

This document was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors.

Transcript

June 4, 2025, 9:05PM

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 0:03

And everyone will cost him one as a director for instruction and economic development, joining virtually filling in for my colleague Pamela today.

OC **Operations Cluster** 0:17

OK, SD2.

Use a second, descriptive Verdi by code view on online nerd and drop in the next second SC3, John Leonard with SD3 and Cecilia Cavale.

OK, SD4.

SG **Schauerman, Grant** 0:34

Grant, Chairman for SD4.

OC **Operations Cluster** 0:36

And Michelle Vega, Christie. Fine, OK, we are going to begin with the general public comments for public comments.

Anyone here for general public comment, please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

I just want to make a note that this meeting is being transcribed.

Thank you, chair.

Let's start with board motion items.

We'll begin with motion by SC1.

Additional Delegation 3 relating to the Grant award project will cost and Tom.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 1:05

Thank you, Michelle.

Good afternoon, officer.

Again, I'm here today to introduce the motion our office coordinated with the C Office and also with the County Council.

I'll go and 1st briefly present the intent of the motion and then pass it to Miss Catherine and offer CU Asset Management Branch and County Council, who have been key county staff on the former.

OC Operations Cluster 1:34

Class. Can you hold on one second?

I'm gonna try to see if I can.

Move this over to the other speaker.

I don't know why it's not doing that.

RW Rehman, Waqas 1:44

No problem.

OC Operations Cluster 1:51

So we can find it.

SK Shelton, Kirk 1:57

Darde it's coming through on the remote end garbled too, so I don't think it's internal to your your room.

OC Operations Cluster 2:00

I'm.

SK Shelton, Kirk 2:02

I think it's the. It's at the sender end.

OC Operations Cluster 2:05

Oh, it's at the center end.

SK Shelton, Kirk 2:07

Yeah.

OC **Operations Cluster** 2:10

OK.

Alright, well, we'll kinda speak loud. Yeah, but we could.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 2:13

OK.

Let me know if you could pick me back up.

OC **Operations Cluster** 2:14

Yes, yeah. If you're still coming through my speaker.

Oh, really? OK.

Try again.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 2:24

Can you hear me better now?

OC **Operations Cluster** 2:27

You know what? I'm gonna move closer to you guys.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 2:29

No, it's getting it's the same.

It's garbled kind of thing.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 2:37

Umm.

Let me know if it improves.

I could hear you all crying on my end.

OC **Operations Cluster** 2:46

What's that?

Yeah, it's that one right there.

I'm trying to figure out why it's the the camera's not working correctly.

Cortana.

OK, OK.

Alright, I got it.

Bear with me.

I'm gonna take this off.

Or if possible, start speaking to see if that works.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 3:31

OK, please let me know if you get all still hear me well.

OC **Operations Cluster** 3:38

Yeah, when it's bad for you.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 3:39

Better than earlier.

OC **Operations Cluster** 3:42

Thank you.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 3:45

OK.

I hear it's a bit better than earlier.

I'll try to speak as loud as I can.

So and I'll be super brief.

OC **Operations Cluster** 3:52

It's no longer a volume.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 3:53

I see.

OC **Operations Cluster** 3:55

I think it's also just choppy.

I don't know if you have a bad connection or turn your video off to see if the audio is better.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 4:03

Let me turn off my video.

See if it improves.

OK.

Let me know if it's been improved now.

OC Operations Cluster 4:15

It's a little better.

I think that's the best we can do, OK.

Go ahead, mokas.

RW Rehman, Waqas 4:22

OK, apologies about that.

Like I like I was mentioning, I'll briefly introduce the motion and the intent of the motion.

I see.

Mr. Compton, in the room so and I know Catherine was joining perhaps virtually and I'll pass them to.

Answer any questions and further explain if anything missed, but just by the way a background, the LA Los Angeles Grand Avenue 40 was established in 2003.

Through a joint power agreement between the Los Angeles County Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles and the city of LA.

So and the goal was to coordinate an overseas development of key properties along Grand Ave. transforming the area into a vibrant cultural and economic hub.

Some of the key prior actions that occurred leading up to this motion.

So like I mentioned 2003, this JPA was created for the Grand Avenue Bunker Hill parcels.

In 2007, that 40 entered into a disposition and development agreement with Grand Avenue LLC related companies to develop parcels including the grand. This is the new development right across from the Disney Concert Hall.

The Emerson property and the Broad Museum.

Then, in 2010 and 2014, the 40 certified in Environmental Impact Report and EIR agenda to assess changes in project scope.

Then in 2021, the board approved an amended and restated JPA agreement, making the Board of Supervisors authorities governing body.

So essentially dissolving the JPA and transferring all of the.

Grand Ave.

Porties matters over under counties review and in 2022, the board delegated authority to the CEO office to execute documents related to the.

Grand Avenue project.

Those are the last letter parcels in Bunker Hill, parcel and parcel Q and parcel Li believe.

So most of the work and the actual disposition and the development of the those parcels had occurred.

There was no point in keeping that authority because there was ministerial and administrative matters.

Remaining and that wouldn't come.

That would come up very occasional.

So those powers were delegated to the CEO from the Board of Supervisors.

And then that brings us to the current motion in 2025.

This is to expand the current CE OS authority to cover all aspects of those projects and parcels. I mentioned, ensuring efficiency and continuity. More specifically is a matter involving Emerson's loans and.

Those are were not previously delegated to the CEO.

She's more administrative in nature to now pass.

That authority, also to the CEO, so this motion will continue. The county's commitment to streamline ordinance while maintaining transparency and oversight in one of the LA's most significant redevelopment efforts.

I'll now pass it to Katherine and Tom to add any key details I may have missed and answer any specific questions related to this motion and apologies for the bad reception and audio on my end.

Thank you.

Operations Cluster 8:15

Yeah. So as Mukash said, this is really just an extension of the prior delegation of authority to CEO to basically handle administrative matters that come up from time to time when we came to the board in 2022, the focus was on parcel Q, which is is. Both the parcel is owned by the county and and is, you know, the authority holds the lease.

We didn't realize that there may be other approvals necessary relating to the Emerson across the street and we got one a few months ago.

And so this will be able to.

Give the CEO the authority to.

Approve for instance. In this case we have an acknowledgement of consent regarding the senior loan on the Emerson or changing their rates and you know.

We have approval rights over that, but we would typically have to go to the board in the absence of having delegated authority to the CEO.

Thank you.

Any questions?

I guess, Tom, do you have any concerns with this?

No, no.

And this this allows us, you know, to move efficiently and not hold up related from engaging in their business activities.

What's left in the Grand Avenue project development plans like, are we only expecting further kind of legal formal if not formalities, but stuff like the Emerson consent?

Or is it actual?

Development approval that we're now delegating, we're, we're.

Only expecting these kinds of approvals.

With regard to the Grand Avenue project itself, from time to time we get requests for approval.

Regarding leasing out that space.

Which is really delighting left. There's there's no future development. You know, the the road project is, is now separate from the Grand Avenue project.

It really is just the Emerson and the grand and parcel. W was taken back by the county, so that's not a part of this, right?

So actually, if you can just speak to what that's that's the entire footprint, what you just walk through.

Yes, those, OK.

So these leases are in place for.

Very long time. And so from time to time they're going to be these kinds of approvals relating to financing issues and leasing issues that are going to come up that you know the county needs to approve or the authority needs to.

And certainly if there's something material that comes to us that would go to the board.

OK.

I'm just looking at the footprint here.

Yeah, I mean all the.

I think if there's anything that would be respected there, but assuming they're not tearing the grand down any time soon.

Bye.

Do we have public comment for this item?

Are there any public comment for this item?

Please raise your hand or speak up.

Great. OK.

We'll move on to SD3 support for Assembly, Bill 648, tackling student housing and security at California Community Colleges.

And CC is going to present this item for us.

cc **Cecilia Cabello** 11:45

Yes. Cecilia Kibeho, FT3AB6, Fourty 8 will streamline the construction of student and staff housing at California community colleges by exempting new student and staff housing projects from local zoning regulations. If the project is constructed on property that is owned or leased by a California commun.

College District and located within 1/2 mile radius of a main campus.

Or of a satellite campus that existed before July 1st.

2025 community colleges will still be required to follow other local regulations and consult with their local planning departments.

The bill is C, sponsored by Santa Monica College and Laccd, and is supported by community colleges and Community College districts in each supervisorial district, including the Antelope Valley Community College District, Cerritos College, Compton Community College District, El Camino Community College District.

Lacc Pierce college.

College happy to take any questions.

oc **Operations Cluster** 12:50

And CC.

It's corrected. The Csu's and UCS already have this authority, and it would just be extending essentially the same to all of us.

cc **Cecilia Cabello** 12:55

Correct.

Correct. And it's also worthy of noting that CSU and UC students have, I'm sorry, Community College students have twice the rate of students who have either experienced housing insecurity or homelessness and part due to many factors. But partially because this authority exists because they are state created ENT. But is one of the main reasons that the community colleges suffer a larger rate of housing insecurity and homelessness.

OC **Operations Cluster** 13:32

Any questions?

No. Great, any members of the public for comment.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 13:37

Questions, OK.

Can you all hear me? OK, I have family.

OC **Operations Cluster** 13:42

Yep.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 13:44

I'll go first from our office.

LP **Leo, Pamela** 13:47

Oh, thank you. Thank you, Kofi.

Hi Pamela with SD2.

Main question on this one is, would you have has the author considered support of? Of support if amend aligned with the issue raised, I noticed in the bill analysis around.

Consistency that the existing code for UCS and Csu's.

Not all of that is included.

It in the bill for the community colleges. I think it was raised as opposed unless amended in that section of the bill analysis.

For the Assembly was wondering if SC3 if you've given any thought to that or.

Concerns about the lack of consistency, it's.

CC **Cecilia Cabello** 14:38

We don't have concerns.

I'm not sure what the author is intending to do, but I'm more than happy to look into that.

LP **Leo, Pamela** 14:46

Thanks. Yeah, I'm I'm curious. Like if we if you would be open to just checking in on that and seeing if it would make sense to like supportive amend or something like that?

CC **Cecilia Cabello** 14:58

I'm happy to check into it. I think we support the bill as is, but we'll look into that.

LP **Leo, Pamela** 15:00

Thanks.

Thank you.

Is it for me?

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 15:07

Do we know I mean to be committed?

Colleagues typically are not residential institutions.

Is through that bill is the author like, do we like how many instances of committee colleagues that are building housing that we know of?

CC **Cecilia Cabello** 15:22

I don't know how many are statewide.

I know Laccd has been trying to.

They had passed a bond measure in 2022 and part of the bond measure was to do a pilot of affordable housing in LACC.

City College was trying to do that, but they've had a lot of snags in the road.

Yes, traditionally they are.

Community colleges are considered commuter colleges. However, what we're finding is that those.

Students as the demographics of those who attend community colleges have

changed, it's fewer and fewer 18 to 24 year olds that would attend a traditional four year university. They tend to be older, but with rents like everybody else, with rents skyrocketing, housing stock not being available it.

Tougher for students to find housing by not even by, but anywhere in the vicinity of a Community College in the LA Greater Greater LA region.

So I think this bill is intended to address that, not just in LA but statewide.

KK Kouassi, Koffi 16:23

I mean to me.

Got it.

Typically, I mean, student housing is expensive, right?

So are we saying that when, if if, let's say communication calories are able to build it, they're going to be able to make it at an affordable rate?

I mean, I was in Community College and I was homeless going to school, college too, so.

I'm asking that from experience because I are we saying that if community colleges are able to build these these.

CC Cecilia Cabello 16:48

Yep.

KK Kouassi, Koffi 16:54

You know.

Residences is gonna be affordable because I mean, from my experience of what I've seen or it's not affordable.

CC Cecilia Cabello 17:04

It's a great question, Kofi.

I know that's definitely the case with four year colleges. I would.

I can't.

This bill doesn't address that, and I couldn't speak to how it actually will operate again, and nor does this bill address that.

But I do think that.

They're they're like understanding that.

The income right of those attending or even the parents of those attending is going

to be in a different scale than Cal State or UKI would imagine.
There would be some kind of program, but I I couldn't speak to that.
Nor does the bill address that.

KK

Kouassi, Koffi 17:37

I understand.

I mean the reason why I'm asking is because we're licking it.

Linking that you know the problem that we see in the bill will solve is helping solve the homelessness crisis, right?

So if you know whatever the outcome of the bill is, that it will result in housing that is not affordable, then we're not solving the problem.

So that's why that's the reason why I'm asking that.

CC

Cecilia Cabello 17:59

I think it is an absolutely fairpoint that you make that 100% true. But if we don't break down barriers to build, we won't have anything whatsoever.

I think that's maybe the next part, maybe in the next session there will be a bill that would will address that. But first we have to make it as at least feasible as possible for community colleges that do have housing projects that have hit a lot of OB.

To at least build and increase the housing stock.

Because if we don't even increase the housing stock.

We're getting nowhere.

KK

Kouassi, Koffi 18:29

I agree.

So here's my question.

This is where I was going.

So my question is, if we have the leverage here to put in our support or our way behind our bill, don't we have an opportunity here to have the the author consider that, hey, whenever community colleges, you know, you know end up buildings, you know one of some?

Of those residences, ensure that those you know have certain.

Variables to allow for affordability.

Again, I'm. I'm saying if we have to put our weight.

And support this bill.

Don't we have leverage here and an opportunity to really help drive whatever problems that we say we want to solve? Don't we have an opportunity here to have an amendment on there for that?

CC **Cecilia Cabello** 19:10

Well, the board can do anything it wants, right?

I think that's not the issue.

I think the issue is that this bill isn't intended to address the operational aspects.

Once something is built, it's just trying to trying to get it built.

So I think it is a different, wholly different subject matter and would deal with different codes and I don't know if I don't think that would be a state matter.

So I don't think that would be before the legislature. You know, the the state doesn't have power to.

Enact how the operations of a community.

College per SE, or programming at a Community College is done.

So I think they're very separate matters.

But I think that you make an excellent point.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 19:56

OK.

Thank you.

CC **Cecilia Cabello** 19:57

You're welcome.

OC **Operations Cluster** 20:01

Any other questions?

Public comment. Are there any public comment for this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

Seeing none.

Thank you, chair.

Great. OK.

I will move on to the board letter, which is the 10 year amendment for the office space in DC.

AN **Alexandra Nguyen-Rivera** 20:19

Good afternoon, deputies.

I'm joining you virtually here.

This is Alexandra Winraro, section chief of leasing at the Chief Executive Office.

Joining you in person and will be presenting is the senior real property agent who negotiated this lease. Omeed Montefi. Thank you.

OC **Operations Cluster** 20:37

Good afternoon.

I'm Amit Montefi senior real property agent with the Chief executive office.

Real estate division.

For your consideration, is a new 10 year permitted use agreement amendment to renew the existing agreement for approximately 1216 square feet at 660 N.

Capitol St. Ste. 430 in Washington, DC.

For the Chief Executive Office, legislative affairs and.

Government.

Relations office, known as Lair or it's Washington, DC advocacy office.

The county's Washington, DC, Office is responsible for leading the county's advocacy efforts, including directing staff and contract representatives and coordinating the advocacy activities of county departments and affiliates.

In addition, the staff is responsible for monitoring of key legislative and regulatory issues in accordance with county board approved federal legislative agenda and policies.

Furthermore, the county's chief legislative representative in Washington, DC, is responsible for coordinating the advocacy of five contract lobbyists.

The existing agreement does not expire until October 31st.

2027 due to the changes in the office market in Washington, DC.

The Grand Tour was able to negotiate a new lease, which included a rental rate reduction. However, in order to pass along the cost savings to layer require the county to extend the existing lease through June, June 30th 2035.

Player has sublease office space from the the Grand Tour since 1988 at different lease locations or it's Washington DC advocacy office and has been located at the premises since 2016.

The county has benefited from the current office location due to its close proximity

to the federal government facilities and the United States Capital.

The county has a one time right to terminate the proposed amendment after July 31st.

20-30 with 180 days notice.

The premise is currently houses for staff with with four workstations. Although telework is available and employed during less busy times.

The Washington, DC advocacy office is primarily at the office due to confidential in person meetings that may take place in meetings with various legislators and or their staff.

The premises are also used by the board, their staff and even other county department heads when traveling to Washington.

DC advocating on behalf of the county's legislative and budget priorities, collaborating with state and federal partners.

Meeting with administration members of the delegation, select congressional and state legislative leaders and or special events.

And based on a review available industry data, the market has an annual rental range of \$62.04 and \$70.20 per square foot per year. The proposed base annual rate of \$71.76 per square foot per.

Year per year is on the higher side of the market because the building is near construction.

And close proximity to United States Capital and includes other buildings.

Humanity, such as access to conference rooms on site, cafeteria, gymnasium and access to rooftop, where events can take place.

The proposed rate is a decrease from the existing \$75.60 annual rental rate per square foot.

The Grand Tour has agreed to 11 months of rent abatement.


In addition, the grants will also provide a TI allowance of 74,000 to make improvements.

To the existing premises by adding a new office, new flooring and improvements to the reception area and conference room.

The proposed amendment has a holdover provision with no holdover fee during the holdover period, all terms and conditions of the agreement would remain the same and a rent will rent would remain subject to the regular annual fixed increases.

This is the same holdover provision as the existing agreement. The Grand Tour is the national.

Association of counties the county does not have any other leases or agreements with this landlord who has remained responsive to the county needs over the years. The proposed permitted use agreement amendment was presented at the board appointed Remc meeting on May 22nd, where it was unanimously approved. I have representatives from Laird joining me. Virtually, we welcome questions or comments at this time. Thank you. Any question? Questions online. Thank you.

 **Schauerman, Grant** 26:00
No.

 **Operations Cluster** 26:05

You can view me.
OK.
That's it, OK.
So it is 231 and meetings is adjourned.
But next week is virtual.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription