IRWINDALE COUNCIL CHAMBER
REMOTLEY ACCESSED
5050 N. IRWINDALE AVENUE
IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA 91706

January 20, 2021
Wednesday
6:31 P.M.

The Irwindale **PLANNING COMMISSION** met in regular session at the above time and place.

CHAIR TAPIA — This Planning Commission meeting is called to order. Please stand for the pledge of allegiance and remain standing for the invocation, please.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE — I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

INVOCATION COMMISSIONER CORPIS — Lord we come to you this hour asking for your blessing and health as we gather together. We pray for guidance in matters on hand and we ask that you clearly show us how to conduct our work with the spirit of service and enthusiasm. We pray for the country and for those suffering due to COVID and losing people, losing loved ones and we ask that you just be our comfort. We ask in His name. Amen.

CHAIR TAPIA — We will be adjourning this meeting in memory of Rosy Guerrero. I don't know if you guys are aware, but the residents that are passing on right now are between twenty to twenty six years old right now when we became a City. They were blessed. There is never a time to let go of a loved one, but we know that is inevitable. I am just happy that they were blessed and they got the blessings that we are continuing to get here in this City.

Roll call.

ROLL CALL: — Present: Commissioners Enoch Burrola; Robert E. Hartman; Loretta Corpis; Vice Chair Richard Chico; Chair Arthur R. Tapia

Also present: Adrian Guerra, City Attorney; Marilyn Simpson, Community Development Manager/City Planner; Berlyn Aguila, Administrative Secretary

CHAIR TAPIA — Any announcements?

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Yes, I will be reading Executive Order N-25-20.
Per Executive Order N-25-20, Californians are directed to follow Public Health directives including canceling large gatherings. The Executive Order also allows local legislative bodies to hold meetings via conference call while still meeting state transparency requirements. The City has made tonight's meeting available in a virtual setting and by phone. Public comments and participation are welcomed through the following means. Pre-registering for the Planning Commission

meeting on Go To Webinar and email submission of public comments to the Planning Commission Department at Baguila@irwindaleca.gov. During the spontaneous communications portion of the virtual meeting, Administrative Secretary will first read any public comments sent by email. Next, the Chair will open the floor to those who are participating via webinar or phone. Please use the Raise Your Hand feature to be added to the queue of speakers. Once called upon, you will have three minutes to address the Planning Commission unless such time limits are extended. So that each member of the public will have the opportunity to speak, individuals will be limited to a single time to address the Planning Commission during spontaneous communications. If your hand is raised and you have spoken, you will not be given another opportunity to speak. During the discussion items on the agenda, members of the public are asked to use the Raise Your Hand feature to be added to the queue of speakers and you will be unmuted from our central console at the appropriate time. Each speaker will be have 3 minutes to address the Planning Commission unless such time limits are extended. So each member is afforded the opportunity to speak, individuals will be limited to a single time to address the Planning Commission. If your hand is raised and you have spoken, you will not be given another opportunity to speak. We welcome your feedback so that we continue to improve the City's engagement with its residents and members of the public. Thank you.

CHAIR TAPIA — Thank you.

REORGANIZATION OF PLANNING COMMISSIONER

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — At this time, it is the appropriate time to reorganization the Planning Commission for the selection of Chair and Vice-Chair. In order to complete the reorganization, I will be opening the floor for the nomination of Chair.

COMMISSIONER BURROLA — Do we nominate now?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO — Yes, now.

COMMISSIONER BURROLA — I will now nominate Art Tapia for Chair.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Accept or decline?

CHAIR TAPIA — I accept.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO — He accepts.

COMMISSIONER BURROLA — There's no second right? We are going to vote on this?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Yes. Is there any other nominations?

Okay, now I will be conducting roll call.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Commissioner Burrola.

COMMISSIONER BURROLA — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Commissioner Hartman.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Commissioner Corpis.

COMMISSIONER CORPIS — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Vice-Chair Chico.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Chair Tapia.

CHAIR TAPIA — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Do we have any nomination for Vice-Chair?

COMMISSIONER CORPIS — I would like to nominate Enoch Burrola.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO — I second that.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Accept or decline?
COMMISSIONER BURROLA	Accept.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Okay, roll call.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Chico.
COMMISSIONER CHICO	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Hartman.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Corpis.
COMMISSIONER CORPIS	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Chair Tapia.
CHAIR TAPIA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Thank you.
CHAIR TAPIA	Nominations are now closed. Congratulations Commissioner Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Thank you. Congratulations to yourself too.

CHAIR TAPIA — I will be counting on you, sir. Thank you to the rest of the Commissioners also. Again, I will say my little piece. Thank you to have the confidence in me and I will continue to do the best that I can. Thank you very much.

SPONTANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

CHAIR TAPIA — This is the time set aside for members of the audience to speak on items not on this agenda. State law prohibits Commission discussion or action as such communication unless the Commission by majority finds that a catastrophe or emergency exists, by at least four votes, finds the matter in need for action arose in the last five days. Since Commission cannot accept as stated, it is requested that such communication can be made in writing, as to be included in the next agenda for full discussion. If a member of the audience feels as if he or she, would like to speak, they will be limited to three minutes, unless such time limits are extended. Again, please hold your discussions to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Thank you very much. Spontaneous Communications is now open. You can raise your hand in the audience for recognition.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Chair Tapia, nobody has raised their hand.

CHAIR TAPIA — At this point we will close spontaneous communications and we will go to item number one, consent calendar.

CONSENT CALENDAR

CHAIR TAPIA — Consent Calendar contains matters of routine business and is to be approved in one motion unless a member of the Commission request separate action on a specific item. At this time, members of the audience may be heard regarding an item on the Consent Calendar using the same procedure. If you want to raise any questions on what is on the Consent Calendar, you can raise your hand. The only item on the Consent Calendar is the recommendation to approve the following minutes which are December 16, 2020. Is there anyone in the audience wishing to make any comments, please raise your hand.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — No hands have been raised.

CHAIR TAPIA — No hands being raised, we will move on to new business. There is no new business. We will go to the public hearing item.

Item No. 1A — MINUTES

1) Regular meeting held December 16, 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Excuse me Chair Tapia, we need to approve the minutes for December 16, 2020.
CHAIR TAPIA	Yes, sorry about that. I am getting ahead of myself here. Anybody wishing to add or delete anything on the minutes of December 16, 2020. If not, do we have a recommendation to approve?
COMMISSIONER CHICO	Motion to approve.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Second.
CHAIR TAPIA	Roll call.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Hartman.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Corpis.
COMMISSIONER CORPIS	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Chico.
COMMISSIONER CHICO	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Chair Tapia.
CHAIR TAPIA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS There were no items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 3A

2020 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 02-2016; ZONE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 04-2016; DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 02-2016; CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 08-2016; SITE PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW (DA) PERMIT NO. 06-2016 FOR A MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY/TRANSFER STATION AND CONVENIENCE STORE WITH PUBLIC GAS STATION LOCATED AT 2200 ARROW HIGHWAY, APN: 8535-001-911 (ATHENS SERVICES)

CHAIR TAPIA

I now give it to Staff.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Thank you Chair and Commissioners. I will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation and giving a verbal presentation. As part of that, we have our environmental consultant, which they will be part of Staff's presentation. Once we give that, we will finish our presentation, we will be open for questions from our Planning Commission and then we can open the Public Hearing. The item before you is the Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station along with a convenience store and a public gas station. Athens is the applicant and they are proposing this project. As part of the project history, this was previously approved by the City Council in 2017. There has been no change to the project since the 2017 City Council approval, but what has happened is that there have been two lawsuits that were filed in 2017 by the City of Baldwin Park and Waste Management. This litigation took approximately two plus years to complete. In 2019, the Los Angeles County Superior Court had determined that the majority of the claims that were brought forward by the two entities were dismissed and that there were four discrete issues in the environmental documents that needed additional consideration. With that, the Court ordered the City to vacate any of the prior approvals and entitlements until the environmental analysis has been revised to address these four issues. That is why you see before you, the entitlements of the General Plan Amendment, Zone Ordinance Amendment, Development Agreement, Conditional Use Permit and the Site Plan and Design Review. The four areas that the Court had determined that needed further consideration had to do with truck fueling operations, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation energy use and project specific health risks from ROG (Reactive Organic Gases), NOx and ozone. In 2019, the City Council had vacated the approvals as directed by the court and the City addressed the four issues in a Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report that is called the 2020 RDEIR. Now that the environmental analysis has been revised and is consistent with the

court's direction, the City has been asked to reapprove the entitlements. Let's go back to the basics. What is a Materials Recovery Facility/Transfer Station? We will call it a MRF, that is what we've identify it as. What a MRF is; it receives curbside refuse and yard debris. It processes it to recover reusable materials and transfers those materials off-site for recycling, composting, or disposal elsewhere. It is not a dump, it is not a landfill and it does not accept any toxic or hazardous waste materials. What you see before you, is the Site Plan. This was the previous Site Plan that shows the same layout that was presented in 2017. No changes have been proposed to this project since the City Council started approval. This site you see is an approximately 17 acre triangular piece of property. This is a rendering that you see if you are looking northwest. What you see in the foreground is the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power transmission lines that are existing. This slide gives you an overview of the project site that it is showing Arrow Highway to the north, Live Oak Avenue to the south and just giving the location and vicinity. This slide shows the existing condition. It is a vacant 17-acre parcel. The surrounding uses to the site are the Santa Fe Dam to the north, City of Baldwin Park to the south - which is industrial, to the east and northeast is Santa Fe Dam and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power lines and is zoned industrial and agricultural. To the west and northwest, we have an industrial and distribution facility that is zoned M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing). The current General Plan Designation for this site is commercial. The General Plan Amendment is proposed to change it to commercial/industrial. The zoning is M-2, which is Heavy Manufacturing. This General Plan Amendment will be consistent with the M-2 zoning. Showing surrounding uses to the north, east and west. I want to speak a little bit more in detail of the entitlements. The first one is the General Plan Amendment and as I mentioned, this is to change the General Plan land use Designation to Commercial/Industrial. This will resolve an inconsistency between the current M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning designation and the current General Plan Land Use Designation. The Zoning Ordinance Amendment is an amendment that will permit the MRF Transfer Station to be in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zone subject to a Development Agreement. This modifies the code to grant a franchise agreement. It modifies the definition of a recycling facility to include the MRF Transfer Station. It includes the MRF Transfer Station as a permitted use within the M-2 zone with a Development Agreement. The Zone Ordinance Amendment also amends the distance requirements for alcoholic beverage sales establishments if a physical barrier exists between certain uses. A Development Agreement is proposed with this project. A Development Agreement is a contract between the City and the developer. This is to be established in conjunction with the Zone Ordinance Amendment. It sets the standards in the conditions for development, provides certainty to the developer to proceed with the project, but also contracts the developer to provide certain benefits to the City. Key provisions in the Development

Agreement include such things such as the scope of the development. This is committing the developer to develop the MRF Transfer Station site in conformance to the City's ordinances, guidelines and policies. There will be a host fee paid to the City. There are certain offsite improvements that the developer is committed to finish and there are certain community benefits including new jobs in the City and revitalizing a blighted area. Also, it indemnifies the City. The developer will indemnify the City for any damages, claims or litigation rising out of the City's approval of the Development Agreement. There is also a request for a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant is requesting a Type 20 Beer and Wine permit for the convenience store so a Conditional Use Permit is required by the City in order to allow that. There is also a Site Plan and Design Review that is being proposed for the construction of the buildings. The site size is 17.22 acres and what is being proposed is; two separate buildings that are approximately 262,641 square feet for the MRF Transfer Station building and the convenience store is approximately 2,587 square feet. The building height for the MRF building is proposed to be 50 and a half feet. In the M-2 zone, there is no height limitation. This is consistent with the M-2 zone. The convenience store is proposed to be 21 feet high. This rendering is showing aerial views of the proposed MRF Transfer Station. This is showing the proposed buildings. The buildings are in conformance with the City's Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines. They include façade elements, roof and parapet materials and colors that are consistent. The MRF project itself exhibits articulated arch façade elements with translucent panels that break up the building massing. The building elevations are scored vertically and horizontally to provide architectural interest. The building features raised decorative accent elements with metal crosspieces over bay doors. The colors are consistent with the Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines that use the neutral color palette. They have tan colors on the building façade, bronze translucent panels and dark trim for building accents. The convenience store exhibits the same color palette and architectural design elements that includes the raised decorative accents with metal crosspieces and a vertical and horizontal scoring to break up the building masses. The entire development is meant to be complementary to each other in color and design features. The project is proposing 15% of the site as landscaping and only 10% is required but 15% is being provided. The landscaping consists of parking lot shade trees, palm trees along the Arrow Highway entrance, shrubs and groundcover throughout. The parking that is provided for this site: A total of 188 parking spaces are required per the Code and 326 spaces are being provided for employees and visitors with a surplus of 138 parking spaces. Parking includes the parking for the MRF facility itself and the convenience store. There are flexible stalls provided for either use and 19 parking spaces for transfer truck stalls. The project is consistent and complies with all ADA parking requirements and with the new Green Building code, they are providing EV Charging stations. They are also providing short and long-term

bicycle racks for the site. All of the entitlements require CEQA review. Just to go into a little bit of the environmental review chronology, this has been extensively analyzed under CEQA. There is a 2014 Draft EIR that was circulated for public review. In 2014, there was a recirculated Draft EIR that was drafted and circulated in response to comments that were received. In 2016, a Final EIR was prepared and certified by the City Council. After 2016, the certification of the Final EIR, Athens had made minor changes to the floor plan and loading tunnel and to document these changes, it did not result in a new environmental impact. The City prepared 2017 Addendum Number 1 to that 2016 Final EIR and the project was approved again in 2017. As mentioned before, after the project was approved by the City Council, the City of Baldwin Park and Waste Management filed lawsuits claiming several issues that had been related to the City's General Plan, Municipal Code and environmental review. The court rejected all claims that were related to the General Plan and Municipal Code. The court rejected most claims related to the project's environmental review, but they did order an additional environmental review that was needed for four issues mentioned before; fueling operations, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation energy use and the project's specific health risks related to the ROG and NOx and ozone. With that, that concludes my portion of it. We will have Dr. Jeff Harvey who prepared the environmental document, speak more specifically about the 2020 Environmental Impact Report.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA

I will now be unmuting Dr. Jeff Harvey.

JEFF HARVEY

Thank you very much. Chair and members of the Planning Commission, pleasure to be here with you today. Appreciate you hosting this and the difficult webinar format. I am Jeff Harvey, the principal and senior scientist from Harvey Consulting Group. I also have with me Paul Miller, who is the senior air quality specialist who participated in this process starting with the 2014 Draft EIR all the way through this 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR. In order to address the court's ruling the City did prepare the 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR and it revised and recirculated only those portions of the EIR related to four discrete issues. All of the studies of the EIR was determined adequate and is no longer subject to legal challenge. The document was circulated for public review/comment for 45 days. We did receive 6 comment letters from agencies and the City of Baldwin Park. We prepared responses to every single one of the comment letters and that is what comprises the final 2020 EIR, which is the one you have before you. All of the content of the Recirculated EIR, comments that were submitted for that document and extensive responses to those comments. Let's go through the document a little bit. The 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR addresses fueling operations, provides more details regarding fueling for all vehicles that use the MRF and distinguishes those fueling operations for vehicles at the convenience

store. Finally, they will be fueled offsite and there is no compressed natural gases on site. All of the waste hauling trucks that are related to the MRF, will fuel somewhere else like a regular gas station: cars, motorcycles, pick-up trucks and whatever will use that. In conclusion of that analysis, is that there are no adverse impacts caused by these fueling operations. I would like to turn over to Paul Miller now for discussion of greenhouse gasses and health impacts related to those air emissions.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA

Paul, you have now been unmuted.

PAUL MILLER

Thank you, Jeff. The next item we will go over is the greenhouse gas analysis. There were concerns about the significant thresholds about the greenhouse gasses used in the previous EIR. We previously used the threshold that the South Coast Air Quality Management District uses for its projects and what they recommend for city regions. That threshold is 10,000 metric tons per year of greenhouse gases. That threshold was previously used by the City of Azusa for its CEQA review of the Waste Management Company MRF in Azusa, but there are no objections to that. What we could have provided more information to support the previous threshold; we chose to apply a much more conservative net-zero threshold to the project. The threshold went from 10,000 to 0 metric tons per year. With the net-zero threshold, the project would emit the same or fewer greenhouse gas emissions as the existing condition and essentially no impact to the environment would occur. In the analysis, we collected detailed information from Athens on the waste markets that they have now and what they expect in the future. The EIR claimed that the new MRF Transfer Station will not generate a new waste in the Los Angeles region. The new transfer station will reduce the length of existing haul trips by adding the new facility in an urban area that is near existing waste generating markets. It is also near the Vincent yard in Irwindale where the vehicles are currently parked overnight. Because of these regional efficiencies, the EIR concludes that the greenhouse gas emission would be reduced as a result of the new Irwindale MRF and therefore, meet the new more conservative net-zero threshold. Thus, the conclusion of the greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced. There is not an impact and no additional mitigation measure will be needed. Next slide, please. Oh, we are on the next slide. The next item is transportation energy use. That was not specifically analyzed in the previous EIR. Other aspects of energy were in the 2016 EIR and no revisions found to be necessary. The EIR will be the LEED silver certification for energy management and conservation. Like the greenhouse analysis, this analysis of transportation energy use, recognized the project will not generate new waste, but process existing waste and it will redirected to the project. Which for the average drip will be closer than the existing trips for those vehicles. The detailed analysis determined that the project could reduce about 1.7 million miles of vehicle travel at full capacity. This would

include 1.2 million miles reduction by collection trucks, self-haul trucks trips, and approximately 500,000 miles of reduction by transfer trucks compared to the existing setting. The conclusion was that because of the regional efficiency obtained by the operations of the project, there are no adverse impacts cause by the transportation energy use. Which as I mentioned earlier, which save a huge number of miles each year in vehicle movements at full capacity. Next slide, please. The next item is health risk impacts. The 2020 RDEIR clarified that we looked at project health impacts from diesel emissions. In the 2014 RDEIR, that analysis concluded the health risks from toxic air contaminants particular made from the diesel fuel emissions in all locations near the MRF would be less than significant. The court agreed that our analysis was complete and no additional work was needed for that analysis. Since then, Athens has further reduced the diesel vehicle emissions in their fleet and they will not be using any Athens diesel vehicles at the Irwindale MRF project. So, that is the previous toxic air contaminants that we looked at. However, in 2018 after we had issued the EIR, in 2016, there was a statewide decision that changed the way we needed to look at EIR's in the health impacts. It indicated that EIR's should look at regional impacts from their significant air emission and describe the health impacts of those pollutants or alternatively, explain why such an analysis is not feasible. For individual projects, both South Coast Air Management District and San Joaquin District, both filed Amicus Brief's saying that such analysis are not feasible. Regardless, we were asked to look into that health impact issue. Jumping ahead, describing health impacts on the air basin from NOx and ROG emissions found that it is not technically feasible for a project of this size relative to the whole mass of the South Coast Air basin. I should emphasize to you that these are emissions that leave from a vehicle but they are regional pollutants that develop as secondary pollutants in the atmosphere and they are affected by winds, temperatures, and other atmospheric conditions. So, they are not directly emitted by vehicles. There is some complex science in how you need to estimate those emissions. I am the author of Appendix 2 in your Final EIR. Appendix 2 is a technical memo that summarizes why such analysis is not feasible in quantitative detail with two examples from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The technical memo compares the size of this MRF project with projects that have calculated regional effects on air quality. The memo compares the MRF emissions of NOx and ROG to a major study by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The South Coast Air Quality Management District study was for the regional air quality plan and it looked at reductions in all emissions throughout the South Coast air basin and at reductions of 432 tons per day of NOx. I think it was about 117 tons per day of ROG and they found that the Ozone levels would only change by 9, it was in their quotes, only nine parts per billion. The MRF project that we are reviewing here would only have about .1% of the emissions that were analyzed in that air quality study. The MRF emissions are about 1000 times less than the South Coast Air Quality Management study and on a proportional basis, such a change

would be for the MRF would be like .009 parts per billion of Ozone. That is a very small number of ozone. It is so small that they can't really calculate it. It is more theoretical than actually anything that they could ever measure. Because this change in air emissions is so small, it is essentially meaningless amount in an effort to estimate any health impacts. It is such a small amount of change in Ozone that there are no epidemiological studies that would be able to tell you how health would change. Therefore as we were asked to do, either tell you what those health changes would be or indicate that it's infeasible to do so. After all this research, we clearly believe that it is infeasible to analyze that health impact of the regional pollutants. The conclusion is that there are no new impacts in this document related to health. With that, I will turn the presentation back to Dr. Harvey. Do I need to unmute myself?

JEFF HARVEY

Thank you, I am back. The 2020 final EIR includes the entire package of what has been done here throughout the years. The 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR responds to all of the comments received on that document and it also documents some minor revisions made on the 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR, very minor. All of the previous analysis confirmed by the court, they are contained in the 2014 Draft EIR, 2014 Recirculated Draft EIR, 2016 Final EIR and the 2017 Addendum no. 1 are also pieces of this entire record that is your 2020 Final EIR. Some of the analysis conclusions have been made out in the CEQA Findings of Facts. The majority of impacts are less than significant and are mitigated or can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. No major impacts were identified in the new analysis 2020 Recirculated EIR and there is the Comprehensive Mitigation and Monitoring Program that is also part of your packet. It identifies all of the measures the applicant must require to implement with the goal to avoid or minimize impacts. Implementation of all of those mitigation measures, there are three impacts that exceed numerical threshold standards or are outside of the City's jurisdiction that therefore, find insignificant and unavoidable. Air quality is the first of those. We do see operational thresholds for Nitrous Gas Emissions. Emissions are reduces to be feasible that could do a mission control recovery system measures that maintenance requirements for the vehicle fleets and on idling limitations on trucks at the site. There are measures to reduce the levels as low as we can get them. The analytical method used for air quality is by South Coast Air Quality Management District to measure the trucks trips and that produced a worst-case scenario and we noted it in the analysis in the Draft EIR and produced extreme results which is why in contrast to the Greenhouse Gas analysis that you just heard about. The gas analysis was done with a different methodology. The impacts are local. For traffic, there are impacts to the freeway onramp system like the 605 freeway. The measures have identified the impacts have reduced, but they under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. Those impacts are mitigated. However, because the City can't guarantee it under its jurisdiction, they have to make a finding of significant and unavoidable impact. Last noise. Noise generated on site will exceed City standards at the

property boundary, but are allow to change noise levels by five decibels before it is considered to be a significant and adverse impact. There are locations by Live Oak Avenue and Arrow Highway, in particularly, just off the western margin of the property, distribution center that will have a noise impact by 7 decimals, however that is unavoidable, but there are no residents or sensitive uses along those boundaries. It also does not affect any residential areas in Baldwin Park. It is important to understand those caveats. As such, the impacts that were identified in 2017 during prior approval, the City does need to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, a CEQA requirement, and must be adopted prior to project approval. Lastly, we did receive an additional comment from the City of Baldwin Park attorney and it has been provided to the each of you. Their letter was followed by a table that has 69 pages of comments. We have reviewed those comments in detail and in our opinion, the letter has not raised any new issues and any issues raised, have already been extensively addressed in the 2020 Final EIR, including responses to Baldwin Park's comment letter on the June 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR. To summarize this letter so you can have a better understanding, they addressed five main issues, greenhouse gas, and why the 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR applies a new methodology to analyze greenhouse gas emissions, different from the methodology used in the original assessment of air quality. The question comes down to whether the trips that bring collected materials to the project should be considered new trips or existing trips. The air quality assessment in the 2014 Recirculated Draft EIR used a different methodology as requested by the South Coast Air Quality Management District to produce a worst-case scenario to account for new local emissions. Potential greenhouse gas emissions impacts are not local; they are large-scale regional and global effects. Selection of a different methodology, therefore, warranted a produces a more realistic assessment of potential greenhouse gas emissions. The 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR explains that the project does not generate new sources of waste. It is simply a facility for processing that waste. Instead, the project redistributes existing trips and shortens those trips by directing them to a closer MRF facility. It does not open new capacity at other MRF's that will need to be filled by new waste and carries by new trips. Therefore, the project does not generate new waste and it does not create new development that generates new waste. Secondly, the comments focus on the truck fueling and it claims that the analysis if greenhouse gas emissions does not take into account trips associated with fueling trucks, which is not correct. The greenhouse gas analysis does analyze trips associated with going to and from the Vincent Yard and to Athens MRF in the City of Industry, which is where Athens trucks are parked and fueled now. Trucks may also fuel while they are out and moving along their routes, just as they do now. There are no new trips associated with fueling that need to be further analyzed. We identified those in the Recirculated Draft EIR. It also focused on non-Athens trucks. The letter claims that the project should be required to forbid entrance by any non-Athens waste hauling truck that is not running on

Compressed Natural Gas. The project cannot be required to do this several reasons. First, mitigation measures are only required when there is a significant environmental impact, and here the project does not result in a significant greenhouse gas impact. Second, the MRF is open to the public and any hauler that needs to use it on a daily basis. Turning away trucks at the entrance is infeasible and unreasonable. The more trucks that are diverted away from the project, the further those trucks must drive to reach other material recycling facilities or disposable sites, resulting in an increase in emissions including greenhouse gasses. We can also noted that Athens will operate compressed natural gas collection trucks, roll-off trucks, and transfer trailer trucks, thus having 100% compressed natural gas fueled vehicles at this MRF location. Self-haul and other non-Athens customers are not held to this standard. Athens overall fleet is about 90% compressed natural gas at this time, including regions outside of the Irwindale MRF service area, and the overall percentage is getting closer to 100% each year as they replace older trucks. Fourth, the letter claims that the environmental analysis is based on an incorrect construction schedule. The project is anticipated to be completed in a single phase, over 18 months. This is clearly stated in the 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR project description. This is also the construction schedule that was assumed in the air quality and construction traffic analysis presented in the 2014 Recirculated Draft EIR. That has not changed and it is in the project description that was approved by the City Council in 2017. Fifth and finally, the letter claims that changes to the project description and site plan have occurred since 2017. This is not the case. Site plan adjustments were made prior to project approval in 2017 and were addressed in the 2017 Addendum to the 2016 Final EIR. Absolutely no changes to the site plan have occurred since the City last approved the project in 2017. No analysis of changes in the site plan are required. A detailed description of the project is included in Chapter 2 of the 2020 Final EIR. In conclusion, there are other very minor comments or similar comments that are restated, but in our opinion, the comments in this letter do not raise any issues that have not already been extensively addressed in the 2020 Final EIR, and responses to Baldwin Park's June comment letter on the 2020 Recirculated Draft EIR. That concludes my remarks. Thank you for the opportunity.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Thank you. This project before you tonight was publicly noticed in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, circulated to the responsible agencies, interested parties, State offices, and the only letter that we received was the City of Baldwin Park's comment letter sent earlier today. As of today, I have not received any phone calls regarding this. Staff's recommendation is that the Planning Commission take the following actions: to adopt the various resolutions recommending to the City Council to certify the 2020 Final EIR, approve the General Plan Amendment, approve the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, approve the Development Agreement, approve the Conditional Use Permit, and

approve the Site Plan and Design Review. This concludes Staff's portion of the presentation. We do have applicant representatives that are available, a representative from the Solid Waste Management Program, and Local Enforcement Agency from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. They are present at this meeting and are available to respond to any relevant questions regarding solid waste, permitting specifications for the project. That concludes the report and I am available for questions.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

Do we ask questions now, Chair?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Chair Tapia, excuse me, the microphone is off.

CHAIR TAPIA

Getting back to Commissioner Burrola, the type of questions that we can ask now are questions that will enlighten more in making a decision or that you did not quite understand as it was being presented.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

I have a general question regarding the Mitigation Measures for the greenhouse gas and the emissions. I think those are the two that the court wanted us to reanalyze and look at again. I don't know if this the Mitigation Measures or the Final EIR took into consideration some State guidelines. I was under the impression that many of our vehicles are going to be moving to EV electrical vehicle standards in the near future. Looking through some of these Mitigation Measures for mostly the diesel trucks, it would be AQ4, AQ5, AQ7, heavy-duty equipment and stuff like that. Do they have any requirements because some of their Mitigation Measures talk about retrofitting the diesel engines to be more compliant with SCAQMD? Is any of those requirements require them to change from diesel to electrical vehicle at some point in the future or are they just required to change the diesel engine because it says that if it is a 2010 model or newer, they should be using the trucks? It was just a general question. Did you guys look at that or is that something that you know the Mitigation Measure could talk about the emissions?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Thank you Commissioner Burrola. I will have Dr. Harvey respond to that.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA

Dr. Harvey you have been unmuted.

JEFF HARVEY

I see the Mitigation Measures that you are asking about and yes, these do pertain to diesel trucks for construction crew and they are after the

trucks that Athens will be using which will be CNG vehicles. They will be using the much cleaner vehicles than diesel in the first place. I am also going to refer to Paul Miller to answer a part of this question. I believe he has a better understanding of the standards and what they apply to and what they do not apply to.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

Okay, thank you.

PAUL MILLER

The standard that they looked at in the South Coast Air Quality Management District is how they overturn their truck fleet and we did consider that in the analysis. There are no State requirements at this time that I am aware of for a solid waste fleets to electrify their fleets to become EV vehicles.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

That was my general question. Do you see foresee that happening in the future because I know our governor has been talking about it?

PAUL MILLER

There are some waste hauling vehicles that are now being designed that are in the design phases to be electric. The collection trucks are heavy and the transfer trucks are also heavy. They are going to be some of the last vehicles that can electrify because of the requirements of the vehicles to move in traffic and so forth. It is going to take a while before they get there. There are some waste vehicles that are being electrified now, but it is in the earliest stages of development.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

Because it is not a requirement this time, it will not have a Mitigation Measure for that even if it is 20 years from now. They are not really required to mitigate into electrical vehicles unless the State or someone requires them to, correct?

PAUL MILLER

That is correct. Both the State and the South Coast Air District will be looking at getting the cleanest vehicles possible required for waste vehicles going forward, but they there needs to be a feasibility of that technology.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA

Okay, thank you.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Chair and Commissioner Burrola, we do have a requirement that if and when State law changes, businesses need to comply. That should be something that happens if there is a change or a mandate; it would be required for this. Also, the applicant might be able to speak in more detail about it, but there are fleet vehicles now that are compressed natural gas, or CNG that are clean fuel.

VICE-CHAIR

Thank you. Can I make some comments on the actual plans or do we

BURROLA — have to stay within the areas that we are approving. We are actually approving the plans today, right?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — At this time, it is questions only.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — I have a question. On the corner of Live Oak and Arrow Highway, if you look at the plans on the front cover of Exhibit I, there is a little area. Are they going to do any landscaping in that area because it does not show. It will be a 1.1 on the first page. If you look at that little area in the corner right in the intersection.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — Where Arrow Highway joins into Live Oak?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Correct. Are they going to do any improvements in that area?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — As part of the project, there would be landscaping and there is potential for a monument signage in that area.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — I didn't see that in the plans that is why I question if they are going to put a monument or something of that sort to clean up that area in that corner. This does not show as part of the Site Plan.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — There is a Condition of Approval that any signage package be be submitted later to the City.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So, you are saying that they will be doing some landscaping in that area as well?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — Yes.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — For the noise control, I don't really see it in the plans. Where's that sound wall going to be constructed at. Will it be along Live Oak Avenue?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON: Yes, the south side of the project site along Live Oak and there will be landscaping buffer.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: I am under the impression that the sound wall is going to have to be taller than the requirements or taller than our standards. I have not seen the design for the sound wall. Is it going to be a big wall or is it going to be like a thicker wall?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON: Not necessarily. It would need to comply with the City's development standards. They're not asking for any kind of variance at this time for the height; that would be something that we would bring back to the Planning Commission.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: At this point, you really don't know what design calls for the sound, but there has to be some sort of sound wall put there for the Mitigation Measure.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Thank you, those are all of my questions that I have.

CHAIR TAPIA: On Item 3, I can't find it and I must have left it at home. On Chapter 3, or whatever it's deem, talks about that there's 87% of the trucks that Athens has are already electrical and they are going to comply in the near future and make it 100%. That's in our report.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: I missed that then.

CHAIR TAPIA: That is in our report on #3, but I don't have it with me. So, all I can do is say what I remember, but I have looked through it and it must have dropped out of my packet.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Thanks for that, Chair.

CHAIR TAPIA: All of the all the trucks that are going to be hauling or transferring out of the MRF are electrical.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA: Excuse me, Mr. Paul Miller would like to respond.

CHAIR TAPIA — Who is Paul Miller?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — He is the air quality scientist who is part of the environmental team.

CHAIR TAPIA — Is that in response to Mr. Burrola's question?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA — Yes. Mr. Paul Miller, you have now been unmuted.

PAUL MILLER — I am sorry about that. The conversion is from diesel trucks to compressed natural gas. Just to clarify that they're making a big move from moving from diesel to compressed natural gas and not electric at this point.

CHAIR TAPIA — Marilyn, it is Article 3 and I believe it is on the second page on the top. I do not have it with me. It is the first paragraph on top, if I remember right.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — Of the Staff Report?

CHAIR TAPIA — Yes.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — Chair Tapia, may you repeat that, so I can find the location?

CHAIR TAPIA — Article 3, I believe. What does Article 3 say that the title is? What is the subtitle for Article 3?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON — Do you have the page number?

CHAIR TAPIA — I don't. There is Article 1, Article 2, Article 3, 4 and 5. It is under Article 3. It is under the section of Article 3 that is talking about fueling and how they fuel, how they go to the City of Industry, how long it takes, and fast and slow fuel. In that section, it talks about there being 87% right now of that particular gas and they are going to eventually be 100%. Does someone have their paperwork with them?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON	Excuse me, it's in the 2020 Final Environmental Impact Report - fueling operations. In the report, it says that 86% CNG fueled add present and it's expected to be 100% CNG fuel in the future. So, as they replace any older diesel field trucks.
CHAIR TAPIA	Does that clarify, Commissioner Burrola?
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	CNG, meaning natural gas, correct?
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON	Yes, Compressed Natural Gas.
CHAIR TAPIA	All of the trucks on-site are going to be transferring the materials, are all going to be CNG.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Okay.
CHAIR TAPIA	It doesn't mean that private trucks from other sources may come in there but there's also an article that says that they must meet certain standards if they are going to be coming into the facility.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Okay.
CHAIR TAPIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON	Any more questions for Staff or for our EIR professionals? Now it will be appropriate to open the Public Hearing and we do have a representative from Athens Services that is available to speak.
CHAIR TAPIA	At this time, we are going to open the Public Hearing.
OPEN PUBLIC HEARING	At 7:47 p.m., Chair Tapia opened the Public Hearing.
CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA	Chair, as Ms. Simpson stated earlier, the direction is when we open up the Public Hearing, we will hear first from the Athens representative; we can open it up to the Public and then any final rebuttal comments from Athens and close the Public Hearing, thank you.
CHAIR TAPIA	As we open up the Public Hearing, the first speaker will be from Athens and once the gentlemen from Athens is done speaking, then it will be opened up to the public for comments for or against the project, in total. Everything that consists of the project site. Sir, state your name and address for the record, please.

GARY CLIFFORD	Good evening Chair Tapia, Vice-Chair Burrola and members Hartman, Corpis, and Chico. My name is Gary Clifford and I am the Executive Vice President of Athens Services and our crew is here virtually tonight. I just wanted to let you know that our company is still as passionate as we were 15 years ago when this started, 12 years ago for me, and it's the same project that the City Council and that some of you members voted on before. We're dedicated to this regional benefit. It is going to be the Nation's most innovative recycling facility. Irwindale is going to be very proud of this site. The site that we have in Los Angeles; many people come to visit it, elected officials and others, to take a first look at the technology. It is the exact same project of the Arakelian family. Athens Services is proud to go through this together, and we are asking you tonight to reaffirm that commitment and move forward with us. I'm here to answer any questions or comments, but just wanted to say good evening to you.
CHAIR TAPIA	Is there any comments or questions from the Commissioners. Doesn't seem like there is.
GARY CLIFFORD	I will be outside if you need me, thank you.
CHAIR TAPIA	Thank you and nice seeing you. Okay, it is now open to the public. Please raise your hand and remember the time limits. Raise your hand and you will be called upon.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Chair Tapia, no hands have been raised.
CHAIR TAPIA	Just for the record, no hands have been raised. We are going to give you another minute or so. We do not want anyone that is out there not at the computer to come in and see that we have already moved on.
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING	There being no additional speakers, Chair Tapia closed the Public Hearing at 7:51p.m.
CHAIR TAPIA	At this time, we have now closed the public hearing as far as the Final Environmental Impact Report. It is now open for discussion among the Commissioners and open for a vote. Any Commissioners have any last questions for Staff?
COMMISSIONER CHICO	I have a question for our attorney at this point. Can we adopt all of the resolutions at one time or do they have to be taken individually?
CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA	If it is the will of the Commission, I could make it one motion and read all the titles as part of that one motion so we don't have to go one-by-one.
COMMISSIONER	You want us to motion first or should the motion to adopt be made first?

CHICO

CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA

I'll go ahead and read the entire motion and if somebody is agreeable, they can make that motion and there could be a second. Bear with me as I have a lot of reading to do. I have to scroll on my computer to get everything, bear with me. The appropriate motion would be to read by title only, waive reading of, and adopt the following six resolutions. I will read the titles. The resolutions are:

790(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending to the City Council certification of the Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013051029), adopt California Environmental Quality Act Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program for the Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station project.

791(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending to the City Council the approval of General Plan Amendment No. 02-2016 to change the General Plan Land Use Designation from commercial to commercial/industrial on property located at 2200 Arrow Highway (APN 8535-001-911), subject to the conditions as set forth herein and making findings in support thereof.

792(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council of the City of Irwindale amend section 8.20.370 of the Irwindale Municipal Code regarding solid waste franchises, amend Chapters 17.56 and 17.58 of the City of Irwindale Municipal Code regarding material recovery facilities in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zone and add Section 17.56.025 regarding distance requirements for alcohol beverage establishments.

793(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council approve Development Agreement No. 02-2016 Athens Services to allow the construction and operation of a Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station, convenience store and public gas station on property located at the 2200 Arrow Highway (APN 8535-001-911), subject to conditions as set forth herein and making findings in support thereof.

794(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending to the City Council approval of a Conditional Use Permit

to allow a proposed convenience store to sell beer and wine for off-site consumption (type 20 off sale beer & wine), and for the operation of a public gas station on property located at 2200 Arrow Highway in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zone, subject to conditions as set forth herein and making findings in support thereof.

795(21)
A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending City Council approval of Site Plan and Design Review DA) No. 06-2016 for the construction of a ± 252,586 square foot Materials Recovery and Transfer Station (MRF/TS) building and convenience store with a public gas station located at 2200 Arrow Highway in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zone, subject to conditions as set forth herein and making findings in support thereof.

Is there a motion and a second?

CHAIR TAPIA — I have a comment, do we have to include changes of what we talked about, like wording?

CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA — I will wait for Berlyn to address the noise. Chair, at this point, we will not.

CHAIR TAPIA — Okay, that is fine.

CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA — Can we take a two minute break before we have the motion and second?

RECESS — At 7:59 p.m., the Planning Commission took a short recess.

RECONVENE — At 8:02 p.m., the Planning Commission reconvened.

CHAIR TAPIA — Okay, we are going to resume.

CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA — I just want to make one clarification on one of the Resolutions and retitle it. That is everything is consistent with the 790, 791, 792, 794 and 795. The only one I'm going to change is 793 regarding Development Agreement. I just want to reference that there is an ordinance being recommended as well, so in the title, I'm going to rephrase the title. It is Resolution No. 793(21): A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale, recommending that the City Council approve Development Agreement No. 02-2016 and corresponding ordinance to allow the construction and operation of a materials recovery facility and transfer station, convenience store, and public gas station on property located at the 2200 Arrow Highway (APN 8535-001-911), subject to conditions as set forth herein and making findings in support thereof. With that, all the titles have been read to read by title only, waive reading of, and adopt those six resolutions. Is there a motion and a second?

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Motion to approve as read.
CHAIR TAPIA	Hold on a second. Is that the resolutions including the EIR?
CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA	Yes, the first resolution title that I read, which was Resolution 790(21), was for the EIR. That one should be adopted first.
CHAIR TAPIA	Mr. Hartman, go ahead.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Motion to approve as read.
CHAIR TAPIA	Second. Roll Call.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Hartman.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Corpis.
COMMISSIONER CORPIS	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Commissioner Chico.
COMMISSIONER CHICO	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Yes
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY AGUILA	Chair Tapia.
CHAIR TAPIA	Yes.
CHAIR TAPIA	Well, I was going to wait until Commissioner comments, but I'm just going to go ahead and command/congratulate the Planning Staff and Dr. Harvey and his associates for the great job that you did in compiling all the information and presenting all the information as you did. I thank

you very much for your hard work and that includes our Legal Staff and our City Manager, Sir William.

DISCUSSION ITEMS/ PRESENTATIONS

There were no items.

CHAIR TAPIA

Do we have any presentations?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Thank you Chair and Commissioners, we do not have any discussion items or presentations tonight.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There were no items.

CHAIR TAPIA

Any Commissioner comments or requests? We will go down to Legal Counsel comments.

LEGAL COUNCIL

CITY ATTORNEY GUERRA

Thank you, Chair. I have no legal comments, but Happy New Year to everyone.

CHAIR TAPIA

Thank you. We will ask our City Manager if he has anything to say.

CHAIR TAPIA

Nothing to say. He is happy.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER'S REPORT

Thank you Chair and Commissioners. I just want to remind you that we will be seeing each other again in a couple of weeks. The next Planning Commission meeting is on February 3rd, a little sooner than the usual. Finally, I just want to wish everybody a Happy New Year and I hope everyone is healthy and safe.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN

To you too, Marilyn and to all of the Staff.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Thank you.

CHAIR TAPIA

Did we get any information on the construction pile that was over there by the raceway?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER/CITY PLANNER SIMPSON

Yes, thank you. We've had Code Enforcement reach out to the construction manager and to the developer regarding that. That'll be taken care of. Some of these things take a little response time.

CHAIR TAPIA

Anything else before we adjourn? I want to thank all of the Commissioners for their consideration for this project. I know that this project goes all the way back to my dad, Arthur F. Tapia. He spoke to me about that they were going on a tour, but this was by railroad at the time so, this is a long time coming. I was just feeling like anytime we have something that we want and it's going to benefit our town monetarily. There was a waste management request by the State in 1989 that asked if any city had property so they could make a transfer station. Something that would be adequate to take care of our trash recycling. It is very disheartening when you know that you're being opposed when this was to asked by the State. I am very happy tonight that this finally is going come to pass so I thank you and with that, we have we will be adjourning this meeting again in remembrance of Rosie Guerrero. Now, if we have if we have a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN

Motion to adjourn.

CHAIR TAPIA

Thank you. This meeting of January 20th has adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Arthur R. Tapia, Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

Berlyn Aguila, Administrative Secretary

Approved as presented at the meeting held May 19, 2021