



The nation's largest pro bono law firm

June 26, 2018

SENT VIA EMAIL

Chairperson James T. Butts, Jr.
Members of the Oversight Board of the Inglewood Successor Agency
1 Manchester Blvd.
Inglewood, CA 90301
jbutts@cityofinglewood.org

Re: Oversight Board Action – Proposed Disposition of Properties

Dear Chairperson and Members of the City of Inglewood's Oversight Board:

Public Counsel and the Public Interest Law Project (PILP) write on behalf of the Uplift Inglewood Coalition and community partners in connection with the disposition of the parcels B-1.1 through B-3 (also known as Parcels 1-13) as identified in the Long Range Property Management Plan (hereinafter referred to as "the Parcels"). We respectfully request that the Oversight Board deny the Successor Agency's request for a resolution regarding the disposition of the Parcels.

Public Counsel is the nation's largest pro bono public interest law firm. Our Community Development Project builds strong foundations for healthy, vibrant, and economically stable communities by providing legal services to community-based organizations, affordable housing developers, and low-income entrepreneurs. The Public Interest Law Project (PILP) is a statewide support center for legal services programs and specializes in affordable housing and redevelopment law. Uplift Inglewood is a coalition of Inglewood residents and organizations working to secure housing for working families, safer neighborhoods, and community-centered development. Public Counsel and PILP, together with the law firm Cozen O'Connor, recently filed a lawsuit against the City of Inglewood and the Successor Agency for failing to meet its obligations as detailed below.

The Inglewood Successor Agency actions lack transparency and deny the public vital information. .

The "Notice to Public of Proposed Action," which was posted on the Inglewood City website on June 14, 2018, does not state to whom or for what purpose the Parcels are being sold. In fact, the Successor Agency, along with the city of Inglewood, propose to sell these parcels to Murphy's Bowl LLC, an entity wholly owned by the owner of the Clippers, Steve Ballmer, for the purpose of developing a basketball arena ("the Proposed Project"). The City and Successor Agency have continually promoted the project on the City's website and through various press conferences, but here, the City and Successor Agency elected to avoid mentioning anything to do with the planned use of the Parcels. The Successor Agency also failed to mention the Parcels' proposed

proposed use when it considered the matter at its meeting on June 19, 2018. In fact, the Successor Agency did not discuss the matter at all in its June 19 meeting – the Successor Agency meeting lasted roughly 60 seconds, most of that time being taken up by the City Clerk reading the motion out loud. Furthermore, the Notice announcing this Oversight Board meeting and its consideration of the requested action by the Successor Agency was posted on June 14 – five days before the Successor Agency actually approved the requested action. The Successor Agency’s lack of transparency prevents real community engagement and should not be allowed to continue.

The City and Successor Agency have continually engaged in these tactics since before they entered into an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement regarding these Parcels and the Proposed Project.¹ We respectfully request that the Oversight Board deny this requested resolution until the Successor Agency adequately informs the public of the proposed use of the Parcels.

This Oversight Board is to be disbanded pursuant to state law in less than a week, and thus, should not take action on this matter.

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 34179(j), local oversight boards, such as this one, are to be disbanded on July 1, 2018. The local Oversight Board’s duties are to be handed to a Countywide Oversight Board. While the Oversight Board has only met three times in the last two years, it is now meeting only days before it is disbanded to make a significant decision about several parcels of land under its soon-to-be-extinguished jurisdiction. This action only contributes to the picture that the City of Inglewood and the Successor Agency are solely interested in pushing the Proposed Project forward without gaining meaningful community engagement.

The Successor Agency has failed to meet its outstanding obligations under state law, and the proposed sale of the Parcels will make it harder to do so.

As stated above, the Successor Agency, along with the City of Inglewood, would like to sell this land to the Clippers organization in order to build a basketball arena. However, the Successor Agency has not fulfilled its outstanding obligations as required under state law. Specifically, the Successor Agency has failed to meet its outstanding affordable housing obligations. Health & Safety Code § 34171(d)(1). As part of this obligation, the Successor Agency must identify a plan to meet this unmet obligation. *Id.* § 34176.1(f). In the latest report from the Housing Successor, it identified an unmet obligation of 112 affordable housing units, but it failed to identify a plan for

¹ See Karen Foshay, “Documents Show How Inglewood Clippers Arena Deal Stayed Secret,” KCET (Mar. 15, 2018), available at <https://www.kcet.org/shows/social-connected/documents-show-how-inglewood-clippers-arena-deal-stayed-secret>. According to documents uncovered through ongoing litigation, the City elected to call a special meeting to avoid posting the ENA 72 hours in advance as required by the Brown Act and agreed to withhold the Clippers name from the documents.

the replacement of these affordable housing units. Instead, the Successor Agency proposes to sell several parcels of valuable land to a private developer to build an arena instead of fulfilling its affordable housing obligations. With the sale of these Parcels, the Successor Agency loses property that can be used to meet its outstanding obligations. And without a plan to meet these outstanding obligations, the Successor Agency will continue to ignore this important obligation.

The Oversight Board should table any resolutions to approve Successor Agency actions until the Successor Agency implements a plan to address its unmet obligations, as required by law.

The City and the Successor Agency are facing multiple lawsuits regarding these Parcels and the Proposed Project.

The City and the Successor Agency are currently defending against three separate lawsuits regarding these Parcels and the Proposed Project. The allegations range from breach of contract to violations of the California Environmental Quality Act to a range of violations of affordable housing and non-discrimination laws. While these lawsuits wind their way through the courts, the Oversight Board should exercise its discretion to withhold approval of the sale of these Parcels.

Given the Successor Agency's failure to collect meaningful public comment on this action, this Board's pending dissolution, the active lawsuits against the Successor Agency regarding this land, and the Successor Agency's failure to meet its outstanding obligations, the Oversight Board should decline to take action on this resolution at this time.

Very Truly Yours,



Antonio Hicks
Senior Staff Attorney

CC: Members of the Oversight Board
Carolyn M. Hull (carolynhull@gmail.com)
Eugenio Villa (eugenio.villa@inglewood.k12.ca.us)
Brian Fahnestock (bfahnestock@elcamino.edu)
Margarita Cruz (mcruz@cityofinglewood.org)