southwesterly 8.00 feet from the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 360.00 feet along a line parallel with and distant southwesterly 6.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to a point on the northwesterly line of Lot 11, Block J of said Tract, said point being distant southwesterly 6.00 feet from the most northerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on said southwesterly line of the alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Cummings Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said parallel line to the centerline of said Cummings Street; thence southwesterly 140.00 feet along said centerline to the northeasterly right-of-way line of 1st Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 292.90 feet along said right-of-way line to the most southerly corner of Lot 83 of Workman and Hollenbeck Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Pages 426 through 427 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as N24°07'25"E, 118.30 feet on Right-of-Way Map F-1282 issued by the State of California, Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence N24°07'25"E, 118.30 feet along the westerly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map F-1282; thence westerly 21.00 feet parallel with the northerly line of said Lot 83 to a line parallel with and distant westerly 21.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the easterly line of said Lot 83; thence northerly 2.00 feet along said parallel line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 20.00 feet; thence northerly, northwesterly and westerly 31.42 feet along said curve to a point on the northerly line of said Lot 83, said point being distant southeasterly 3.50 feet from the most northerly corner of said Lot 83, said corner being also on the southerly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 453.56 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 83, 86, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 98, 99 and 102 of said Tract, to a point on the northeasterly line of said Lot 102, distant southeasterly 15.00 feet from the most northerly corner of said Lot 120, said point being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of State Street, 75.00 feet wide (formerly 60.00 feet wide), as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 45.00 feet along the said northeasterly line of Lot 102 and the northwesterly prolongation thereof to the centerline of said State Street; thence northeasterly 562.30 feet along the centerline of said State Street to the centerline of Michigan Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on the Subdivision of Lot 2 of Block 60 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 3 Page 54 and 55 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 450.00 feet along the centerline of said Michigan Avenue to the easterly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway as shown on Right-of-Way Map F-1282 prepared by the State of California, Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; thence northerly along the said general westerly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway the following courses: thence northeasterly 114.21 feet along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N3°51'34"E, 233.54 feet

along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N3°05'42"E, 12.70 feet along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N18°42'47"E, 18.76 feet along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N12°31'24"E, 17.31 feet to the beginning of non-tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 35.00 feet; thence northwesterly 37.39 feet along said curve through a central angle of 59°30'05", a radial to said point bears S78°57'59"E; thence N4°22'29"E, 88.16 feet along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N4°22'25"E, 62.25 feet along said general right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence N1°18'50"E, 165.95 feet to the southwesterly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence southeasterly 373.60 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 2 of Clark Place, as per Map filed in Book 5, Page 149 of Maps, said point being distant 14.60 feet from the most easterly corner of said Lot 2, said point being also on the easterly line of said right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway; thence S14°29'37"W, 144.12 feet along said easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway to the southwesterly line of said Lot 3, said line being also the northeasterly line of an alley, 16.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence southeasterly 25.69 feet along the northeasterly line of said alley to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 5.00 feet from the southeasterly line of Lot 3 of said Clark Place; thence northeasterly 22.00 feet to a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 22.00 feet from the southwesterly line of Lot 4 of said Clark Place; thence southwesterly 21.00 feet along said parallel line; thence southwesterly 10.00 feet parallel with and distant 21.00 feet southeasterly of the above mentioned course of 22.00 feet; thence southeasterly 18.45 feet to a line parallel with and distant 8.00 feet from the most southerly line of said Lot 4, said line being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 160.00 feet along said parallel line to the easterly line of Lot 8 of said Tract, said line being also the westerly right-of-way line of Cummings Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.53 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 11, Block A of the Subdivision of Lot 2 of Block 60 Hancock's Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 3 Page 54 and 55 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Cummings Street; thence southeasterly 360.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 11, 9, 7, 5, 3 and 1, Block A of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said St. Louis Street; thence southwesterly 78.00 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 11 of Spence's Addition to Boyle Heights, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5 Page 503 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street; thence southeasterly 361.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 11 and 10 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 78 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street; thence southeasterly 180.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 78 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also the northwesterly line of Lot 71 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 76.00 feet along the northwesterly of said Lot 71 to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 51 of L. N. Breed's Subdivision of the Easterly Portion of Lot 1 Block 60 Hancock's Survey; thence southeasterly 45.39 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 51; thence northeasterly 50.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 51 to the most northerly corner thereof; thence southeasterly 161.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 51 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of said northeasterly line of Lot 51 to the centerline of said Breed Street; thence southwesterly 430.00 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Michigan Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 402.82 feet along the centerline of said Michigan Avenue to the centerline of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 83.65 feet along the centerline of said Soto Avenue to the centerline of Michigan Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on the Resubdivision of the Miles Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 55 Page 25, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 432.97 feet along the centerline of said Michigan Avenue to the centerline of Mathews Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 398.25 feet along the centerline of said Mathews Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 16 of Dennis & Cook's Subdivision of Lot 3 of the Matthew's and Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 36 Page 85 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said

Mathews Street; thence southeasterly 170.44 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 16 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 20.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 15 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley, thence southeasterly 170.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 15 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 7 of H. J. Woollacott's Subdivision of Lot 6 of the Mathews and Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 10 Page 23 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Fickett Street; thence southeasterly 170.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 7 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 20.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 20.50 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 8 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 170.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the centerline of said Mott Street; thence northeasterly 77.11 feet along said centerline of Mott Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 1 of Rosetta Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 12 Page 68 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 13.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 358.95 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also on said northeasterly line of alley and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Saratoga Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 64.59 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 12, Block 10 of Workman's Subdivision of Lots 9 and 10 Mathews and Fickett Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 53 Page 99 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Saratoga Street; thence southeasterly 174.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 12 through 14 inclusive, of Block 10 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 14, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 12.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 15, Block 10 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 174.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 15 through 17 to the most southerly corner of said Lot 17, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Savannah Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 66.40 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 1 of Clifton Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Page 68 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Savannah Street and on the northeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 358.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, of said Tract to a point distant 2.00 feet northwesterly from the most southerly of said Lot 8, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Evergreen Avenue, 62.00 feet wide (formerly 60.00 feet wide), as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 32.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 8 to the centerline of said Evergreen Avenue; thence northeasterly 348.99 feet along said centerline of Evergreen Avenue to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 15, Block A of Forest Heights Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 6 Page 130 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 35.00 feet to the most southerly corner of said Lot 15, Block A said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Evergreen Avenue; thence northwesterly 645.45 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 15 through 28 inclusive, of Block A of said Tract to the westerly corner of said Lot 28, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Forest Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 80.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 11, Block P of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Forest Avenue; thence northwesterly 459.74 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 11 through 20 inclusive, of Block P of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mott Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 59.63 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 9, Block 14 of Brooklyn Heights Ganahl Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Page 17 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Mott Street; thence northwesterly 140.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 9, Block 14 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 18.12 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 13, Block 14 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 390.50 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 13 through

20 inclusive, of Block 14 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley and on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Fickett Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 24, Block 13 said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Fickett Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide; thence northwesterly 450.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 16 through 24, Block 13 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said alley, and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.50 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 16 to the centerline of said alley; thence northeasterly 190.00 feet along said centerline of the alley to the centerline of Cincinnati Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 188.75 feet along said centerline of the Cincinnati Street to the centerline of Soto Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 44.90 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 16, Block C, of Soto Street Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 31, Page 35 of miscellaneous records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence northwesterly 140.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 16, Block C to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley, 14.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 14.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 7, Block C, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 7, Block C to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Breed Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 7, Block C to the centerline of said Breed Street; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet along said centerline of the Breed Street to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 6, Block D of said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 6, Block D, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Breed Street; thence northwesterly 251.41 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 6 and 17, Block D to the most westerly corner of said Lot 17, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Cornwell Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 60.90 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 7, Block A, of the Bird Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 14, Page 74 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Cornwell Street; thence northwesterly 255.70 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lots 7 and 30, Block A of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 30, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 50.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 50.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 7, Block B, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Chicago Street; thence northwesterly 245.10 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 7 and 30, Block B to the most northerly corner of said Lot 30, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of St. Louis Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of said Lot 30, Block B to the centerline of said St. Louis Street; thence southwesterly 110.00 feet along said centerline of St. Louis Street to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 6 of Reesmont Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 8 Page 29 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of Lot 6, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said St. Louis Street; thence northwesterly 247.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 6 and 53 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 53, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Cummings Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 71.76 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 60 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Cummings Street; thence northwesterly 127.78 feet along the southwesterly line of Lot 60 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 60, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 105 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 44.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 105 to the most southerly corner thereof; thence northwesterly 127.77 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 105 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Britannia Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 63.64 feet to the most southerly corner of the northeasterly 40.00 feet of Lot 3, of Squire's Subdivision a Part of Lot 5 Block 61 Hancock Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 29 Page 72, of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Britannia Street; thence northwesterly 126.36 feet along the southwesterly line of the northeasterly 40.00 feet of said Lot 3 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Lot 4 A.W. Brodes Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 7, Page 35 of Maps; thence northwesterly 45.43 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said parallel line to the easterly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway as shown on Right-of-Way Map F-1283-1 prepared by the State of California, Department of Transportation; thence S2°17'14"W, 121.33 feet along the

easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway to the northeasterly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, 82.50 feet wide (formerly Brooklyn Avenue) as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence northwesterly 280.06 feet along the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue to the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as $N9^{\circ}51'18''E$ 144.99 feet on said Right-of-Way Map; thence $N9^{\circ}51'18''E$, 144.99 feet along the westerly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 5 of Mitchell Block A Part of Lot 5 Block 61 Hancock Survey, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 66, Page 79 of Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 109.24 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 5 inclusive, of said Mitchell Block A Part of Lot 5 Block 61 Hancock Survey to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 40.00 feet from the centerline of State Street, 80.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map, said parallel line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of said State Street; thence northwesterly 81.36 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 8 of the Brooklyn Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 3 Pages 316 and 317 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said State Street; thence northwesterly 300.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 8 through 13 inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 13, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of Lot 1 of Condominium Tract No. 50483, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 1183 Pages 18 and 19 of said Maps; thence northeasterly 151.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Bridge Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 296.23 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most northerly thereof, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Bridge Street; thence southwesterly 151.77 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 1 to an angle point thereon; thence northwesterly 185.24 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Boyle Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 60.00 feet to a point on the southwesterly line of Lot 26, Block 8 of said Brooklyn Tract, said point being distant northwesterly 5.00 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 26, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Boyle Street; thence northwesterly 345.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 26 through 32 inclusive, of Block 8 of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 32, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Echandia Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 82.50 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 14 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Echandia Street; thence northwesterly 400.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 7 through 14 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of Lot 7 said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 6 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 151.00 along the southeasterly line of said Lot 6 to the most southerly corner of said Lot, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue; thence northwesterly 50.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 6 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue; thence northeasterly 1.75 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 6 to a line parallel with and distant 1.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the southwesterly line of said corner, said parallel line being also the northeasterly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez (formerly Macy Street), of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 264.50 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly terminus of a curve concave easterly, having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its northeasterly terminus with the curved northwesterly line of Lot 1, of said Brooklyn Tract, said northwesterly line also being the southeasterly line of Bridge Street, 60 feet wide; thence northwesterly 83.62 feet to the intersection of a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 3.00 feet from the southwesterly line of Lot B of Tract No. 2797, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 27, Page 99 of said Maps, and the southeasterly line of said Lot B, said intersection being also on the northwesterly line of Bridge Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 62.20 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of Lot C of said Tract; thence southwesterly 3.19 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot C to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 88.80 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots C and D of said Tract to the beginning of a curve having a radius of 25.00 feet, and said curve being on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Progress Place, 40.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 81.04 feet to the southwesterly terminus of that certain course shown as 7.47 feet on Right-of-Way Map F-1849-3 prepared by the State of California, Department of Transportation, said terminus being also the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly and having a radius of 914.93 feet, a radial bearing to said beginning bears $S11^{\circ}54'01''W$ as calculated from said Right-of-Way Map, said terminus also being on the southerly line of Lot 2, Block Q, of Map of Portion of Block Q, Mount Pleasant Tract, in said City, as per map filed in Book 5, Page 182, of said maps, and said terminus being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Cesar E. Chavez Avenue; thence northwesterly 236.45 feet along said curve, and along said southerly line of Lot 2, through

a central angle of $14^{\circ}48'27''$ to a point of tangency on said northerly right-of-way line of Cesar E. Chavez; thence northwesterly 191.10 feet to the southwesterly terminus of that certain course shown as $N64^{\circ}08'21''E$, 9.91 feet on said Right-of-Way Map; thence northeasterly along the northwesterly right-of-way line of the San Bernardino Freeway the following courses: thence $N64^{\circ}08'21''E$, 9.91 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 948.00 feet; a radial bearing to said point bears $S40^{\circ}47'27''E$; thence northeasterly 137.80 feet along said curve through a central angle of $8^{\circ}19'43''$; thence $N40^{\circ}52'50''E$, 408.14 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 1127.00 feet; thence northeasterly 802.06 feet through a central angle of $40^{\circ}46'33''$ to a point of tangency as shown on Freeway Right-of-Way Map F-1283-4 prepared by the State of California Department of Transportation; thence $N81^{\circ}39'23''E$, 444.55 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 973.00 feet; thence northeasterly 254.33 feet along said curve through a central angle of $14^{\circ}58'34''$; thence $N66^{\circ}40'49''E$, 648.38 feet to the beginning of a curve concave southerly and having a radius of 850.00 feet; thence northeasterly 111.64 along said northerly right-of-way line to the westerly right-of-way line of the Golden State Freeway as shown on said map; thence northerly 127.26 feet along said westerly right-of-way line to the beginning of a curve concave westerly and having a radius of 1170.00 feet; thence northerly 158.10 feet along said curved westerly right-of-way line; thence northeasterly 2.40 feet to an angle point therein; thence northerly 56.48 feet to an angle point therein; thence 67.81 feet to an angle point therein; thence northwesterly 84.00 feet to the southerly terminus of that certain course shown on said Right-of-Way Map as $N6^{\circ}46'35''E$, 125.17 feet; thence $N6^{\circ}46'35''E$, 125.17 feet along said right-of-way; thence $N0^{\circ}06'01''E$, 119.00 feet along said right-of-way; thence $N89^{\circ}07'46''E$, 12.00 feet along said right-of-way; thence $N0^{\circ}52'14''W$, 216.10 feet to the southerly terminus of that certain course shown as $N9^{\circ}57'40''W$, 149.34 feet, said course being also the easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence $N9^{\circ}57'40''W$, 149.34 feet along said easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence $N44^{\circ}23'05''W$, 22.61 feet along easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway to the southeasterly right-of-way line of Mission Road, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence northeasterly 361.21 feet along said right-of-way of said Mission Road to the northerly terminus of that certain course shown as $N30^{\circ}19'12''W$, 96.21 feet on said Right-of-Way Map, said course being also the easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway; thence along said easterly right-of-way line of said Golden State Freeway the following courses; thence $S30^{\circ}19'12''E$, 96.21 feet along said easterly right-of-way; thence $S24^{\circ}02'28''E$, 336.27 feet along said easterly right-of-way; thence $S41^{\circ}15'46''E$, 61.62 feet along said easterly right-of-way; thence $S52^{\circ}27'02''E$, 72.85 feet along said easterly right-of-way; thence $S82^{\circ}22'34''E$, 75.07 feet along said easterly right-of-way; thence $N55^{\circ}55'37''E$, 83.69 feet to the curved southwesterly right-of-way of Marengo Street, 90.00 feet wide as shown on said Right-of-Way Map, said curved southwesterly right-of-way being concave northeasterly and having a radius of 545.00 feet; thence southeasterly 142.82 feet along said curved southwesterly right-of-way through a central angle of $15^{\circ}09'13''$ to the northeasterly corner of Lot 18 of Tract No. 5272, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 17, Pages 74 and 75 of said Maps, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Marengo Street and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Lord Street 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said southwesterly right-of-way line of Marengo Street to the centerline of said Lord Street; thence southwesterly 205.00 feet, along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 26 of Tract No. 296, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 17 Pages 74 and 75 in said Maps; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 26, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Lord Street; thence southeasterly 230.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 26 and 27 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 27, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Mark Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 52 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Mark Street; thence southeasterly 230.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 52 and 53 of said Tract, to the most southerly corner of said Lot 53, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Clement Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 68 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Clement Street; thence southeasterly 230.22 feet along the southwesterly line of Lots 68 and 69 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 69, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of State Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 69 to the centerline of said State Street; thence southwesterly 41.00 feet along the centerline of said State Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 6 of Tuthill's and Mrs. Gleason's Subdivision of Lot 4 of the Orange Slope Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 12 Page 20 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly

corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said State Street; thence southeasterly 249.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 6 and 27 to the most southerly corner of Lot 27 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Kingston Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 27 to the centerline of said Kingston Street; thence southwesterly 331.50 feet along said centerline of Kingston Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 46 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 46, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Kingston Street; thence southeasterly 249.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 46 and 51 of said Tract to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Britannia Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 51 to the centerline of said Britannia Street; thence northeasterly 362.50 feet along said centerline of Britannia Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 8 of Florence Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 30 Page 19 of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most westerly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Britannia Street; thence southeasterly 343.00 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 8 and 18 of said Florence Terrace to the most southerly corner of said Lot 18, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Cummings Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Map; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 18 to the centerline of said Cummings Street; thence southwesterly 350.00 feet along said centerline of Cummings Street to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 16 of said Florence Terrace; thence southeasterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most northerly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said Cummings Street; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 16 to the most westerly corner thereof; thence southeasterly 171.50 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 16 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most westerly corner of said Lot 1 of Tract No. 23625, as per Map filed in Book 841, Page 15 through 17 inclusive, of said Maps; thence easterly 100.08 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 1 to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly and having a radius of 1051.00 feet, a radial to said point bears $S17^{\circ}24'49''W$, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 624.78 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 1 through a central angle of $34^{\circ}03'36''$; thence northeasterly 43.51 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 1 to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 416.00 feet; thence northeasterly 332.70 feet along said southerly line through a central angle of $45^{\circ}49'23''$ to the westerly prolongation to the northeasterly line of Tract No. 10802, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 185 Page 30 of said Maps, said line being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Marengo Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 445.88 feet along said prolongation and said northeasterly line to the most northerly corner of said Tract, said corner being also the southerly right-of-way line of Marengo Street and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 318.39 feet along the southeasterly line of said tract and the southeasterly line of Lots 17, 18, 19 and 20, Block 9, of Florence Terrace, in said city, as per map filed in Book 30, Page 19, of Miscellaneous Records, to the northeasterly terminus of that certain course shown as 12.65 feet of Right-of-Way Map F-1850-3 prepared by the State of California Department of Transportation, said course being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of the San Bernardino Freeway, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence southwesterly 12.65 feet along said southeasterly right-of-way line of the San Bernardino Freeway to the northwesterly line of the southeasterly 8.75 feet of said Lot 20, said northwesterly line also being the northeasterly line of Soto Street, 100.00 feet wide; thence southwesterly 237.48 feet along the northwesterly line of the southeasterly 8.75 feet of Lots 20 through 24, of said Block 9, to the most westerly corner of the southeasterly 8.75 feet of said Lot 24; thence southeasterly 8.75 feet to the most southerly corner of said Lot 24; thence southwesterly 275.90 feet along the southeasterly line of Lots 25 and 26, of said Block 9, the southeasterly line of Lots 4 through 6, of Denair Tract, in said city, as per map recorded in Book 6, Page 77, of said maps, to the most easterly corner of Lot 3, of said Denair Tract, said corner being the intersection of the southwesterly line of Barlow Street, 60 feet wide, and the northwesterly line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide; thence southwesterly 166.03 feet along the southeasterly line of Lots 1 through 3, of said tract, and the southeasterly line of Lot 1, of W.V. Kellen Tract, in said city, as per map filed in Book 14, Page 10, of miscellaneous records, to the northwesterly prolongation of the centerline of Fairmont Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Brooklyn Heights Ganahl Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Page 17, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 230.00 feet along said prolongation and said centerline to the centerline of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 348.81 feet along said centerline of said alley to the southeasterly prolongation of the

northeasterly line of Lot 10, Block 1 of said Tract, said prolongation being also the southwesterly right-of-way line of Wabash Avenue, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.50 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being the intersection of the northwesterly right-of-way line of said alley and the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Wabash Avenue; thence northwesterly 40.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 10 to the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of Lot 19, Block 25, of De Soto Heights, in said city, as per map filed in Book 31, Pages 71 and 72, inclusive, of said maps; thence northeasterly 82.50 feet along said southwesterly prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 19, said corner being the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Wabash Avenue; thence northeasterly 213.25 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 20 and 15, Block 25 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 15, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Pomeroy Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 30.00 feet along the northeasterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of said Lot 15 to the centerline of said Pomeroy Avenue; thence northwesterly 95.00 feet along said centerline to the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 8.75 feet of Lots 16 and 17 of Tremont Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 16, Page 116, of said Maps; thence northerly 50.15 feet along said southwesterly prolongation to the northeasterly terminus of a curve concave easterly and having a radius of 20.00 feet, and being tangent at its southeasterly terminus with the northeasterly line of said Pomeroy Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on Right-of-Way Map F-1850-6 prepared by the State of California Transportation Department; thence northeasterly 124.26 feet along said southeasterly line and the southeasterly line of Lot 14 and 15, of De Soto Heights Tract, in said city, as per map filed in Book 9, Page 179, of said maps to the southerly right-of-way line of the San Bernardino Freeway, as shown on said Right-of-Way Map; thence northwesterly 8.75 feet at right angles to said southeasterly line to a point on the northwesterly line of Lot 14, of said De Soto Heights Tract, said point also being the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide; thence northeasterly 155.62 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 11 through 14, of said tract, to the most westerly corner of said Lot 11, said corner also being the intersection of the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street and the southwesterly right-of-way line of Marengo Street (formerly Magnolia Avenue), 60 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northeasterly 61.26 feet in a direct line to the most southerly corner of the northwesterly 12.50 feet of Lot 11, Block 18, of De Soto Heights, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 31, Pages 71 and 72 of Miscellaneous Records, said corner also being the intersection of the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Marengo Street and the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 95.00 feet wide; thence northeasterly 294.51 feet along the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 12.50 feet of Lots 8 through 11, Block 18, of said De Soto Heights and its northeasterly prolongation to the curved northerly right-of-way line of the San Bernardino Freeway, as shown on said right-of-way map, said curve being concave southerly and having a radius of 2054.00 feet; thence southwesterly 14.26 feet along said curved northerly right-of-way line; thence southwesterly 4.25 feet along said northerly right-of-way line to the northwesterly line of Lot 14, Block 11, of said De Soto Heights, said line also being the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide; thence northeasterly 177.69 feet along said northwesterly line and its northeasterly prolongation to the southwesterly corner of Lot 14, Block 10, of said De Soto Heights, said corner being on a curve concave southerly and having a radius of 1453.00 feet; thence easterly 9.35 feet along the curved southerly line of said Lot 14 to the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 6.75 feet of said Lot 14, said line being the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 98.00 feet wide; thence northeasterly 153.97 feet along the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 6.75 feet of Lots 14 and 13, Block 10, of said De Soto Heights, to the most easterly corner of the northwesterly 6.75 feet of said Lot 13; thence southeasterly 2.00 feet to the most southerly corner of the northwesterly 8.75 feet of Lot 12, Block 10, of said De Soto Heights, said line also being the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 100 feet wide; thence northeasterly 141.01 feet along the southeasterly line of the northwesterly 8.75 feet of Lots 10 through 12, Block 10, of said De Soto Heights, to a point distant southwesterly 8.99 feet from the most easterly corner of the northwesterly 8.75 feet of said Lot 10; thence northerly 12.52 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 9, Block 10, of said De Soto Heights, said corner being on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 91.25 feet wide; thence northeasterly 100.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 9 and 8, Block 10 of said De Soto Heights to the most northerly corner of said Lot 8, Block 10 of said De Soto Heights, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Chelsea Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 7, Block 9 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Chelsea Street and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 200.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 7 and 6, Block 9 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Verde Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 50.00 feet thence to the most westerly corner of Lot 14,

Block 5 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Verde Street and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 300.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 14 and 13, Block 5 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 13, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Zonal Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 60.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 7, Block 4 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Zonal Avenue and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 300.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 7 and 6, Block 4 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Lancaster Avenue, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 82.50 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 8, Block 17 of Boston Heights, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 19 Page 38 of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of said Lancaster Avenue and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, 82.50 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 163.30 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 8 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street and on the southwesterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 15.00 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 7, Block 17 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 200.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 4 through 7 inclusive, of Block 17 to the most northerly corner of said Lot 4, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Soto Street; thence southeasterly 8.75 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 4 to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 8.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of Lot 3, Block 17 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 135.00 feet along said parallel line to a point distant 15.00 feet from the northeasterly line of Lot 1, Block 17, of said Tract; thence northeasterly 75.57 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 12, Block 16 of said Boston Heights, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Norfolk Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 400.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 5 through 12 inclusive, of Block 16 to the most northerly corner of said Lot 5, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence southeasterly 8.75 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 5 to a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 8.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of Lot 4, Block 16 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 100.00 feet along said parallel line to the southwesterly line of Lot 2, Block 16 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 8.75 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 2 to the most westerly corner of thereof, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 100.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 1 and 2, of Block 16 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Alcazar Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 70.54 feet to a point on a line parallel with and distant southeasterly 8.75 feet, measured at right angles, from the northwesterly line of Lot 10, Block 15 of said Tract, said point being distant 15.00 feet northeasterly from the southwesterly line of said Lot 10; thence northeasterly 35.00 feet along said parallel line to the southwesterly line of Lot 9, Block 15 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 8.75 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 9 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street; thence northeasterly 450.00 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 1 through 9 inclusive, of Block 15 of said Tract to the most northerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 300.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 and 20, Block 15 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Ricardo Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 1, Block 11 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Ricardo Street and on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street; thence southeasterly 290.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 and 20, Block 11 of said Tract to a point distant 10.00 feet from the most easterly corner of said Lot 20, said point being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street; thence southeasterly 70.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 1, Block 7 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Tremont Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street; thence southeasterly 300.00 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 1 and 20, Block 7 to the most easterly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Murchison Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 75.00 feet to a point on the northeasterly line of Lot 1, Block 3 of said

Tract, said point being distant 15.00 feet southeasterly from the most northerly corner of said Lot 1 and said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street; thence southeasterly 135.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 1 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southwesterly right-of-way line of Medford Street; thence southwesterly 300.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, of Block 3 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of Lot 7, Block 3 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 150.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 7 to the most northerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Murchinson Street; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet along the northwesterly line of said Lot 7 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on said southeasterly right-of-way line of Murchinson Street; thence southeasterly 150.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 7 to the most southerly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 8, Block 3 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 150.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 8, 9 and 10, Block 3 of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Alcazar Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.00 feet along the southwesterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of said Lot 10 to the centerline of said Alcazar Street; thence southeasterly 573.51 feet along said centerline of Alcazar Street to the centerline of Indiana Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 6333, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 71, Pages 11 through 14 inclusive, of said Map, said centerline being also the East Charter Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 628.73 feet along said East Charter Boundary Line and said centerline of Indiana Street to the southwesterly corner of Lot 11 of Tract No. 1426, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 30, Pages 14 through 16 inclusive, of said Maps, as shown on said Tract No. 6333; thence easterly 289.62 feet along the southerly boundary line of the City of Los Angeles to the easterly line of Lot 19, Block A, of Tract No. 6333, in said city, as per map filed in Book 71, Pages 11 through 14, inclusive, of said maps, said line being also the westerly line of an alley, 17 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northerly 137.37 feet along the easterly line of Lots 19 and 20, of said Block A, to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 20, said corner being also the beginning of a curve concave southwesterly, having a radius of 450.76 feet; thence northerly and northeasterly 343.37 feet along the curved northeasterly lines of Lots 21 through 23, of said Block A, to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 23, said corner being also the intersection of the southwesterly line of said alley and the southerly line of Worth Street, 40 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence easterly 30.07 feet to the westerly corner of Lot 3, of Tract No. 8093, in said city, as per map filed in Book 100, Pages 28 and 29, inclusive, of said maps, said corner being the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southwesterly, having a radius of 467.76 feet, said corner being the intersection of the southerly line of said Worth Street, and the northeasterly line of said 17 foot wide alley; thence southeasterly 71.26 feet along the curved southwesterly line of said Lot 3 to an angle point therein; thence southeasterly 66.06 feet to an angle point therein; thence southeasterly 8.96 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northeasterly, having a radius of 433.18 feet; thence southeasterly 348.41 feet along said curved southwesterly line of Lot 3, and the curved southerly line of Lots 1 and 2, Block B, of Tract No. 6333, in said city, as per map filed in Book 71, Pages 11 through 14, inclusive, of said maps; thence easterly 456.87 feet along the southerly line of Lots 2 through 6, Block B, of said tract, to the southeasterly corner of said Lot 6; thence northerly 242.81 feet to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 6, said corner being the southerly line of said Worth Street; thence easterly 619.09 feet along the northerly line of Lots 7 through 13, of said Block B, to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 13, said corner being the intersection of the southerly line of said Worth Street and the westerly line of an alley, 15 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence easterly 15.79 feet along the easterly prolongation of said northerly line to the southerly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 8, of Tract No. 1426, in said city, as per map filed in Book 30, Pages 14 through 16, inclusive, of said maps, said line being the easterly line of said alley; thence northerly 82.11 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also the southerly line of the Southern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way, 100 feet wide; thence easterly 331.56 feet along said southerly line to the westerly right-of-way line of Boca Avenue, 40 feet wide and variable in width; thence southerly 81.63 feet along said westerly right-of-way line to the northwesterly corner of Lot 14, Block B, of said Tract No. 6333; thence southerly 36.98 feet along the generally westerly line of said Lot 14, to the Southerly Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles; thence easterly 1430.92 along said Southerly Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles as shown on said Tract, to an angle point thereof, said corner being also the southeasterly corner of Lot 5 of said Tract No. 1426, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 160.00 feet along said Southerly Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles to a point on the northerly line of Lot 10, Block C of Tract No. 6479, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 75, Pages 1 through 5 inclusive, of said Maps, said point being distant westerly 56.71 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot 10, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Worth Street (formerly Baker Street), 40.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 56.71 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 10 to the northeasterly corner thereof,

said corner being also on said southerly right-of-way line of Worth Street and on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Miller Street, 70.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 81.84 feet to the most westerly corner of Lot 1, Block D of Tract No. 6479, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 75, Pages 1 through 5 inclusive, of said Maps; thence easterly 490.23 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block D of said Tract to a point distant westerly 6.02 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot 3, said point being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Marianna Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 40.05 feet along the easterly prolongation of said northerly line of said Lot 3 to the southerly prolongation of the centerline of said Marianna Avenue as shown on Tract No. 23444, in said City, as per map filed in Book 749, Pages 14 and 15, of said Maps; thence northerly 705.98 feet along said prolongation and said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 500.31 feet; thence northerly and northeasterly 294.33 feet along said curved centerline through a central angle of $33^{\circ}42'26''$; thence northeasterly 426.65 feet along said centerline to the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 1 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 801.35 feet along said centerline to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 5549.55 feet; thence northeasterly 510.82 feet along said curved centerline through a central angle of $5^{\circ}16'26''$ to a point of tangency; thence northeasterly 20.01 feet along said centerline to the northwesterly prolongation of the centerline of Cavanagh Road, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 8289, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 118 Pages 10 through 14 inclusive, of said Maps; thence southeasterly 68.10 feet along said centerline to the beginning of a curve concave northerly and having a radius of 86.92 feet; thence easterly 94.68 feet along said curved centerline through a central angle of $62^{\circ}24'46''$ to a point of tangency; thence northeasterly 34.03 feet along said centerline to the southerly prolongation of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 7669, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 86 Pages 78 and 79 of said Maps; thence northeasterly 194.91 feet along said prolongation and centerline of alley to an angle point thereon; thence northeasterly 294.46 feet along said centerline to an angle point therein; thence northeasterly 610.66 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Beatie Place, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 875.73 feet along said centerline to the centerline of Block Place, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 30.43 feet to the intersection of the northeasterly Right-of-Way line of said Block Place and the centerline of said alley; thence northeasterly 234.46 feet along said centerline to an angle point thereon; thence easterly 106.98 feet along said centerline to the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 96 of said Tract, said prolongation being also the easterly terminus of said alley; thence southerly 10.00 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 96, said corner being also on the southerly line of said alley; thence southerly 2.88 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 96 to the northwesterly corner of Lot 423 of Tract No. 7746, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 89, Pages 45 through 47 inclusive, of said Maps; thence easterly 348.13 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 416 through 423 inclusive, of said Tract to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 416, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Borland Road, 30.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 15.00 feet along the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of said Lot 416 to the centerline of said Borland Road; thence northerly 255.86 feet along the centerline of said Borland Road to the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of Lot 1 of Tract No. 5104, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 95, Pages 68 and 69, of said Maps; thence easterly 15.05 feet along said prolongation to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Borland Road and on the northerly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 232.31 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 1 through 9 inclusive, of said Tract to the southeasterly corner of said Lot 9, said corner being also on said northerly line of alley and on the westerly line of Bullard Avenue, 30.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 15.18 feet along the easterly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot 9 to the centerline of said Bullard Street; thence southerly 18.29 feet along said centerline to the westerly prolongation of a line parallel with and distant northerly 10.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the northerly line of Lot 14 of said Tract; thence easterly 135.22 feet along said parallel line to the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of said Lot 14; thence southerly 10.06 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 14, said corner being also on the southerly line of said alley; thence southerly 231.08 feet along the easterly lines of Lots 14 through 19 inclusive, of said Tract to the southeasterly corner of said Lot 19, said corner being also the southwesterly corner of Lot 11 of Tract No. 19908, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 832, Pages 79 and 80, of said Maps; thence easterly 140.06 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 11 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Warwick Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract and said corner being also the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 50.00 feet; thence northerly and easterly 157.08 feet along said curve, and the easterly and southerly lines of Lots 8 through 11 inclusive, of said Tract, through a central angle of $180^{\circ}02'47''$ to a point of reverse curve having a radius of 50.00 feet; thence southeasterly and easterly 42.05 feet along said curve and said southerly line of said Lot 8 through a

central $48^{\circ}11'09''$, said southerly line being also on the northerly line of Dobbs Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 178.21 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 6 through 8 inclusive, of said Tract to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 15.00 feet, said beginning being also on said northerly right-of-way line of Dobbs Street; thence northeasterly 18.26 feet along said curve through a central angle of $69^{\circ}44'09''$ to the northwesterly prolongation of the centerline of an alley, 20.00 feet wide as shown on Tract No. 8266, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 94, Page 13 and 14 of Maps; thence southeasterly 327.48 feet along said prolongation and the centerline of said alley to the centerline of Lillyvale Avenue, 60.00 feet, as shown on Tract No. 7746, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 89, Pages 45 through 47 of Maps; thence southerly 15.66 feet along said centerline to the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of Lot 199 of said Tract; thence easterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the southwest corner of said Lot 199, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Lillyvale Avenue and on the northerly right-of-way line of said Dobbs Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 225.08 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 192 through 199 inclusive, of said Tract to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 15.00 feet; thence northeasterly 23.48 feet along said curve through a central angle of $89^{\circ}44'00''$ to the southwest corner of said prolongation and said centerline of Highbury Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 32.11 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 79 of said Tract, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Highbury Avenue; thence southerly 46.66 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 79 to the southwest corner thereof, said corner being also on said easterly right-of-way line; thence easterly 69.25 feet along the southerly line of said lot to the westerly line of the Long Beach Freeway, as shown on Right-of-Way Map No. F-1529-5 prepared by the State of California Division of Highways; thence northerly along said westerly Right-of-Way line the following courses: thence northerly 66.78 feet to an angle point therein; thence easterly 36.33 feet to an angle point therein; thence northerly 134.72 feet to the northerly line of Lot 18, Tract No. 5039, in said city, as per map filed in Book 91, Pages 87 and 88, of said maps; thence westerly 9.97 feet to the northwest corner of said lot; thence northerly 20.96 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 1, of said tract; thence easterly 9.01 feet along the southerly line of said lot; thence northerly 70.18 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 27.00 feet, a radial to said beginning bears $N4^{\circ}43'27''W$; thence westerly 13.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of $29^{\circ}39'59''$ to a point on the southerly right-of-way line of Valley Boulevard, of variable width, (formerly Alhambra Avenue) as shown said Right-of-Way Map No. F-1529-5, said point being also the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southerly and having a radius of 788.00 feet, a radial to said point bears $N37^{\circ}39'06''W$; thence northeasterly 223.67 feet along said curved southerly right-of-way line of Valley Boulevard through a central angle of $16^{\circ}15'49''$; thence northeasterly 210.83 feet along said southerly right-of-way line to the southerly prolongation of the westerly line of Lot 341 of Tract No. 5906, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 62, Pages 13 through 15 inclusive, of said Maps, said southerly prolongation being the Easterly Boundary Line of the City of Los Angeles; thence northerly 107.17 feet along said prolongation and said Easterly Boundary Line to a point on the westerly line of said Lot 341, said point being distant northerly 10.72 feet from the southwest corner of said Lot 341, said point being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Valley Boulevard; thence northerly 813.35 feet along the westerly lines of Lots 341 and Lots 322 through 338 inclusive, of said Tract and said Easterly Boundary Line to the northwest corner of said Lot 322, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Front Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 50.33 feet said Easterly Boundary Line to the southwest corner of Lot 321 of said Tract No. 5906, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of said Front Street; thence northerly 118.78 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 321 and said Easterly Boundary Line to the northwest corner thereof; thence northerly 100.66 feet along said Easterly Boundary Line to the point on the northerly right-of-way line of the Southern Pacific Railroad, 100.00 feet wide as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 391.03 feet along said northerly right-of-way line to the southwest corner of Lot A as shown on Tract No. 4952, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 79, Pages 29 and 30 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 52.18 feet along the southwest line of said Lot A to the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 202.70 feet; thence northerly 82.93 feet along said curve and said southwest line to a point of tangency; thence northerly 186.87 feet along the westerly line of said Lot A to the centerline of Alhambra Avenue, 80.00 feet wide (formerly Concord Avenue), as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 91.12 feet along said centerline to a line parallel with and distant easterly 30.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the easterly line of Lot 24, Block 12 of said Tract, said parallel line being also the centerline of Lowell Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 151.46 feet along said parallel line to the easterly prolongation of the centerline of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 302.10 feet along said prolongation and said centerline to the centerline of Stockbridge Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as

shown on said Tract; thence westerly 301.88 feet along said centerline of alley to a point on the centerline of Dorchester Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract No. 4952, said point being also the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 1662.51 feet; thence westerly 147.33 feet along said centerline through a central angle of 5°04'39" to the beginning of a compound curve having a radius of 1620.16 feet ; thence southwesterly 178.23 feet along said centerline through a central angle of 6°18'11" to the centerline of Covina Street, 60.00 feet wide as shown on Tract No. 7784, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 89, Pages 82 through 87 of said Maps; thence southwesterly 308.92 feet along said centerline through a central angle of 10°55'30" to the centerline of Warwick Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 373.07 feet along said centerline through a central angle of 13°11'37" to the centerline of Bullard Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 125.30 feet along said centerline through a central angle of 04°25'52" to the northwesterly prolongation of a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 1.90 feet from the northeasterly line of Lot 120, of said Tract No. 7784; thence southwesterly 245.95 feet along said centerline to the southerly prolongation of the westerly line of Lot 126 of said Tract, said prolongation being also the easterly right-of-way line of Hollister Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract thence southwesterly 135.74 feet to the intersection of the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 162 of said Tract and the centerline of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, said prolongation being also the southerly right-of-way line of Ithaca Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 572.25 feet along said centerline of alley to the centerline of Haven Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 6900, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 86, Pages 34 through 39, of said Maps; thence southwesterly 650.08 feet along said centerline of alley to the centerline of Endicott Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 555.12 feet along said centerline of said alley to the centerline of Lombardy Boulevard, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 110.00 feet along the centerline of said Lombardy Boulevard to the northeasterly prolongation of Lot 159 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the most easterly corner of said Lot 159, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Lombardy Boulevard and on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 350.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 159 through 172 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 172, said corner being also on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue; thence northwesterly 3.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 172 to a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 3.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the southeasterly line of Lot 173 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 175.00 feet along said parallel line to the northeasterly line of Lot 180 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 3.00 feet along the northeasterly line of said Lot 180 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue; thence southwesterly 325.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 180 through 192 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 192, said corner being also on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Belleglade Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet to the most easterly corner of Lot 99 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Belleglade Avenue and on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue; thence southwesterly 400.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 99 through 114 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 114, said corner being also the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 6129.65 feet, said corner being also on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue; thence southwesterly 225.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 115 through 123 inclusive, of said Tract and said curve through a central angle of 2°06'11" to the most southerly corner of said Lot 123, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Alhambra Avenue and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Gratiot Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°28'03" to the most easterly corner of Lot 39 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Gratiot Street and on said northwesterly right-of-way line of Alhambra Avenue; thence southwesterly 81.61 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 39 through 42 inclusive, of said Tract and said curve through a central angle of 0°45'46" to a point on the southeasterly line of Lot said Lot 42, distant southwesterly 6.61 feet from the most southerly corner of said Lot 41, said point being also the beginning of a compound curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 481.12 feet, said point being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Alhambra Avenue; thence southwesterly and southerly 382.91 feet along the southeasterly and easterly lines of Lots 42 through 56 inclusive, of said Tract and said curve through a central angle of 45°36'00" to a point on the easterly line of said Lot 56, said point being also the beginning of a reverse curve concave westerly and having a radius of 230.00 feet, said point being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Alhambra Avenue; thence southerly 34.44 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 56 and said curve through a central angle of 8°34'45" to the most

southerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Alhambra Avenue and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Druid Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southerly 32.89 feet tangent to said curve to the centerline of said Druid Street; thence northwesterly 94.73 feet along said centerline to the northeasterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of Lot 16 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of said Druid Street and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 30.13 feet along said prolongation to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 16, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Druid Street and on said southeasterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 76.23 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 14 through 16 inclusive, of said Tract to the most westerly corner of said Lot 14, said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 13 of said Tract and on the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southwesterly 286.17 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 2 through 13 inclusive, of said Tract to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 2, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley and on the easterly right-of-way line of Brawley Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 93.31 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 12 of Tract No. 21308, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 579, Pages 49 and 50, of said Maps, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Brawley Street; thence westerly 130.00 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 12 to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 9 of Tract No. 18578, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 468, Pages 49 and 50, of said Maps; thence southwesterly 172.15 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 7 through 9 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 7, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 6 of said Tract; thence southeasterly 336.64 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, of said Tract to the most southerly corner of said Lot 1, said corner being also the most easterly corner of Lot 41 of Tract No. 12507, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 238, Page 47, of said Maps; thence southwesterly 86.12 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 41 to the most southerly corner thereof; thence westerly 81.72 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 41 to the southwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Eastern Avenue, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 40.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot 41 to the centerline of said Eastern Avenue; thence southerly 205.00 feet along said centerline of Eastern Avenue to the centerline of McPherson Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on Tract No. 11917, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 222, Pages 17 through 20 inclusive, of said Maps; thence westerly 117.29 feet along said centerline of McPherson Avenue to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly and having a radius of 200.00 feet; thence westerly and northwesterly 63.80 feet along said curved centerline through a central angle of $18^{\circ}16'37''$ to the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 97 of said Tract; thence southerly 31.37 feet to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 97, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said McPherson Avenue; thence southerly 207.48 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 97 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also the northeasterly corner of Lot 63 of Tract No. 6837, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 76, Pages 32 and 33, of said Maps; thence southerly 131.57 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 63 to the southeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of Cyril Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 50.57 feet to a point on the northerly line of Lot 282 of said Tract distant westerly 85.00 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot, said point being also on the southerly right-of-way line of said Cyril Avenue and said point being also the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southeasterly and having a radius of 15.00 feet; thence westerly and southwesterly 23.56 feet along said curve through a central angle of $89^{\circ}59'33''$ to a point of tangency on the westerly line of said Lot, said point being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Catalpa Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southerly 216.45 feet along the westerly lines of Lots 274 through 282 inclusive, of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 274, said corner being also on the easterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract, and said corner being also the most northerly corner of Lot 273 of said Tract and the beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 2144.29 feet; thence southerly 97.61 feet along the westerly line of Lots 270 through 273 inclusive, of said Tract through a central angle of $2^{\circ}36'31''$ to a point of tangency, said point being also on said easterly line of said alley; thence southerly 268.28 feet along the westerly lines of Lots 259 through 270 inclusive, of said Tract to a point on the northwesterly line of said Lot 259, said point being also the beginning of a tangent curve concave westerly and having a radius of 349.72 feet; thence southwesterly 205.44 feet along the westerly and northwesterly lines of Lots 250 through 259 inclusive, of said Tract through a central angle of $33^{\circ}39'47''$ to the most westerly corner of said Lot 250, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Del Paso Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 106 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Del Paso Avenue and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 225.90 feet along the northwesterly lines of

Lots 102 through 106 inclusive, of said Tract to a point on said northwesterly line of Lot 102, said point being also on the southeasterly line of said alley, said point being also the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly and having a radius of 2208.63 feet; thence southwesterly 335.71 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 96 through 102 inclusive, of said Tract through a central angle of $8^{\circ}42'21''$ to the most westerly corner of said Lot 96, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of said alley and on the northeasterly right-of-way line of Ronda Drive, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 50.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of $01^{\circ}17'50''$ to the most northerly corner of Lot 95 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of said Ronda Drive and on the southeasterly line of an alley, 20.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southwesterly 172.42 feet along said curve, and the northwesterly lines of Lots 92 through 95 inclusive, of said Tract through a central angle of $4^{\circ}28'22''$ to the beginning of a compound curve concave northerly and having a radius of 810.24 feet; thence westerly 312.29 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 85 through 92 of said Tract through a central angle of $22^{\circ}05'00''$ to a point on the northerly line of said Lot 85, said point being distant easterly 39.72 feet from the northwesterly corner thereof, said point being also on the southerly line of said alley; thence westerly 34.72 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 85 to a line parallel with and distant easterly 5.00 feet from the westerly line of said Lot 85; thence westerly 30.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of said Lot 85 to the centerline of Boca Avenue, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 110.54 feet along said centerline to the easterly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 132 of said Tract; thence westerly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 132, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Boca Avenue, said corner being also the southeasterly corner of Lot 25 of said Tract; thence westerly 61.52 feet along the southerly line of said Lot 25 to an angle point thereon; thence northwesterly 183.08 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 25 and 22 of said Tract to the southwesterly corner of said Lot 22, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of Jones Avenue, 55.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 30.77 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 22 to the easterly line of Lot 15 of Tract No. 12323, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 231 Pages 31 through 34 inclusive, of said Maps; thence southerly 177.45 feet along the easterly line of said Lots 15 and 138 of said Tract to the southeasterly corner of said Lot 138, said corner being also on the northerly right-of-way line of Valley Boulevard, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 899.84 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 124 through 138 inclusive, of said Tract, and their southerly prolongation to the easterly line of Lot 2 of Tract No. 679, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 17, Page 24 of Maps; thence northerly 1025.88 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 2 to the southeasterly corner of Lot 35 of Tract No. 12524, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 236, Pages 5 through 7 inclusive, of said Maps; thence northeasterly 87.25 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 35 to a point distant southwesterly 67.34 feet from the most easterly corner of said Lot 35; thence northwesterly 35.54 feet to a point on the easterly line of said Lot 2 of said Tract No. 679, said point being distant southerly 35.00 feet from the northeasterly corner of said Lot 2; thence northwesterly 78.36 feet to a point on the northerly line of said Lot 2, said point being the most westerly corner of Lot 35 of said Tract No. 12524; thence westerly 722.92 feet along the northerly line of said Lot 2 of said Tract No. 679 to the northwesterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southerly right-of-way line of Hatfield Place and on the easterly right-of-way line of Indiana Avenue, 30.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 15.00 feet along the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of said Lot 2 to the centerline of said Indiana Avenue; thence southerly 481.96 feet along said centerline of Indiana Avenue to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 101 of Tract No. 12234, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 327, Pages 14 through 19 of said Maps; thence northwesterly 15.40 feet along said prolongation to the southeasterly corner of said Lot 101, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of said Indiana Avenue; thence northwesterly 1022.17 feet along the southwesterly lines of Lots 88 through 101 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 88, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of Soto Street, of variable width, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 28.14 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 88 to a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 28.00 feet, measured at right angles, from the westerly line of said Lot 88; thence southwesterly 492.72 feet along said parallel line to the northerly right-of-way line of Valley Boulevard, 100.00 feet wide, as it now exists; thence westerly 1499 feet along said northerly right-of-way line to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southerly and having a radius of 3014.93 feet as calculated from Tract No. 2082, in said City, as per map filed in Book 32, Page 73 of said Maps; thence westerly 1289.48 feet along said curve and said northerly right-of-way to a point of tangency; thence southwesterly 593.06 feet along said northerly right-of-way to the centerline of Eastlake Avenue, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 302.25 feet along the centerline of said Eastlake Avenue to the centerline of North Main Street, 80.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence westerly 1970.09 feet along said centerline of North Main Street to the centerline of Workman Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on

Block 6 of the Moulton Tract Known as Moulton's Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 7, Page 12, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southerly 205.00 feet along said centerline of Workman Street to the westerly prolongation of the northerly line of Lot 8 of said Tract; thence easterly 30.00 feet along said prolongation to the northwesterly corner of said Lot 8, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Workman Street; thence easterly 330.00 feet along the northerly lines of Lots 8 and 7 of said Tract to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 7, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Sichel Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 60.23 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 6, Block 5 of Dickenson's Subdivision of Block 5 of Moulton Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 7, Page 70, of said Miscellaneous Records, said corner being also on the easterly right-of-way line of said Sichel Street, and said corner being also on the northerly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence easterly 314.48 feet along the southerly lines of Lots 1 through 6 inclusive, Block 5 of said Tract to a point distant westerly 15.68 feet from the southeasterly corner of said Lot, said point being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Griffin Avenue, of variable width; thence easterly 55.52 along the easterly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot 1 to the centerline of said Griffin Avenue; thence southerly 510.64 feet along said centerline to a line parallel with and distant southerly 75.00 feet from the southerly line of Lot 23, Block 5 of said Tract; thence westerly 1168.65 feet along said parallel line to the centerline of Daly Street, of variable width as shown on Parcel Map No. 1590 filed in Parcel Map Book 20, Page 14, of said Maps; thence northerly 544.23 feet along said centerline of Daly Street to an angle point therein; thence northerly 396.47 feet along said centerline to the centerline of North Main Street, 80.00 feet wide as shown on said Parcel Map; thence westerly 1058.02 feet along said centerline of North Main Street to an angle point therein; thence northwesterly 945.63 feet along said centerline of North Main Street to an angle point therein; thence northwesterly 683.42 feet along said centerline of North Main Street to the Point of Beginning.

TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS (PARCEL 2): Beginning at the intersection of a line parallel with and distant northwesterly 41.25 feet from the northeasterly line of Lot 15 of the Subdivision of the Cheesbrough Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 14, Page 20 of Miscellaneous Records, said parallel line being also the centerline of Lorena Street, 82.50 feet wide, with the northwesterly prolongation of the southwest line of said Lot 15; thence southwest 673.91 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 17 of East End Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 23, Page 85, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence southeasterly 41.25 feet to the most northerly corner of said Lot 17, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Lorena Street; thence southeasterly 611.70 feet along the northwesterly lines of Lots 17 through 28 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 28, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of Velasco Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 60.00 feet to the most northerly corner of Lot 29 of said Tract, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Velasco Street; thence southeasterly 254.29 feet along the northeasterly lines of Lots 29 through 33 inclusive, of said Tract to the northeasterly corner of said Lot 33, said corner being also on the westerly right-of-way line of Indiana Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 34.17 feet along the southeasterly prolongation of the northwesterly line of said Lot 33 to a line parallel with and distant easterly 30.00 feet from the easterly line of said Lot 33, said parallel line being also the centerline of said Indiana Street; thence northerly 483.43 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly prolongation of the generally southwest line of Lot 14, of Tract No. 1809, in said city, as per map filed in Book 21, Page 24, of said maps; thence northwesterly 127.67 feet along said prolongation and said generally southwest line to an angle point therein; thence southwest 50.00 feet to an angle point therein; thence northwesterly 65.00 feet to the most westerly corner of said Lot 14, said corner being the intersection of the northeasterly line of an alley, 10 feet wide, and the southeasterly line of an alley, 10 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 10.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 5, of said tract, said corner being the intersection of the northwesterly line of said alley and the northeasterly line of an alley, 10 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 125.00 feet to the most westerly corner of said lot 5, said corner being the intersection of the northeasterly line of said alley and the southeasterly line of Cheesbrough's Lane, 30 feet wide, as shown on said tract; thence northwesterly 15.00 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said southwest line to the centerline of said Cheesbrough's Lane; thence northeasterly 250.79 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southerly line of Lot 5 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 15.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 5, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Cheesbrough's Lane; thence northwesterly 170.00 feet along the southwest line of said Lot 5 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly line of an alley, 15.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.50 feet along the

northwesterly prolongation of the southerly line of said Lot 5 to the centerline of said alley; thence northeasterly 50.26 feet along said centerline to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of said Lot 15 of said Tract; thence northwesterly 7.50 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 15, said corner being also on the northwesterly line of said alley; thence northwesterly 186.00 feet along the southwesterly line of said Lot 15 to the most westerly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southeasterly right-of-way line of said Lorena Street; thence northwesterly 41.25 feet along the northwesterly prolongation of said Lot 15 to the Point of Beginning.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS (PARCEL 3): Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of Cummings Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on Marengo Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 11 Pages 166 and 167, of said Maps with the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 86 of said Tract; thence southwesterly 1040.25 feet along the centerline of said Cummings Street to a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 35.00 feet from the southwesterly line of Lot 177 of Marengo Terrace Sheet No. 2, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 13, Page 21 of said Maps, said parallel line being also the northeasterly right-of-way line of Marengo Street, of variable width; thence southeasterly 165.36 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of said Lot 177, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 12.00 feet along said parallel line to the northwesterly line of Lot 11, Block 5 of Florence Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 30 Page 19 of said Miscellaneous Records, said northwesterly line being also the southeasterly line of said alley; thence southeasterly 129.80 feet along said parallel line to a point distant northwesterly 20.00 feet from the southeasterly line of Lot 220 of Marengo Terrace Sheet No. 3, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22 Page 21 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 70.18 feet to a point on the northwesterly line of Lot 226, of Marengo Terrace Sheet No. 5, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 25 Page 61, of said Maps, said point being distant northeasterly 30.00 feet from the southwesterly corner of said Lot 226, said northwesterly line being also the southeasterly right-of-way line of Chicago Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 100.00 feet along a line parallel with and distant northeasterly 30.00 feet from the southwesterly line of said Lot 226 to the southeasterly line of said Lot 226, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of Lot 23, Block 6 of Florence Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 30, Page 19, of said Maps; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of said Lot 23, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of Lot 146 of Marengo Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 11, Pages 166 and 167 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 50.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of said Lot 146, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of Lot 223 of Marengo Terrace No. 4, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 22, Page 24 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 100.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of said Lot 223, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly right-of-way line of Cornwell Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence southeasterly 70.17 feet to a point on a line parallel with and distant 35.00 feet northeasterly from the southwesterly line of Lot 21, Block 7 of Florence Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 30 Page 19 of said Maps; thence southeasterly 30.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of said Lot 21, said southeasterly line being also the northwesterly line of Lot 147 of Marengo Terrace, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 11, Pages 166 and 167, of said Maps; thence southeasterly 100.00 feet along said parallel line to the southeasterly line of Lot 148 of said Tract; thence northeasterly 115.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 148 to the most northeasterly corner thereof, said corner being also on the southwesterly line of an alley, 12.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 12.00 feet to the most southerly corner of Lot 149 of said Tract, said corner being also on the northeasterly line of said alley; thence northeasterly 100.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lots 149 and 150 of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 150, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 11 of said Florence Terrace; thence northeasterly 50.00 feet along the southeasterly line of said Lot 11 to the most easterly corner thereof, said corner being also the most southerly corner of Lot 151 of said Marengo Terrace; thence northeasterly 360.00 feet along the southeasterly lines of Lot 151 through 159 inclusive, of said Tract to the most easterly corner of said Lot 159, said corner being also on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Charlotte Street, 60.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northeasterly 30.00 feet along the northeasterly prolongation of the southeasterly line of said Lot 159 to the centerline of said Charlotte Street; thence northwesterly 175.00 feet along the centerline of said Charlotte Street to the centerline of Cornwell Street, 50.00 feet wide, as shown on said Tract; thence northerly 220.76 feet along the centerline of said Cornwell Street to the southeasterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Lot 12 of Orange Slope Tract, in said City, as per Map filed in Book 5, Pages 326 and 327, of said Miscellaneous Records; thence northwesterly 25.00 feet along said prolongation to the most southerly corner of said Lot 12, said corner being also on the northwesterly right-of-way line of said Cornwell Street; thence northwesterly 353.52 feet along

ATTACHMENT NO. 6

**MAP OF THE
ADELANTE EASTSIDE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA**

Adelante Eastside

CRA/LA

