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

September 21, 2022
Wednesday
6:31 P.M.

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

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 FUENTES

Dear heavenly Father, we just come before you this evening, dear Lord, thanking you so much for your love, your grace, and your mercy. Father God. We just ask that you bless this City, this Commission. Dear Lord, our Council. Dear Lord, this State and the whole United States, dear Lord. I pray for these items before us, dear Lord, that you would give us wisdom beyond our years to make the proper decisions that are appeasing to you. We ask this in your gracious name, Amen.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Roll call.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners; Richard Chico; Robert E. Hartman; David Fuentes; Vice Chair Enoch Burrola; Chair Suzanne Gomez

Also present: Julian Miranda, City Manager; Jamie Traxler, Assistant City Attorney; Marilyn Simpson, Community Development Director; Daniel Co, Assistant City Engineer; Brandi Jones, Senior Planner; Luis Pimentel, Assistant Engineer; Martin Romero, Planning Technician; Jesus Hernandez, Administrative Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIR GOMEZ

Do we have any announcement tonight from the Staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

We have no announcements.

CHAIR GOMEZ

No announcements, okay.

SPONTANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

CHAIR GOMEZ

We move on to Spontaneous Communication. At this time, Mr. Hernandez will advise us on Spontaneous Communication.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

This time is set aside for members of the audience to speak on items not on this agenda. State law prohibits any Commission discussion or action on such communications unless 1) the Commission by majority vote finds that a catastrophe or emergency exists; or 2) the Commission by at least four votes finds that the matter (and need for action thereon) arose within the last five days. Since the Commission cannot (except as stated) participate it is requested that all such

communications be made in writing as to be included on the next agenda for full discussion and action. If a member of the audience feels he or she must proceed tonight, then each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes, unless such time limits are extended. We are in a hybrid format, so we do have both in-person and hybrid audience members and they will participate in the following order. Tier 1: In-person attendees. Tier 2: Teleconference attendees. Tier 3: In-person attendees who have not previously provide comments on the matter(s) being discussed by the legislative body, and Tier 4: Teleconference attendees who have not previously provide comments on the matter(s) being discussed by the legislative body.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, at this time do we have any on the first Tier for Spontaneous Communication?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — No.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Second Tier?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — We do not have anyone online.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, none on Third Tier and none on Fourth Tier, thank you.

CONSENT CALENDAR

CHAIR GOMEZ — We are gonna now move on to the Consent Calendar for Minutes the Regular Meeting held on July 20th, 2022. Any changes, recommendations by the Commissioners or Staff? Can I get a motion?

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Motion.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Second? I will second it. Can I have a Roll call please?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Commissioner Chico.

COMMISSIONER CHICO — Abstain.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Commissioner Fuentes.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Commissioner Hartman.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Abstain.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Chair Gomez.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

No Items.

PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIR GOMEZ	Now we move forward to Public Hearings, number A is a Site Plan and Design Review No. 02-2022, 25,000 square-foot Central Utility Plant at 1500 Duarte Road and we are going to have that presentation.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON	Thank you Chair and Commission, this Item will be presented by Martin Romero, our Planning Technician.
PLANNING TECHNICIAN ROMERO	Good Evening Honorable Chair and members of the Planning Commission. Our next topic of discussion is a Site Plan and Design Review (DA) for the construction of a 25,000 square-foot Central Utility Plant located in the City of Hope Campus at 1500 Duarte Road. The applicant is Joey Kragelund of HKS Architect. The property owner is the City of Hope National Medical Center. The applicant is requesting a Site Plan and Design Review (DA) for the construction of

a roughly 25,000 square-foot Central Utility Plant. The site is bounded by the City of Hope parking lots to the North and South, the City of Hope main Campus, and City of Duarte to the West, and the Santa Fe Dam Flood Control Basin to the East. The project site has a General Plan designation of City of Hope Specific Plan, and is currently zoned Infrastructure and Utility/ City of Hope Specific Plan. The proposed project is part of the scope of the overall City of Hope Specific Plan Final EIR, adopted by the City on May 9, 2018. City of Hope was founded in 1913 as a tuberculosis sanatorium and has transitioned to become an internationally known comprehensive cancer center. It is an independent, non- profit medical center, hospital, and transitional research facility that currently employs approximately 5,000 employees. It serves hundreds of patients daily on its campus. Both City of Duarte and City of Irwindale worked collaboratively to develop and adopt the City of Hope Specific Plan (COHSP) in 2018. The proposed project is for the construction of a roughly 25,000 square-foot central utility plant to service the City of Hope Hospital. The ground floor level will house five chillers, five emergency generator, normal and emergency electrical rooms, the Main Distribution Frame room, a control room, and an office and workshop. Five cooling towers and air-handling units will be located on the roof. The Central Utility Plant will have eighteen foot setbacks from internal roadways and a thirty-nine foot two inch setback from the Specific Plan boundary. The building is proposed to be fifty-four feet eight inches tall, which is shorter than the allowable one hundred twenty feet in the Infrastructure and Utility District. The project is also proposing about 5,000 square-feet of drought tolerant landscaping. The proposed Project is consistent with the City of Hope Specific Plan, to integrate future development within the campus that complements the existing facilities and infrastructure. The proposed project is adequate in size and shape and helps implement the COHSP through development of a “state of the art” central utility plant that compliments and serves the existing topography, including the health care facilities within the Campus. The design incorporates both compatibility and architectural design and detail throughout the project. The design of the building and its location are consistent with the COHSP design guidelines, which encourage buildings with a relationship to streets by orienting the building to future Circle Drive. The new building is located in the Infrastructure and Utility District, which encompasses approximately twenty acres of the southeastern edge of the campus. The primary purpose of this district is for utility services and infrastructure. Staff recommends to adopt Resolution No. 816 (22) recommending that the Planning Commission approve Site Plan and Design Review (DA) No. 02-2022, subject to the proposed Conditions of Approval. This concludes my presentation, the applicant and I are available for questions.

CHAIR GOMEZ — At this time does any of the Commissioners have some questions they would like to ask Staff or the developer? No questions? So I have a couple of things. In reading it, it does address that fact that when they put the air conditioning units. Is this correct, when they put the air conditioning units on the roof. Is that correct?

PLANNING TECHNICIAN ROMERO — The cooling tower?

CHAIR GOMEZ — Ah huh.

PLANNING TECHNICIAN ROMERO — Umm, yes.

CHAIR GOMEZ — So those will have a façade? So they are not seen from…

PLANNING TECHNICIAN ROMERO — They are screened.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And how close is. I know that. Let me tell you that, City of Hope has been a great neighbor to us and we appreciate them. We wish them well to their business, and all that they do for the Community and the world. They are a fabulous organization. We are honored to have them in our City and also to work in partnership with them. I have a couple more questions. How close is it to, is it Buena Vista that is closest to the utility facility?

Audience Member was not using the microphone to speak, therefore, the audio was not recorded.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And so the proximity is, how far would you say from homes?

Audience Member was not using the microphone to speak, therefore, the audio was not recorded.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And so would you be developing an emergency plan in case of a national disaster that would incorporate not only your business but also the community? If you haven't thought of that then I would like you to in the future. I think that you addressed all of our needs and I think that... Does it impact the parking? I know that City of Hope has had a lot of parking issues, but that has no impact on it?

PLANNING TECHNICIAN ROMERO — It does not, they have enough parking.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And so does the City of Hope have an emergency plan in general, that may not speak currently to the utility if there is a natural disaster? Do you think that they will be incorporating that part in it as well when you get this completed?

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA — Excuse me can you please come to the microphone.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Please step forward and give us your name. Thank you Mr. Miranda. Thank you.

ROBERT SCROFANO — My name is Robert Scrofano. I am the Executive Director at City of Hope. I can answer that by saying that this is an infrastructure project and by its nature, it supports every building in campus with the exception of the hotel. If there is emergency generators, it takes care of that. It takes care of cooling for the campus, as well as, we are also going to have generators for backup. It is a hard question to answer but it is incorporated into the emergency planning, because any building in campus that finds itself in an emergency will be addressed with this facility, because it will be on generator back up and provide, you know, cooling and emergency services. That is probably the easiest way to answer it.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you. I have no more questions. Anybody in the Commission? Okay, we are going to close the Public Hearing at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — You haven't opened it.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Oh, sorry we haven't opened it. I am going to open the Public Hearing now. Thank you. You have a question?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — With the Specific Plan you guys are doing permits on the right of way. I guess it will be in the front of, is it Buena Vista, the main road coming in. Per the Specific Plan, I am not too sure I haven't looked all the way through it, but was there traffic signals or any improvements that were going to be done. You guys done it already?

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA — I am sorry, could you please come to the mic if you are going to speak or respond to the question.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — This is not specific to this development. I am just talking about the Specific Plan.

ROBERT SCROFANO — Sure, yes, we have installed the two signals and they are operational.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, good. As far as the improvement with the sidewalk, and curb and gutter, and stuff like that was that done?

ROBERT SCROFANO — Correct.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, so that has been done already.

ROBERT SCROFANO — Correct

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Any additional questions? Okay now, thank you Mr. Hernandez, we will open up the Public Hearing.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING — At 6:47 p.m., Chair Gomez opened the Public Hearing.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Do we have any public participation or communications, present or on Zoom?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — We do not.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, then we are going to move on to closing the Public Hearing at this time, and we are going to open it for discussion.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING — There being no speakers, Chair Gomez closed the Public Hearing at 6:47 p.m.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Any discussion from the Commission as to this project. So we've reviewed it and I think it is a great project. We are here to support you. I have been to City of Hope with my family, and I know you have been doing a lot of work. Parking and the Metrolink, it looks pretty spiffy actually. It is very accommodating. The concern is just to keep our neighbors aware. I am not speaking to the natural disaster as to supporting the building itself, but let's say we are going to have a major earthquake and the facility itself, how is that going to stand the utility and also the implications if something happens to that building and close to the neighborhood. That is what I am speaking to, that you can handle on your own in your company. So at this time, let's do Roll Call and take a vote. Mr. Hernandez?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Let's get a motion.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, I need a motion, that's good. It is a tough day today.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Motion to approve.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Wait, wait, wait. Don't we do a recommendation, read the first one?

CHAIR GOMEZ — Don't we read it after we approve it?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — We just need to read the title of the Resolution and that can be done through a Commissioner's motion.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, so we read the title of the Resolution. Okay, I was running late, I am discombobulated. Resolution No. 816(22) a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale approving, we did not approve it yet though. For a Site Plan and Design Review.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — We need someone to make the motion and they can read the recommendation.

CHAIR GOMEZ — That is what I thought we were going to do.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Correct.

CHAIR GOMEZ — I need a motion.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Motion to approve.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Second.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Who motioned it?

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — I did.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Do you mind reading the recommendation?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: I can read the recommendation. So the recommendation is to approve Resolution No. 816(22) a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale approving Site Plan and Design Review (DA) No. 02-2020 for the construction of a ±25,000 square foot central utility plant building located at 1500 E. Duarte road (APN: 8533-003-012) in the Infrastructure and Utility (IU) District/City of Hope Specific Plan Zone, making certain findings of fact, and finding that the environmental review for the project was previously conducted through, and consistent with, the City of Hope Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report SCH #2015101047 adopted by the City of Irwindale City Council on May 9, 2018.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Okay, so as stated we have taken a vote and we made a motion, now we are going to take a vote.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Jesus, do you have your motion and your second?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Who second, I am sorry?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: I second.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Okay, we can do Roll Call now. Commissioner Chico.

COMMISSIONER CHICO: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fuentes.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Hartman.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Chair Gomez.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Thank you.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Now we move forward to the Public Hearing as to Item 3B on the Calendar. Site Plan and Design Review DA No. 04-2020 speculative 129,830 square-foot concrete tilt-up building at 4416 Azusa Canyon Road. Thank you gentlemen for coming tonight.
COMMISSIONER FUENTES	You've done a great job fellas.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Good evening Chair and members of Planning Commission, the next item is Site Plan and Design Review (DA) No. 04-2020 for 4416 Azusa Canyon Road. Before I get started I just wanted to go over the memo that was placed on the dais. We have some additional items for you. The first one was just a copy of the PowerPoint presentation for the City of Hope project. The second one was this PowerPoint presentation along with some information that the applicant provided. The third item was a revised Staff Report and Resolutions for this item. We just added some additional discussion regarding mediation Measure T-1 to the Staff Report and Resolution. This information was already provided in the Response to Comments, so this is not new data it was just explained a little bit more in the report. The fourth item is an email form Paul Porter with a Technical Memorandum received September 20th, 2022. The fifth item is a letter from LIUNA received September 21st, 2022. The sixth item is a letter from Teamsters Local No. 396, received September 21st, 2022. The last item is a letter from Lozeau Drury LLP, received September 21st, 2022.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Brandi, before we get started you can tell me how you would prefer to do this. So on the amended one that you provided, will you be covering the additional. So we read the initial one and the amended, will you point out what has changed? I am not sure what it is.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — I can point out what's changed.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — And also because this item has gone, so we presented this item to you before, so if you want we can kind of just give a brief overview and then we can into more of the detail about the environmental and transportation, if you want to do that. I mean we will still go over the project but we don't have to go into a lot of detail about the same items, but I will also go over the changes that were made in the report.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, thank you.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — So the last time this item was before you was May 18th, 2022 and it was continued. We posted the Public Hearing Notice, we did the 500 foot mailing, and also put it in the newspaper as required. I will try to stay with the PowerPoint but I am not really good at it. So basically from1928 to 1952, this was used as an orchard. From 1956 to 2020, it was used as the Pepsi bottling plant. Currently there is an existing single story building there, about 62,713 square feet. It is currently there, it won't be demolished until if this is approved. Let's see, it went to Planning Commission a few times. We continued it from the May 18th Meeting. The subject property is located in M1, with a General Plan designation of Industrial Business Park so those are both consistent. So the proposal is for a 129,830 sq. ft. concrete tilt-up building, 9,160 sq. ft. for office, 17,000 sq. ft. for manufacturing, and the remaining 103,670 sq. ft. for warehousing. The Lot size is 251,096 sq. ft. There is also a 5,568 sq. ft. dedication required along Azusa Canyon Rd. At this time there is still no prospective user. It is just a speculative development, just like the majority of developments for industrial are. This proposed building incorporates tilt-up. The building incorporates many of the desired designs elements from the commercial and industrial guidelines. The layout, landscaping, and design of the site also incorporated encouraged design principals. The building incorporates troweled elements at focal points, and breaks up the expansive exterior walls with architectural projections and details around the window. The vertical and horizontal reveals, arched windows, and multicolor palate also work to add depth and character to the building. The design is similar to many of the recently approved developments, which have been designed to closely adhere to the guidelines while maintaining function and aesthetic uniqueness. Also based on the feedback from the last Planning Commission Meeting we had, the applicant's team worked and revisited the design for the sidewalk and the water fountain. They created a meandering sidewalk as oppose to just a standard sidewalk. Also, they added a fountain. I am sorry. That's why I don't like PowerPoint because I just talk through

all of that. So they added a meandering sidewalk along Azusa Canyon. They have a fountain with signage and also incorporated the "Welcome to Irwindale." The prospective use is currently unknown. There are many potential uses that are permitted by right due to the current zoning designation. However, certain uses will not be allowed or they would be conditionally permitted. If a use requires a CUP it would come to you, so we will not be able to permit that by right. Cold storage, however, has been expressly prohibited from the site without further future environmental analysis. The overwhelming majority of all new development is speculative. If a company wanted to come in and incorporate cold storage into this development there would be an additional environmental review, a separate review. Approximately 27,979 sq. ft. or eleven percent of the project site is proposed to be landscape in compliance with the guidelines. The minimum is ten percent. An eight foot high steel fencing is proposed to surround the property. Ingress and egress to the site are provided via three driveways, one fronting on Azusa Canyon and the two fronting onto the driveway but it is noted as Los Angeles Street.

Planning Commissioner was not using the microphone to speak, therefore, the audio was not recorded.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES

Yeah, and it is part of the property to the south. Based on the square footage of the project, one hundred and sixteen parking stalls are required, one hundred and twenty-three are being provided so it exceeds the minimum. There will be five ADA stalls, ninety-seven standard stalls and twenty-one compacts. There are no designated trailer stalls. All parking is surface so there is no proposed parking structures or subterranean parking. That concludes Staff's report, I am going to turn it over to our consultant, Dina Gass from PlaceWorks and also Carleton Waters, from Urban Crossroads.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER

Sorry to interrupt, Dina are you going to be addressing the alternative Mitigation Measures at this time? So Madame Chair we have to do a Public Hearing for this part so I would recommend that this time you open the Public Hearing.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Okay, at this time we are going to open up the Public Hearing.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

At 7:01 p.m., Chair Gomez opened the Public Hearing.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

Thank you.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES

I just wanted to go back and point out the change. If you look on page thirty-two of sixty-nine in the updated report, we added additional discussions about Mitigation Measure T-1 and also the alternatives.

Basically staring on that page we go more into detail about Mitigation Measure T-1, which is also in the mitigation monitoring program.

Planning Commissioners were not using the microphone to speak, therefore, the audio was not recorded and unintelligible.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES

We added additional discussion on Mitigation Measure T-1. Also on page forty-five of sixty-nine, we added that same additional discussion in the Resolution. So I will pass it back over to Dina.

DINA GASS

I'll run you through the environmental review that was conducted for this project. PlaceWorks prepared an Initial Study and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for this project. My name is Dina Gass, I am a Project Manager from PlaceWorks. We were the consultancy firm that conducted the CEQA process for this project. We prepared an IS/MND for the project. We circulated the IS/MND for public review for a thirty day period, per CEQA. The public review period went from December 21st, 2021 till January 19th, 2022. I am going to stop and just ask, can you all hear me okay? Alright, very good. Thank you. My voice sometimes is a bit low, but I am glad for the mic. So during the Public Review Period we received four comment letters. We then received, with the two that we received tonight, another four comment letters that come after the Public Review Period. All in all, we received eight comment letters. Some during the Public Review Period and some at the dates for the Planning Commission hearing. The IS/MND addressed twenty environmental study areas per CEQA. The document also included Mitigation Measures that are summarized in the MMRP, and you should have a copy of the MMRP in the Staff Report. With those Mitigation Measures all of the twenty environmental study areas were reduced to a less than significant impact. And now this up here, this is the Pepsi bottling plant that is on the site. As Brandi mentioned it is not operational, but it has been operational for more than sixty years on the site and it ceased to operate roughly two years ago. The Pepsi bottling plant was used as the baseline conditions for the IS/MND. All of the project impacts are compared to net impacts over the existing conditions. As I mentioned, the use of the Pepsi bottling plant as the existing baseline conditions is because it is a historical baseline that gives a very definite description of the kind of uses that have been on this site for a very long time, which is very adequate under CEQA analysis. Lots of case law that demonstrate that historic baseline can be used if it had been operated as proposed, or as analyzed in the IS/MND for an extended period of time. The use of a hypothetical historic baseline cannot be used per CEQA, but we use the bottling plant as it was operational on the site for a very long time. Also because it ceased operation very recently, CEQA allows such a baseline. Here are the topics that we analyzed in the IS/MND. These are the topics per the CEQA checklist. Twenty in total, some of these study areas were backed by technical studies. A considerable number of them are backed by technical studies. The

hydrology and water quality topic has a WQMP or Water Quality Management Plan. The IS/MND also includes an Air Quality analysis and a Health Risk Assessment. The IS/MND included a Health Risk Assessment for the operational phase of the project. In responds to the comment letters that we received we also conducted a Health Risk Assessment for the construction phase. Health Risk has a lot of technical analysis backing up the IS/MND. There was also a Cultural Resources Report, a Geotechnical Report, a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, and a Phase 1 to analyze hazards and hazardous materials on the site, a Noise Analysis, and also a Transportation Analysis. I am sure you have heard this many times, in terms of CEQA the Transportation Analysis did cover Vehicle Miles Traveled or VMT. That analysis was pulled into the IS/MND. It also included a Traffic Analysis, which is not part of CEQA but part of the City's requirements. After me, Carleton will speak to the details of the Transportation Analysis that was conducted for the project. Urban Crossroads is the firm that analyzed that part of the environmental review. All the impacts in the Initial Study were found to be less than significant. Some of the areas did require Mitigation Measures and those are Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Transportation, and Tribal Cultural Resources. Now in terms of Transportation the Mitigation Measure that we included in the IS/MND was related to pedestrian safety, which is a CEQA issue. Pedestrian safety needs to be analyze under CEQA. That Mitigation Measure from the initial or from the IS/MND that was released for public review has been amended, in line with new information on the project. I will run through that briefly in terms of how it relates to CEQA but Carleton will run you through the specifics, so you will understand what has been changed. He will also show you the new design plans and how that affected the Mitigation Measure. We will run you through all of that. With the mitigated measures as I stated, all the impacts were found to be less than significant. I am going to go into a bit of the comments that we received, whether it was during the Public Review Period or after the Public Review Period. For the comments received during the Public Review Period, those were addressed by very specific conditions of approval. We will run you through those and some changes that we needed to make to the text of the initial study. For the comments received after the Public Review Period, including the two letters that we received tonight. Now, I do want to note, the two letters that we received tonight one was identical to the letter we received before the February 16th Planning Commission hearing. The same letter was submitted twice. I think it's now the third letter that we received by SAFER the comments in those letters are also, the responses to those comments are assess, kind of responded through the Conditions of Approval. They do not require any changes to the text of the initial study. Now what we have also prepared for this project is a responds to comment document. We have consolidated all of the letters in the RTC, the Responds to Comment document which you should also have a copy of. All the letters are in the RTC. All the

responses to the comments are in the RTC. Some of the comments did require some additional technical analysis, and those are included as an Appendix or Appendices to the RTC. That document also includes all of the changes, the text changes that we made to the Initial Study. It also includes the changes that we made the Mitigation Measure, the MMT1 that we are talking about. The changes made to the MMT1 are in that document. That is the written record of the change of the Mitigation Measure, which is a requirement per CEQA. If you make changes to any Mitigation Measure you need to have a written record of it, and the RTC is the written record per that change. Now in terms of the comments received after the Public Review Period, this was something that the Planning Commission raised at the February 16th Meeting. Some of the comments asserted that an EIR is needed for this project. Now in terms of the preparation of an EIR versus an MND. Per CEQA, MNDs are the appropriate CEQA document and process for projects without significate and unavoidable impacts. EIRs are only required per CEQA, when one or more impact cannot be mitigated to less than significant. As noted all of the environmental categories for this project were determined to be less than significant. This is after conducting the additional technical analysis and responding to the comment letters. All twenty environmental categories are still found to be less than significant. What we have pulled up on this slide is the text from CEQA. CEQA section 15070, just to show clarity what CEQA stands on where you prepare an IS/MND as opposed to an EIR. This section, right in the first sentence says, a public agency shall prepare or have prepared an MND for any project that does not have a significant effect on the environment. Preparing an EIR in this case would not be per the requirements of CEQA. The IS/MND is an appropriate document for the project. I am going to run through briefly some of the broader comments that came up in the letters. Some of the comments are very nuanced. They are very detailed. They are very technical. We do have our Air Quality Specialist with us virtually. If you have any questions about the more detailed technical issues, he is available to take any of those questions. All of those details are in the RTC. But I will run through more of the broader issues that came up. There were comments on the VMT analysis. There were comments on the AQ/GHG analysis, the Health Risks, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Now, in terms of the VMT comments, for the VMT analysis we used the trip generation rates that are consistent with spec warehouses or speculative warehouses. I have a lot of trouble with that world, spec warehouses. The generation rates that we used were based on, kind of the allocation of uses per the project description and per what is in the Resolutions. This warehouse, even though the tenants are speculative it is very clear what can be used for manufacturing in terms of square footage, I think it was seventeen thousand for manufacturing and then one hundred and three or so for warehousing. We use those square footages because even though the tenants are not known at this point, those are the uses that are

permitted on the site and in that kind of proportion. We use generation rates for those uses to calculate the passenger trips. For VMT we are concerned with passenger car trips and we found that the net increase in passenger car trips, when compare to the existing conditions is bellow one hundred and ten trips per day. That screens the project out of a detailed VMT analysis. There is a threshold where a project can be screened out and this project was screened out. There is also a very clear condition of approval, which states that Occupancy or Tenant Improvement permit will not be issued until VMT is demonstrated to not exceed what was analyze in the IS/MND. Once the tenants come in they have to demonstrate that they will not exceed this limit, and if they do they have to conduct additional CEQA review. That is what the Condition of Approval states, just to make sure and to make it really clear that they need to stay within these limits. If the limits are exceeded additional VMT and CEQA review is required. That condition of approval was placed in there as a responds to these comments. For the AQ and GHG comments because there was also some issues with that raised with these letters. Again, if the passenger cars or the VMT is more than what is analyzed, the CEQA needs to be done again. For AQ/GHG, for VMT we are just concerned for passenger cars but with AQ/GHG we are also concerned with trucks. The truck rates are based like we said on that manufacturing/warehouse square footage split, and they are very conservative. What we did in the IS/MND in terms of truck trips is conservative, and filters into a conservative AQ/GHG analysis. For the health risks, again with health risks we are only concern with truck emissions and those are very conservative in the IS/MND. We also at this point, have both construction and operational health risk assessment. We found that the cumulative health risk from both phases is still below the health risk thresholds. That was additional analysis that we conducted in responds to these comments. For the Hazards and Hazardous Materials there was a concern with a former underground storage tank or a UST on the site. After the IS/MND was released for public review the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board issues a no further action letter for the site. We included that letter as an appendix to the RTC. They are the regulating board when it comes to contamination from USTs, from historic storage tanks. The letter clearly states that were is a very low threat to human health, soil, and ground water beneath the site from this UST that has been removed. We did not have the letter when we issued the IS/MND for public review. We do have it now and we included it in the RTC. None of the comments raised new issues or substantiated potential new impacts not addressed in the IS/MND and the RTC, as both together. The IS/MND fully discloses potential environmental impacts and all impacts are mitigated to less than significant. At this point the preparation of an EIR would not include and further analysis, and it would not require any additional Mitigation Measures. If we were to go that route. Here is the discussion of this updated Mitigation Measure, the famous MMT-1. After the public release of the IS/MND some of the

proposed improvements for the intersection of Azusa Canyon Road, and I think we are calling it the Access Road, we are no longer calling it Los Angeles Street. So that intersection there is a requirement for a traffic signal at that intersection. That traffic signal includes improvements for pedestrian safety, so that is how it got filtered into the CEQA analysis. The traffic signal requires some improvements to maintain the safety of pedestrians. That design for the improvement of the pedestrian safety has changed, there are now two alternatives. Carleton will run you through both of the alternatives. Since the design has changed the Mitigation Measure had to be changed as well. The text of the Mitigation Measure as we changed it, is shown in the RTC. The MMRP has been updated with the new Mitigation Measure. Now the MMRP includes the most up to date Mitigation Measure. For CEQA when you switch out a Mitigation Measure, you have to make sure that it is equally efficient or equally effective to the Mitigation Measure that was in the initial document. In terms of the new Mitigation Measure, it will substantially improve pedestrian safety at that intersection compare to existing conditions, because under existing conditions there is no signal there. With the signal and the crosswalks that intersection will become substantially more safe for pedestrians. The updated MM still requires the offsite traffic signal, and it will not disturbed any additional land with all the improvements within the existing right of ways. This is also clearly detailed in the RTC. The new Mitigation Measure would be as effective as the original Mitigation Measure and would not result in a significant environmental effect, which is a requirement of CEQA when you switch out Mitigation Measures at this point. I think that might be all. Yes, so that concludes my part of the presentation. I am going to give it over to Carleton, he will present the transportation analysis.

CARLETON WATERS

Good evening Commissioners, I am Carleton Waters representing Urban Crossroads. Urban Crossroads is the firm that prepared the Transportation Technical Analysis for this project. I have the opposite problem of Dina, so if I talk too loudly just let me know. Alright? I am going to talk about some of the same topics that Dina touched on, so I will try to be brief. As she mentioned, Vehicle Miles Traveled is a required transportation analysis under CEQA these days. That was approached through a screening analysis that showed the number of passenger cars that are expected to be generated by this project above and beyond of what was already generated by the existing warehousing uses, falls below the threshold were any further analysis is required. We also performed Level of Service Analysis in accordance with the policies and requirements of the City of Irwindale General Plan Circulation Element, to make sure that we don't have excess traffic congestion and to allow us to address any situations where we do have excessive delays, and therefore poor levels of services. Delays is the primary measure of effectiveness for congestion that we use, but it is not required by CEQA so it is not included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Finally, we went into

some very extensive safety evaluation to make sure that we were providing appropriate mitigation in terms of pedestrian accommodations; ADA, bicycles, and appropriate site distance which again plays into the safety of the pedestrians, drives being able to see them and them being able to see the drivers. Next slide please. Oh do I have control of that? No? Okay, there we go. There we go, alright. We analyzed several scenarios with and without the proposed project. A, what we call, a hypothetical non-COVID 2021. We went into an intensive exercise to take counts that had been collected before the pandemic began, and factor them up to represent conditions as they would have been in 2021 if we would have not all been staying home and wearing masks. We also had an Interim Year condition representing cumulative development with and without the proposed project. The project was anticipated to open in 2022. We had some delays here. We are going to be very close to that, I think. We also looked at a long range 2040 condition, again with and without the proposed project. The study area that we looked at included five arterial intersections along Azusa Canyon Road, north to Arrow Highway, and then down south to San Bernardino Road. The other streets that are listed on the slide are actually in between those two streets. It is not alphabetical order but those are the north and south boundaries of the study area. I won't list all of the streets unless someone want me to. Then of course, we looked at the project's driveways as well. In terms of project trip generation, the study actually looked at the proposed trip generation for the combination of one hundred and twelve thousand eight hundred and thirty square feet of warehousing use and seventeen thousand square feet of manufacturing use. When you take the trips from both of those uses and combine them you end up with a total of two-hundred and sixty-two daily trips, which approximately sixty-five are expected to be trucks. The analysis converts trucks into what we call passenger car equivalents. Essentially trucks take up more space on the road, they accelerate and decelerate more slowly. They act like more than just a single vehicle in the analysis. Based on the number of axels the truck has, we consider a truck to be equally to anywhere between one and a half passenger car to three passenger cars. As Dina alluded to earlier, we have an existing use that had been on site for a long time. In order to correctly evaluate in the context of CEQA the net project impact, the difference between the existing baseline site was sixty-two thousand seven hundred thirteen square feet of warehouse compare to the proposed one hundred twenty nine thousand eight hundred and thirty total square feet building was calculated and resulted in a net total of two hundred and twenty-two passenger car equivalent. This is in terms of that converted number as I mention. When you think about it, this existing use that is out there or was out there until a couple of years ago was actually included in the traffic counts that we used as a basis to factor up and get to our hypothetical 2021 conditions. We are very comfortable with this approach and the fact that the Pepsi plant was accounted for in the analysis in the volumes that we dealt with. We had

a project trip distribution that we developed based on existing traffic patterns, reviewed with City Staff, and went through an approval process. About forty-five percent of the project traffic is expected to go up to Arrow Highway and go either east or west. There is a fairly substantial proportion that is expected to go west on Los Angeles Street to access the 605 freeway, or other locally intervening destinations between. A fairly substantial proportion is expected to go down to San Bernardino Road to the south, about twenty percent total. We then, as I mentioned, looked at existing conditions in two sets of future conditions. What we saw under the existing conditions analysis, is that we have two intersections today; Azusa Canyon Road at Los Angeles Street, and Azusa Canyon Road at Arrow Highway that are currently experiencing levels of services that are not meeting the City's level of service standards. That is something that directed our thoughts about mitigation improvements that could be made to improve travel through the City of Irwindale. As I mentioned, we look at both an interim year 2022, kind of an opening year condition for the project, then a 2040 long range condition with or without the project. We found that the same two intersections will continue to have problems if there are not improvements. None of the other intersections that we looked at experience deficiencies in level of service. So those are the two intersections that we focused in on in terms of making sure that we have to improve conditions at those two locations. This side presents the improvements that are being proposed. For the intersection that is directly adjacent to the project site, Azusa Canyon Road at Los Angeles Street and with the private access roadway for the east leg of that intersection, the project is going to contribute five hundred fifty thousand dollars to install traffic signal control at the intersection. The striping of this intersection is going to be modified. The primary changes is the east bound direction, there is currently a lot of people making a left turn at this intersection to go up Azusa Canyon Road. I was out there today and I can say there are a lot of people out there trying to make that left turn, with a stop sign it takes a while to get through there. With the traffic signal, we are going to create a situation where you have two lanes were you can make a left lane from them, an exclusive left turn from the inside lane, a shared left turn through lane, next lane over, and then we will keep the existing right turn out there as well. We looked at a change to the west bound approach of converting it to a left turn lane and a shared right turn lane, because of the sensitivities of the private owner of that access driveway, what you'll see on the concept plans that we have developed and we will have in here later. We did not touch those stripings on the concept plans, we won't need to unless the property owner decides that they want to do that on a cooperative bases. The other section is much further away from the project up Azusa Canyon Road and Arrow Highway, just north of us here. For that intersection the project's responsibility is to contribute its fair share towards developing a new westbound through lane at the intersection. That will result in an approved level of service that meets the City's Levels of Service

thresholds and standards. This slide just simply shows the projects fair share contribution to the volumes of these intersections. You can see particularly for Azusa Canyon Road at Los Angeles Street the project's fair share is less than ten percent. The project is really going above and beyond here to make sure that, that intersection is improved to all of the folks who travel through it. This slide shows site access recommendation. The intersection as I mentioned verbally before is actually a proposed left turn lane and there is a shared left through lane that isn't showing up on the slide, but is part of what you see on the concept alternatives that are coming up. All of the other improvements here for site access are strictly related to the site itself and do not required any changes to the adjacent roadway system nor to the private driveway, that is going to be access by two of the projects access driveways. For safety purposes a few changes, the project is going to reconfigure the existing driveways that are currently kind of approaching the roadways intersection within a diagonal making them a ninety degree approach. That makes it easier for the driver to see what is going on when they are attempting to join the traffic that is on the adjacent street. The project is going to be constructing pedestrian facilities. I think Dina already touched on the meandering sidewalks along the project frontage. They are going to be improving the ADA pedestrian accessible ramp on that north east corner to meet current standards. It does not right now. As I said I was out there today and that will be a nice little improvement there as well. The most important improvement that is related to Azusa Canyon Road at Los Angeles Street in providing crosswalks. Right now there is one crosswalk across the north end of the intersection and that is it. We traffic engineers like to see the ability for pedestrians to cross to all corners of an intersection in a safe matter, meaning that you need to provide crosswalks at least three legs of the intersection that will then connect all four corners, one way or the other. There is also a need based on the analysis to restrict the on-street parking on the east side of Azusa Canyon Road, which is right there in front of the project site there. Because we are now putting a second left turn lane for those east bound vehicles that didn't need to go northbound, trucks will be in that outside lane. We did some truck turning analysis as well and concluded that removing that parking is also necessary to facilitate the ability for those trucks to turn simultaneously with the passenger car using the inside lane. There used to be a removal of parking on the private driveway. The owner of that driveway express sensitivity to that so we have found a way to improve pedestrian safety probably even further and allow that parking to remain for that private user. As always, as actual plans are developed we will be reviewing those with city, oh well whoever does the designs will be reviewing those with City Staff and making sure that the more detailed the plans get the more confident we are as engineers that we are providing a safe environment for cars, bicyclist, pedestrians, all the road users. That brings me to the concept striping plans. As Dina mentioned, we have developed two alternatives. This is alternative one. We prefer to put

crosswalks across the less busy legs of intersections. If we are going to need to omit a crosswalk, we would rather have it be one of the busier ones. We think because of all of those left turning vehicles the number of vehicles using Los Angeles Street to the west of the intersection, the crosswalk across the west leg is prudent. You can see at the bottom we've created a conceptual little bulb-out into the street to shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians. We have checked and made sure that trucks can make that turn, and proceed south if they need to. This particular alternative shows a crosswalk on the east leg. Again, what I call bulb-out which brings the ramp and the sidewalk out a little further and reduces the crossing distance for pedestrians. That crosswalk, that pedestrian bulb-out improvement is on private property, and given the sensitivities that we heard expressed we then went ahead a developed a second alternative. This alternative has no improvements what so ever on anyone's private property, everything is within public right of way. What it does is that it moves that third crosswalk down to the south leg of the intersection. Just to reiterate what Dina said previously, there are strong measures in the Conditions of Approval, in the Mitigation Monitoring Program that the City will have the right to continually monitor at the owners expense the actual trips generated by this project to ensure that we are meeting the estimates of trip generations that we produce and ensuring that we don't cross over any thresholds that we stated would not be crossed. That is essentially supported by the subsequent three bullets that indicate the requirements for technical memorandum that will demonstrate, that the trip generated thresholds are being met, that will allow the City to coordinate with the occupant of this building regarding the timing of truck trips, if that becomes an issue. Should any of these analysis show that any of these thresholds are being excited then that would put us in a position where this then could come back for further CEQA review, as Dina had already mentioned. Just to summarize we had two intersections that have been impacted on north Azusa Canyon Road of off Los Angeles Street directly adjacent to the project site. Azusa Canyon at Arrow Highway, they were both, when we did the analysis were experiencing unacceptable levels of services under today's conditions. With the improvements that have been proposed through our technical analysis those levels of services will be improved to level of service C, which is acceptable to the city. This table is a tabular summary of what I just said. I am not going to go into any further detail. With that I am going to turn this back over to Dina, I think. Or Brandi, excuse me. Pardon me, Brandi will take over.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Hey, so Brandi we are still in the Public Hearing. At this time and I want to know, If we can check Mr. Hernandez if there is other input or questions either in house or on Zoom.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Let's start with Tier 1. No.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES: Well the applicant had a presentation, is this the time for them to do it?

CHAIR GOMEZ: Yes.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES: Okay.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Unless the Commissioners had specific questions for Staff or the consultants.

CHAIR GOMEZ: We will go to the questions but you can go ahead and make your presentation sir.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ: While he does that, my name is Michael Ramirez. I am with Rexford. I am part of the construction team that's overseeing the project. So if you have any questions specific to it, high level, I would love to think I can help you out with that. So a lot of this information we covered. What I think I liked to do is go through this slide. We added updated renderings. This represents the south west corner elevation. It is a real nice design that we put together. We went back and forth a few times and actually had time between our first PC Hearing in February to get these renderings done so we can put this together. Next slide, yeah perfect. A lot of what I am going to say is who we are as a company. We can talk to specifics of the project, we have done that quite a bit tonight but overall. I believe you have hard copies of the proposal so I will run through this quick. You can look at it in detail if you want. We are a publicly traded REIT and we are excusive to Southern California and the industrial market. We have a tremendous diverse portfolio of thirty-eight million square feet over three hundred properties, like I said all over Southern California. What we do is we create value. We take older buildings, distressed buildings, either reposition or TI. If it is a building that just adds volume we will redevelop the entire property. We are a long term owner. We manage all the projects in-house through property management. The goal is to establish long term relationships with whoever the tenants are that we bring to the property. We have low vacancies and there is a real strong demand to support this current market that we are in, in regards to industrial. We own and manage significant assets in the SGV. This is not just a one-off, it is something that we are invested in and will continue to invest in. We are also a member of the Irwindale Chamber of Commerce as well. This is an important slide. The ESG, the goals and benefits I think is what separates us or apart from other developers. We have a huge, huge effort that we've put together in the past that we are implanting now and we will continue to upgrade. I think that it is very important to everyone now, not just the people here but residents throughout that this project will be a LEED Silver Project. I feel like we are going above

and beyond, but our above and beyond is the minimum of what we will do. We will improve local property values and taxes once we develop this property. That is what we forecast. That is what is tried and true that, that is what will happen. We just had a very detailed conversation about how we are reducing regional truck miles and commute miles. What is best about this is that we create local jobs and then we engage with the community, as we do that throughout this planning processes, throughout construction, and then once we turn it over to tenants and operations. Here is a couple of different elevations we have. The top one is new. It's the, I want to say north/west elevation, as opposed to the existing which are at the bottom. That is what the building looks like now, so it is a tremendous improvement. The information to the right we went over, so I will skip over that because it is project specific and it was in the presentation earlier. This is the site plan we have seen it a bunch of times. This is a focus on the meandering sidewalk as well as the landscape. Also we have seen this too as well, it is the welcome to Irwindale fountain. So in summary, obviously a new Class A building in place of a building that has run its course. That property needs to be developed. LEED Silver that is what this project will be when it is completed. The amount of revenue that this project is going to bring to the City, as oppose to a vacant building that is sitting there now. I think that is a huge, one of the biggest parts of the presentation. With that, that is where Rexford stands for. Any questions, or do you leave it open?

CHAIR GOMEZ

Thank you, we will leave it open. We probably do have some questions. We are going to go back to communications. Is there anybody in the tiers Mr. Hernandez?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

Let me start off with just reading the letters again so they can be part of the Public Hearing.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Yeah.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

We did get an email for Paul Porter representing the owners of the property at 4414 Azusa Canyon Drive, implementing that the matter on the agenda be continued to the next Planning Commission meeting, to allow us to run these issues to their conclusion with our neighbor, and to explore ways to eliminate the serious traffic problems inherent in the current plan. And he also attached a traffic study that they conducted. The next letter is from Jon P. Preciado, Business Manager from LiUNA, stating that, "On behalf of over 32,800 members and ten affiliated local unions throughout Southern California, I write to relay out strong support for the project." The next letter is from Ron Herrera, Teammasters Local 396, stating, "We respectfully request that the City of Irwindale reject the proposed IS/MND, or impose conditions on the ultimate use of the property that would justify the assumptions in the IS/MND. The last letter is from Victoria Yundt, LOZEAU, stating "the

project will result in significant impacts to air quality, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic and that the MND's conclusions are not supported by substantial evidence. SAFER respectfully requests that the City prepare an EIR rather than an MND prior to approval of the Project."

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you for that.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Okay. We do have some members on Zoom that would like to speak. I will first be unmuting Paul Porter.

PAUL PORTER — Am I unmuted?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Yes.

PAUL PORTER — Okay, great thank you. My name is Paul Porter, I wrote that email. I am an attorney at Hill, Farrer & Burrill and I represent the owners of the property at 4414 Azusa Canyon. We are Decorative Specialties. We have operated for decades. We bring revenue to this Community and have for decades. My client is not anti-development. I tried to explain all of this. If you read my March 15th, 2022 letter, and if you read my email yesterday I really don't have a lot to add to it. We are not anti-development but we have some very serious concerns about what this project and what you are approving is going to do to our access, our ability to reach the public street as well as impacts on the intersection. Whether it is signal lights or not. Some of that is spelled out in the report that was attached to my email yesterday. Cutting to the chase and sitting aside the technical issues that I might touch on later, if I have time or given a little more time. My thought here is, we came to this as a cooperative neighbor trying to find solutions not just spike stripping a project. My client has actually invested money and hired a consultant and said to them, "find solutions." Immediately our concern was that the City's traffic analysis does not factor in impacts to us. It does not factor in our use. There is a bunch of particular details about that most notably that all of the truck traffic for this project is through our property. The two driveways which are not differentiated in the City analysis, those two driveways are between us and the public street system. In particular the one that is closes to the intersection of our drive way and Los Angeles Street and Azusa Pacific. The first driveway is so close to it that our consultant has concluded that trucks attempting to get in and out, and as all this trucks who have to use the same portion of the property as they conflict with each other are gonna back up and further cause problems with that. We have come up with a solution. Regrettably it took us time to do it. It is a difficult time to find consultants but we have done it. We have spent the money on it. We like to be able to have time to sit down with the City, have my

consultant sit down with the City, to sit down with the project proponent to see if we can come up with a solution that works for everybody. We think we found one. We think that one of the diagrams you had before showed the intersection at Olive and Azusa is working just fine. Several of the grades are A and B's on there. What our solution is, restriping of Azusa right next to this project to allow for use of the driveway on Azusa.

CHAIR GOMEZ Mr. Porter?

PAUL PORTER Yes Ma'am.

CHAIR GOMEZ Okay, let him go? You want to hear him? Continue Mr. Porter. The Commissioners would like to hear.

PAUL PORTER I am sorry, was I not clear?

CHAIR GOMEZ You were at a time limit but one of the Commissioners asked you to continue so please.

PAUL PORTER I'll wrap it up because I did summarize that. But our solution is to basically restripe the rest of the street as it is restriped already up the street next to the Sriracha factory, the Huy Fong Foods at Olive. That would allow use of the driveway that is on Azusa, and if we can use that driveway for this project, it is not our project, we think it benefits the City. We certainly think it benefits the project and it certainly benefits us because what it does, is it allows trucks to go one direction through this project. They go in one door and they go out the other, rather than both the end and the out being in my clients property. We tried to work cooperatively with the project proponent. We totally understand their need to push this forward. We just want the availability and an opportunity to explore with the City, whether or not this is an acceptable solution because we think it is. We think it's proven. Rexford, with my understanding, at least doesn't have a visceral objection to it. In fact they may have proposed something similar but without a modification to the stripping on the street that I think makes it feasible. That is all we are asking for. If what we have proposed can be baked into the approval tonight then we are on board with it. But if there hasn't been enough time, or we really don't have an opportunity to try to work through the details of that, and it shouldn't be just a yes or no we might be able to message a solution. My client, as a neighbor, wants to work with these guys. Whoever they put in there as a tenant we are going to have to get along with them. We want to see it work and we think we've come up with a better idea, and we just want the time to discuss it and to see if it can work. For that reason if the project cant include that irritation, which is not part of the presentation tonight and that is not Staff's fault, then we ask for a continuation to the next hearing to allow us time to explore that with our neighbor. That is it, I've gone over my time. I won't go over any of

the sort of technical issues that I find but I think my letter mentions most or all of those. I thank you for your time and I am happy to answer any questions you might have. By the way, the proposed restriping that we are talking about if you look at my email it should be the very last page because it is the last page of the consultant report that my client spent its money getting. We wanted to see that, that wasn't a total waste of time and we can see that it might be used. These are smart people and if they get a seat at the table maybe we can come up with a solution that everybody is happy with.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, Mr. Porter.

PAUL PORTER — Thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — I will now be unmuting Victoria Yundt.

VICTORIA YUNDT — Good evening, my name is Victoria Yundt. I am an attorney at Lozeau, Drury speaking on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER). SAFER request that the Planning Commission refrain from adopting the resolutions recommending that the City Council approve the MND for the proposed warehouse project until an EIR is prepared. Several overarching factors support requiring an EIR for the project. First, the MND cannot be relied upon to determine the significance of the project's air quality impacts because the air model underestimated the project's construction and operational emissions. Second, the MND inadequately analyzed the project's impact on human health from diesel particulate matter emissions, on nearby sensitive receptors by failing to prepare a quantified construction Health Risk Assessment, and by including an operational Health Risk Assessment that fails to evaluate the cumulative lifetime cancer risk to nearby existing receptors, as a result of project construction and operation together. Lastly, the MND inadequately addresses the projects significant impacts on GHG emissions as a result of construction and operation, because the MND and the responds to comments incorrectly evaluates the projects GHG emissions and the MND RTC quantitative GHG analysis relies upon an outdated threshold, and indicate a potentially significant GHG impact under the fair argument standard. Also, in the comment letter that we submitted today we have a huge list of mitigated measures that I think the City Staff should look at before they adopt the MND and they should also include it in the EIR. Given the substantial evidence of significant impacts to the environment from the project construction and operation, the Commission should recommend that an EIR is prepared for the project. Thank you so much for your time and consideration this evening.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: I will now be unmuting Steve Masura.

STEVE MASURA: Hello Commissioners, I am Steve Masura. Hello. Can you hear me I am sorry?

CHAIR GOMEZ: Yes, we can hear you.

STEVE MASURA: I am Steve Masura, Director of Entitlements for Rexford. Mr. Michael Ramirez did such a great job, I don't really have anything to add right now. I was just raising my hand in case I needed to add something. We have our team available. We also have our attorney, who will also be responding to some of the comments as well. We appreciate your consideration tonight to finally get this before you. Thank you, I will relinquish my time.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Question, I have another hand raised by Steve Masura. Is that the same one?

STEVE MASURA: Yeah, it is the same one you can disregard.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Those are all the members on Zoom.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Thank you. So at this time…

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Oh, we do have a new one.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Okay, go ahead.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: It will be Andrew Fogg.

ANDREW FOGG: Yes, hey good evening Commissioners my name is Andrew Fogg. I am an attorney with Cox, Castle and Nicholson and we represent Rexford. I would like to respond to a few of the comments that Mr. Porter made. There were a lot of candidly factual inaccuracies about the traffic improvements. The traffic improvement document that was prepared by Urban Crossroads and perhaps the representative from PlaceWorks or Urban Crossroads might want to respond to those. If you look at the exhibits within that document it actually allocates the usage among all

the driveways. Driveway one, which is directly onto Azusa Canyon, Driveways two and three which relate to the private driveway. There is a deeded easement that runs in favor of Rexford to use that driveway for ingress and egress. They have legal rights to use that. According to the TIA, the Traffic Impact Assessment, forty-six percent of the truck traffic is estimated to be using the driveway one. We will never use their driveway. He said that everything goes through that driveway and he is just factually incorrect. He said that the two different driveways are not differentiated, that is factually incorrect. The TIA goes through in exhibits 4-2 and 5.2, both the analysis of how the trips are going to be use in the A.M. peak. The project over the baseline is expected to generate ten trips on driveway two, and four trip in driveway three. This is not huge increases. This is not sky is falling type of analysis that they would make you think. In the P.M. peak is twelve trips. Just to be clear in the A.M. peak it is eight in and two out in driveway two, and three in and one out in driveway three. The P.M. peak its twelve trips three in and nine out, and four trips one in three out. These are small numbers in terms of increasing during these P.M. peak numbers. By comparison the traffic improvement if you look at the assessment, the site if you look at their use they have a total of sixty trips in the A.M. peak and a total of ninety trips in the P.M. peak. Twenty-nine out and thirty-one in the A.M. and seventy-four out and twenty-six in the P.M. With their project, with our project constructed the Rexford project would only have thirty one percent of the trips in the A.M. peak and twenty-five percent of the trips in the P.M. peak in the driveway. So the notion that this wasn't analyzed and that everything is being forced onto their driveway is just factually incorrect. It is not support by any evidence and his testimony to the contrary is not substantial evidence upon which you can rely. The TIA speaks for itself. It analysis everything that has been done. There are no impacts here. Ironically the proposal that they would make, rather than giving the ability to distribute trucks out to go turn right towards Azusa Canyon would force one-hundred percent of the trucks from the driveway three out onto their site. It would actually be an intensification of the use of the driveway beyond what is being done now, where there is operational flexibility to make sure that if there is a backup on the driveway they send them out the other direction, and avoid exacerbating any back up under their conditions that would not be possible. From the comments regarding SAFER all of these were analyzed and responded to adequately by PlaceWorks in the responds to comments. I don't think we need to add anything else. Again a lot of the information, detailed responses were prepared. I think everything is sufficient for the Planning Commission to rely upon and move forward. There has been a lot of delay on this project. We appreciate the efforts that our neighbors have put in. We are happy to continue talking with them to find ways to work together cooperatively. That is in everyone's interest and we want to do that. Notably there is nothing that their site plan or their consultant recommends as a change to the site plan. They are talking about operational uses and potential restriping of the street but

nothing would change to the project or the improvements. We don't see any reasons for additional delay. As I said, Rexford is committed to being a good neighbor. We will continue the conversation but we respectfully request that the Planning Commission act on this matter today, allow it to go to the City Council for final action, and allow this project to proceed. With that I thank you for your time and attention. Also, I like to thank the Staff, and PlaceWorks, and Urban Crossroads for their efforts to find creative solutions that eliminate any impacts at all to the neighboring property. With that, I thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you. Any additional speakers?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Those are all our speakers, thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you so much Mr. Hernandez. So at this time we are going to have continuing the Public Hearing, where the Commission has opportunity to ask questions. We will then close the Public Hearing and we will have discussion. If you have any questions for Staff or for the consultants, now is the time to do so.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — The MND, you guys, I believe the TI Measure…

CHAIR GOMEZ — Please step forward to the podium and identify yourself, and then we will have these questions according to…

DINA GASS — Traffic measures. I need traffic questions.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay so the traffic analysis was used as, using a speculative building and for the usage per the zoning of that site. When you guys did the analysis, there was no impact significant to doing an EIR. Is that what I heard correctly?

CARLETON WATERS — Well from a CEQA standpoint the impacts are related to the VMT under today's rules, and so they did not meet the screening for the net increase in trips compare to the building that was out there and in use for a long time. That ended the CEQA portion of the traffic impact evaluation. The City's General Plan Circulation Element Policy on the other hand, still relies on level of service. What the study found is that there are two intersections that are having issues today. The project contributes traffic. I don't believe that the levels of service change but because of the traffic contribution, we looked at improvements for every scenario and showed that with the improvements that I described earlier, we can approve the levels of service acceptable.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: This is based on the initial analysis so say if the building is build and you have a tenant occupying the building, and it is a business that has higher VMT, who is responsible to do the analysis at that point? So we are probably going to need another analysis once the occupant, whoever it is going to be, is in the building. Is that something that we are going to be doing? Or is that something the City… I guess Daniel is going to answer that question.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: When a tenant does come in, we will look at that project at that time, look at the trip generation, and then see if it exceeds. If it does exceed we will do another CEQA analysis at that time. I think the Planning Commission will decided whether or not to retain Urban Crossroads and Placeworks again, to do that additional analysis.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay so you are going to oversee it, and they are going to provide, you know, the analysis.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Right.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay and that is in the CUP, correct?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: It is in the Conditions of Approval.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, so it is under, I believe Daniel, it is under page sixty-two of sixty-nine of the new documents.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Um, condition twenty.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: So it does say, "The City will regularly and continually monitor the actual trips generated." So by the City regularly monitoring you are going to have the owner have a consultant do an analysis?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: No, I mean the City would typically do that analysis but it would be funded by the owner.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, and then you guys will have someone come in, and do it for the City.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: I mean we will monitor and make sure that it doesn't exceed the daily, and if it does we can bring someone on to actually do the analysis.

VICE-CHAIR: Okay, so if there is like a problem or we are seeing a high volume of

BURROLA — traffic there then the City will get involved?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Absolutely, that is why it written that way, to give us that flexibility to monitor while these conditions are in place, which is moving forward.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, also in the T-1 it talks about, "submit final improvement plans for the Azusa Canyon Road/Los Angeles Street intersection including the new traffic signal/cross walk stripping." According to the Condition of Approval it talks about, how the owner and development shall construct the following improvements. It doesn't really talk about how, you know, they will be responsible for the traffic plans. They are responsible for five hundred and fifty thousand towards the actual traffic signal, but what about the plans?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Their contribution will go towards the development of the plans and constructing those improvements.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, so can we add that? That they are going to be actually providing the traffic signal plans for us to review.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — They are not providing the traffic signal plans. They are just contributing this cost, this dollar amount, towards the preparation of those plans and constructing these improvements.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, cause according to the T-1 it is a little confusing then.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — We can modify that to be more accurate if need be.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, so the City will be in charge of…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Well the City will be approving the plans. There is another project that is required to do the improvements and draw the plans. The City will be approving the plans, and overseeing the construction, and really pushing the project forward.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — The owner is part of the five-hundred fifty or is it…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — The owner of this project is just contributing this five-hundred and fifty-thousand towards that, and the City with another party will be driving the rest of the construction and the development of the plans constructing the signal.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Oh, okay I see. So that five-hundred and fifty is including the traffic plans that the City is gonna…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: It will go towards that, yes.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay. Did the City look into, I know we are going to look into it later but, did you guys reach out to Metrolink? You know, what we are planning on doing in the future.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Yes we have. So they have viewed preliminary plans. We are getting comments from them. Unfortunately, it takes a long time with dealing with these agencies. They are on board. They understand what we are trying to do. We have been in contact with them, even our Director Arsanious Hanna, has reached out to their Staff. We have a contact there, so we are in communication with them.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: These are just the conceptual plans that were shown here, it doesn't really show anything for the Metrolink crossing.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Correct, this project is just paying a fair share into that, it doesn't necessary get into the detail of that crossing, but with the final design we will be.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, are we going to see that, or is this part of the CUP? Are we going to approve those, or are you guys just going to…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: It is going to go to City Council. Those final design plans, once the Staff has review them. We will take it to City Council for approval.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, so it won't come to the Planning Commission? That would be nice if they did. Okay, um…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: We can bring it back as maybe a discussion item or presentation.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: So then the other lawyers from I guess, what is the…

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN: Porter.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Porter. So they were talking about driveways and that is a little something new to me, because I always thought the driveway going into the back. So it is the one next to the Metrolink. It is the one that provides access to the business.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Yeah, parallel to Metrolink.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Is that an easement or is that privately owned? Because now I am thinking that driveway belongs to…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: So it is both. It is a private street that is owned by Decorative. Rexford does hold an easement that also them ingress, you know, allows them access in and out of that site. We did review that document and it does grant them that right.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: So then, do we have to do anything as a City to change the easement? to allow for this new…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: No, as far as I am aware, unless Legal Counsel has another opinion.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: No the City wouldn't have control over changing that easement because it is a private issue between the two property owners.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: That would be a problem there wouldn't you say, if the property owner is not allowing them access to this driveway for their truck traffic.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: They have access rights according to the easement that they are holding.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Who has access rights?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Rexford, the project applicant.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: They do?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Yeah, they do.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Cause I was hearing something different, that is why. I am making sure that we looked into this and we are not…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Yeah, again we reviewed that access easement documents and they do have those rights.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, alright. Yeah, that is all I have Daniel. Thank you.

Planning Commissioner Chico was not using the microphone to speak, therefore, the audio was not recorded and unintelligible.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY: Commissioner Chico, I think your mic is off.

HERNANDEZ

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: I can hear you, yeah.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: It is not turning on. There we go.

COMMISSIONER CHICO: If you come up with new parameters basically simply speaking all you have done, maybe allow just using a figure ten marked cars or whatever. All you have done is increase the mileage or the number of trips per day. Suppose we can't reach a reasonable agreement. Maybe the traffic is too much, whatever that may be, what do we do then?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: The purpose of the traffic analysis is to identify the impacts first, figure out how much trips it is adding, what the impacts are, where the impacts are, whether or not the impacts are significant, and then they go into, they proposed mitigation that would bring the level impacts back to less than significant levels, or before the project, or prior to the project being implemented. Typically it would just identify the problems and then propose improvements to mitigate them. If there is no mitigations available then it would be a significate and unavoidable impact, I assume.

COMMISSIONER CHICO: Oh, that is a fancy word but does it mean that we stop the business from operating if necessary. Does that mean that?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: I think that it just means there is a new CEQA analysis. I will let Dina speak to that.

DINA GASS: Yeah, it is a two-step process, or maybe a three-step process. First the analyses, and then a good effort to include additional Mitigation Measures in case those are needed to bring the impact to less than significant. Then if it is still found to be significant and unavoidable then we go into the findings and the overrides, where the City needs to assess whether the positives with the project; economics, jobs, you know all the positive aspects of the project, override any kind of significant and unavoidable impacts. So that would be the CEQA process and how we would go through that. Of course at that point, if it is found that the VMT threshold has been exceeded and more CEQA analysis needs to be done, we go through the CEQA process again, and we come before you again, and you make a decision at that point. It's not just…

COMMISSIONER CHICO: So far it is kind of redundant, more analysis, and more analysis, and more analysis.

DINA GASS

It does insure that the current analysis is valid and not exceeded. I think also JoAnn would like to speak. She is also from PlaceWorks, the Principal on this project.

JOANN HADFIELD

I just wanted to clarify a little bit why this came up…

CHAIR GOMEZ

Please state your name.

JOANN HADFIELD

Oh, I am sorry. JoAnn Hadfield, Principal Environmental Services for PlaceWorks. I have been involved from this project from the outset. First of all, I want to be sure that everyone is talking about the vehicle miles traveled metric and not the level of service for intersections. What we are talking about, this Mitigation Measure was to come back and confirm that the project once implemented did stay under the one hundred and ten vehicle miles traveled that was the threshold, that meant more detailed analysis wasn't available. The way that this measure came up is because the actual analysis per the Office of Planning and Research CEQA proposed for it came up with one-hundred and nine VMT. So CalTrans and others came back and said, "That is so close, what is your backup plan?" It legitimately fell under the threshold, but the City agreed we can monitor the trips to confirm that the methodology is accurate and that the trips are under that one-hundred and ten vehicle mileage trips average, that doesn't exceeded the threshold. In talking to Daniel and crafting the conditional approval, all this happen again you have the warehousing manufacturing mix and the estimates that are associated with that. The City will follow up at the time of TI's and the Occupancy Permits to be sure those are accurate. The actual measure, the actual condition is monitoring those trips to be sure they don't exceed that one ten (110). Daniel assures me they can do that with cameras and other measures to verify. If those trips were too high I don't think that you necessary have to go to a CEQA processes. I think that you would have to reduce the square footage that is approve with the Occupancy Permits, so that would reduce the trips to the below one-hundred and ten VMT. If that was exceeded then it would be subject to additional CEQA review before it could be approved, but it also couldn't be operational until it was approved again. I know it is very confusing but if I can answer any questions, let me know. I just want to clarify, the condition is already set and it is not that we are going to come back and go, "Oh that didn't work. We need to do more analysis, more analysis, more analysis." It was just a verification, CalTrans said, "This is awfully close make us more comfortable with it." We offer an additional condition that the City would actually monitor to verify that the VMT is below the threshold. None of this applies to the level of service analysis.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO

So really the purpose was to make sure that they are within what we analysis and if they do exceed it, then we would propose new improvements and that they would contribute the fair share cost for

those improvements, so the City can go ahead and make those improvements and improve the congestion and traffic.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — A question would be, what additional improvement can we do if we are doing them now?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Well depending on the impact, the improvements would differ. They would be specific to that impact. So depending what the turning movement is that is causing the significant impact, you can mitigate it with additional lanes, striping additional lanes, changing the length of configuration, timing, adding additional lanes. There is a wide range of improvements you can. As I understand, I believe the applicant has something to say.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Once again, Michael Ramirez with Rexford. So the conditions of approval, everything that is set at this point gets us to the point where we build it. Once it is build we have property management, leasing in-house and they will know what those specifics are that we are talking about. We will have our property manager deal with the Director of Operations, or whoever that person is for that tenant represents the tenant, monitoring that as long as with the City as well. I guess that is second level of working together with the City to make sure that is. What happens after that, they spoke to that but on our part we know what those numbers are, that all gets funnel down to the end user. We monitor in-house not third party, in-house. I just wanted to add that.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Mr. Ramirez, so the thing that brings up these variables of congestion and pollution is because we don't know who you are going to have in there. One of the things that California is doing right now, the Green Movement, moving gradually to trucks with green fuel. What kind of marketing or creative measures do you take in that kind of environment?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — So it is a LEED Silver building, so there is certain issues regarding mechanical, electrical, plumbing efficiency with our systems. One of the other things that we do is, we put outlets at each truck bay so that trucks that want electricity and want to use that, they have to have their trucks on…

CHAIR GOMEZ — Excuse me, are you trying to draw in companies or users that also follow that kind of protocol of a green environment in California?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — It is one of our main, I want to say, when you have a pool of tenants focus is on that type of tenants. We have long partnerships with our tenants so we have to be align and think alike in those terms. I'll tell you this, the amount of tenants that want those opportunities or are moving that way, whether they like it or not it's being forced slowly but surely. That is who we want to partner with. Our leasing team is great at attacking those potential tenants.

CHAIR GOMEZ — But you've seen the progression that we had in these meetings, is that you have answered the questions, and you've done a good in coming up with information. Now, with that you have spoken that you are going to bring jobs, it's a new business, you renovated an old building. Pepsi Co. is a great company they moved away. How do you speak to Paul Porter's issues? I've looked at the emails. I know that our Staff attempted many times to set up a meeting to discuss these issues. This is going to be your neighbor and you are sharing a driveway, how do you propose to reconcile your compatibility in this environment?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yeah, so there is two things. One is, we have the easement. That is not in question, that egress and ingress.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Yes, that is not in question, but he has concerns about his own business and traffic.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Correct. So the first thing was that I will bring up, the last time that we were here there were ten parking stalls, on that private road that were going to be eliminated. We all worked to figure out how we could keep them. That is a good neighbor. That is us saying, "We are going to lose months getting this project approved, working for him to keep those parking spaces." We offered parking spaces on our property once it gets developed. If he were to lose those, now he is not losing those. We have taken the time to go back and forth and figure out this configuration of these crosswalks. That has taken time.

CHAIR GOMEZ — I applaud you on that, that's nice.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — And then…

CHAIR GOMEZ — So one of the questions was, we just got this so I just had a chance to breeze through it quickly, but his concerns is the traffic at certain times of the day. We can't really address it concretely. I think that is the concern of the Commission, is that what business are you bringing in and what potential can happen when we are speaking to the traffic congestion. On the reports it is not because they are not adequate, they are very adequate but we don't even know what the potential tenant is. So the question is, according to what he says about his traffic. They have been to Irwindale a long time as well and we are welcoming you wholehearted. Have you reviewed that and what do you think about it?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — We have. We have talked about it internally. I know that Andrew Fogg, our attorney, has talked to Paul Porter several times especially in the last two weeks to get to the point to where it's not, it's not, this is off the table or this is on the table. I mean there is several, there is three.

There is two alternatives that we have and then there is one that was proposed by Paul Porter.

CHAIR GOMEZ — So you are working in a collaborative effort?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — We have been working on it. If we hadn't been, I think we would have gone to the mat, sort to speak, a while back. From February sixteen to September twenty-first, we have been extremely patient but diligent in trying to find all these different avenues. Half of the time people were on vacation so you can't really do anything about that. When we have to get to work, we all rolled up our sleeves and said, "Let's figure this out together." One of the things is, getting the project passed tonight for the approval. There is still work to be done but at least we are passed that hurdle, sort to speak, and now we can look to City Council. We still are going to be working at this. We truly are a good neighbor. I don't think we would be here and all these work and efforts would be presented in front of you, if we weren't. I hope that answers the questions.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, yes. Then I have an additional question. Thank you Mr. Ramirez. Brandi, so I was contemplating when we did the study and when we shared about the environmental impact. When we talk about in the presentation, all impacts were found to be less than significant without mitigation except for air quality etc. etc, and then the Mitigation Measures reduces these impacts to less than significate. That particular slide. You don't have to put it up.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — Oh okay.

CHAIR GOMEZ — So the question I had was, we have been doing in the City the Housing component. One of the issues that has come up, mandated by the state again is the environmental justice, which speaks specifically to congestion and pollution. With the one mitigation, I think we only had one right? OT, right? OT1. Do you think that it is significant to speak to the increase in traffic and to the potential congestion even though we thought we mitigated to a certain degree now? Then we have all these other variables that speak to, cause we don't know what is coming in. We do not know if there is going to be more or less. How as a Staff do you feel that the Environmental Justice component, as to congestion, and pollution, and communities is addressing in the Environmental Justice as to this project.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — It would probably be best if answered by the consultant.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, thank you.

DINA GASS — In terms of environmental justice, the way that it is addressed in the IS/MND is through the health risk assessments. The health risk assessments, the main goal of that is to look at truck traffic, to look at truck emission both on the site and off the site. What we have done also, we've done both phases construction and operation. That health risk assessment specifically…

CHAIR GOMEZ — I just want to clarify, as you are going through this before I lose my train of thought. So when you do the assessment of truck emission, is it only to this project or is it to all the truck emission in that area, because we do have a lot of other trucks. Can you answer that question for me?

DINA GASS — We do also have our Air Quality online if he wants to add to that. In terms of the requirements or the standards for Health Risk Assessments, they do include only during the operation on the site…

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, okay, okay.

DINA GASS — Yeah, for what they call sensitive receptors in the area. So you look at the area to this site there are some sensitive receptors. I think there is a residential home that is close to the site and then there is are mobiles homes also close to the site. Perhaps one school because there is a certain radius that you look at. What we did is the impact on those sensitive receptors from the operations and construction on the site. We did also look at other kind of warehousing projects, both proposed and existing, and did an analysis of how that would accumulate with what's coming from the site. In terms of what is required per the standards and what we really dug into is operations and construction, from the proposed project to the sensitive receptors.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, so it was only as to the site not to the other congestion or traffic from the other businesses?

DINA GASS — There was a discussion of the industrial facilities because those are primarily truck producing uses, so we did include a discussion about that, but the detailed analysis is from the site per the standards.

JOANN HADFIELD — I think we need to unmute John. Is John available?

DINA GASS — Yes, John is available. Can you unmute him?

JOANN HADFIELD — I think he can explain the Health Risk Assessment and cumulative approach on how the threshold work better than anyone of us.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, if John can please state his first and last name for the record.

JOHN VANG

Hey, yes. Good evening Commissioner and the Public, my name is John Vang. I am with PlaceWorks and I assisted in preparing the air quality, greenhouse gas, and risk assessment for this project. In terms of health risks, extending from what Dina as already mentioned. In terms of the health risk and how we determine whether it would be less than significant or significant health risk impacts, is based on South Coast AQMD's accepted significant threshold. Based on their threshold, the cancerous risk threshold of ten in one million its use for both at the project level and cumulative as well. In terms of how we set up the risk assessment, as Dina mentioned we looked at the emissions that would occur on the site that is from just the truck traveling within the site, also any truck idling that would occur from the site. Additional, we also access potential impacts from trucks traveling on the roadways, as well. Based on that analysis, I think the main arterials that we looked at was, let me pull them up here, was Los Angeles Street and Azusa Canyon Road. So primarily we do just focus on the impacts that would be generated by the proposed project. As Dina mentioned, we also in terms of a cumulative assessment, we also did look at three other warehousing projects that I believe were on the City's cumulative project list. For each of the warehousing project, each one prepared a quantify health risk assessment. We took the cancer risk at the maximum expose individual receptor. The MEIR, is the receptor that would be were the highest concentration of pollution would occur. Adding the health risk determined for each project plus the health risk that we determined for this project it would still, let me see hear excuse me while I look for the figure here. The three additional projects plus the proposed project (2:08:36) combine to add a health risk of 8.1 in one million. That would be below the ten in one million significant threshold thus adopted by the South Coast district.

CHAIR GOMEZ

So the three hypothetical buildings that you chose, what was their location? Was their location similar to the air quality in this valley or where they anonymous as to where they were located?

JOHN VANG

These projects were, they are in the City of Irwindale if I know correctly and I believe they were from the cumulative project list that was provided to PlaceWorks.

CHAIR GOMEZ

They are within the City itself?

JOHN VANG

Yes.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Okay, thank you.

JOHN VANG

And for these three projects, the quantified health risk assessment was prepared for each project, as we referred to the health risk determination from those HRA's that were conducted.

CHAIR GOMEZ

So what was the level? I mean was it significant lower, if that we do a cumulative of other businesses and neighborhoods then we are going to be safe, as to the ratio for cancer or can you speak to that?

JOHN VANG

I think that just looking at, so we took the maximum risk level from each project, plus the maximum risk level from this project and they came out to be, the total combine risk level came out to be 8.1 in a million. You have to remember that, the 8.1 in a million that is based on the maximum risk levels for the MIER of each project. The MIER would be different for each project, because it is based on proximity of say a residential home or a school to a particular project. So the 8.1, that's the maximum of the theoretical hypothetical number but in actuality because each concentration of air toxics dispersed over a distance. In reality it would likely be a smaller number than 8.1 in a million.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Okay, thank you very much. And I just had another question for Daniel. So Daniel, I know that so when we spoke to the easement, for instance, it is a private property so it is not a City issues, correct? Is that what you said earlier?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO

We did verify that they do have the rights, yeah.

CHAIR GOMEZ

When we look at a project part of the Commission is to ensure the health and safety, successful business which we definitely do want here in Irwindale. So when we are looking at that whole project it is kind of good news that we are getting some sidewalks and streetlights. That is very nice. Do we as a City, as a Staff, because we have a couple of big businesses there and some congestion, how do we handle that flow? Is it something that we do as a Staff because we are looking at this project just as this project in particular? We already know that there is congestion. It seems that we made some good headway into remedying the problem. Correct? With these crosswalks and these signals.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO

Yeah, absolutely. When we do the analysis we are not just looking at the traffic that the project contributes, we are looking at the traffic all around the project that is existing as well. We do look at how that is going to interact with each other. Where these driveways and ingress and egress points for this particular project, how that would affect the surrounding traffic. We did, we know the proposal that Paul Porter is bring forward to the Commission, generally the Staff does not agree that putting the access of off Azusa Canyon is safe or efficient. We believe making a left turn at an intersection stop control signalized would be much safer, much more efficient and bringing that traffic on to Los Angeles, that private road, and into that driveway because having a left turn on Azusa Canyon creates more conflict points because there is more traffic on Azusa Canyon versus a private road of Los Angeles, which only carries the traffic of these two projects.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you Daniel that is great input I just needed clarification on that. Is there any other additional questions?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Daniel, real quick on that subject.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Sure.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So you talk about egress and ingress areas, so it is hard for me to understand their routes. So if they are going north bound on Azusa Canyon Road are they turning into that private driveway, or are they turning into the driveway?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — They will turn into the private driveway and then turn right out at the intersection. That is for the trucks, for passenger vehicles they have a driver on Azusa Canyon which allows them to turn right to Azusa Canyon from that driver.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So the trucks are not turning onto their driveway per say?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — They are turning into the private route of Los Angeles Street and then going on to Azusa Canyon.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So I am talking northbound.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — So making a right on Azusa Canyon going northbound.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — On Azusa Canyon.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Your going north on Azusa Canyon.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — North on Azusa Canyon and taking a…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Passing the railroad tracks.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Passing the railroad track.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Oh okay, making a right on to the private roadway and then left onto the driveway.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Oh, it does show in one of these plans where they are taking the right turn into, I am not sure if that is going to even be feasible but let me see here if I am not mistaken. Yeah, I don't think I remember where I saw it. So they are not taking that right turn into their private driveway to go around the building back to the bay?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: No, that would not be ideal to have the trucks go all the way around the building. You typically want to take the shortest route to the bays.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Okay, because I know I have seen it, it does show, I know I seen it. It does show. You know what, it does show it but they are actually using that front driveway and going around the building to get in. So that is the main ingress is to take right and then go left…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: That and then left into and then get closure into the bays and then back up into the bays from there.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Then out the same way?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Coming out the same way and then making a right and then making a right again, or a left at the intersection.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: That's what the problem is with the neighboring?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Yeah, I mean from the prospection of the City it is best to get that traffic off the main highway cause you don't want the traffic to stack on the main highway, cause that would create more of a congestion issue.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: My understanding of what Paul Porter is saying is taking that left into that private driveway and going around. Is that what he is proposing?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: What he is proposing is to make a left off of Azusa Canyon directly into the project to bypass the private driveway completely.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: So using their driveway?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: Rexford's driveway only.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA: Yeah, which can you even get a truck in there or?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: It would be difficult because, again as you guys know, the Olive Pit Project does have a high volume of trucks, to make a left turn at that intersection going northbound on Azusa Canyon…

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Yeah, I see the concern.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — There is a conflict point there cause Olive Pit has trucks running business hours throughout the day.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Did anyone talk about that and say, "Okay, this is not a safe way of…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — That has been expressed. We sat down with Paul Porter, and you know as Michael has said, we have sat down with them. We tried to work with them. The project I think was delayed and hold one time because the issues raised. We have been waiting for input resolution and to be honest it was a little slow going so, but we did sit with them. We expressed my opinions and we did look at that proposal.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So your conclusion, it was unsafe to make that right turn.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — That is the opinion and recommendation of Staff, that it is best to use the ingress and egress of off the Los Angeles private driveway. It is definitely safer, yeah.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Any questions before I close the Public Hearing?

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — I just had one comment I guess. I am not too sharp on traffic studies but I would think that a railroad going right through the center of that intersection would be included in this traffic study. I would think that would be pretty important but I've heard nothing about the railway going through that intersection. I mean that's gotta impact that traffic.

CARLETON WATERS — I was out there today. I watched two or three Metrolink trains go by. I think I maybe even taken a picture of one.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — I am not sure Metro is the only one that uses it.

CARLETON WATERS — I am sure they are not.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Yeah, okay.

CARLETON WATERS — For a signalized intersection, if I was doing that signal design, I would put signage and a limit line, and make darn sure that the drivers were aware that you do not under any circumstances stop any closer, than you know, fifteen, twenty feet back of the railroad track. There are situations very similar with traffic signals near City of Chico, City Hall actually, there is a railroad track that goes by. I have observed, I have been in that left turn lane many times and the drivers, you know how big those trains are, and they tend to obey those limit lines and signage that says, "Stop here, do not stop on tracks." I have not seen somebody that did not realize the importance of that message yet. The analysis assumes that those vehicles will be, you know there is more of a detailed design aspect. You are absolutely correct Commissioner Hartman the analysis, unless you go into very detailed simulations and the like, don't get into that level of detail. For this particular situation, I am comfortable as a Traffic Engineer that when we get to the point of doing final design plans, the City get the point of doing final design plans, that would be a very carefully thought out configuration and it will be safer than the current situation, where people are kind of creeping forward and they are at a stop sign…

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — Also for pedestrians also.

CARLETON WATERS — For pedestrians as well. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Excuse me, just thinking about this, if you say you are coming off San Bernardino Road, which is West Covina, and you are heading north on Azusa Canyon Road. You come up the little hill there and there is a stop there. That is where the railroad track comes down. Let's just say, worst case scenario, I don't know if you guys take this into consideration, you have Decorative Specialties coming in and you got your new tenants coming in and that private road is back up, and you got some knucklehead driver that stops on the tracks and they can't move because the trucks are backed up. Do we take that into consideration, that kind of stuff? I know you are saying there is limit lines and everything else…

CARLETON WATERS — You're talking about where the tracks curve around and go across the private road.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — No, no, no I am talking about where they cross Azusa Canyon Road. As you go up the hill, right there is a little hill there, as you go there, there is a stop sign and right pass that is the private driveway or the access. What I am saying is afternoon traffic, everyone is coming in they want to get home, trucks are backed up down the access road to get into the driveways, you have a mini traffic jam. The next truck comes up there trying to make a right but he can't go anywhere, he stops on the tracks and the train comes. Have you given that any thought?

CARLETON WATERS — We think that with the traffic signal, the length of those queues is going to be greatly reduced. We have shown that we are going to go from a level of service E or F to a level of service C, much shorter wait times, much more organized. One of the things that I think as I look at the traffic volumes I got here in my computer in front of me, and think about the previous question about those big slow trucks making a left turn off on to Azusa Canyon Road into…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I am thinking a right.

CARLETON WATERS — Right, I was going back a step here just to express something else. I will stick your question sir. Again, there will be very clear signage. Those trucks know how vulnerable they are cause they can't go anywhere quickly. If there is a limit line, and it says stop here for red light those trucks will make the point of stopping there. Those tracks are so close that, that limit line, there will be no point over the tracks to wait at that signal. That limit line will be back behind those tracks because those tracks are only twenty, thirty feet from the intersection. All of the control that is going to be implemented would be safer than the situation you have out there today.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — So with that being said, that's partially in West Covina, I believe. Is it not?

CARLETON WATERS — I believe that is correct.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — So do we need to get together with West Covina for the restriping and all that?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Partially and those questions are thought about by Metrolink and when we would go through the design with them those are the safety requirements they will put on the City to make.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — So I got you now. I got a bunch of questions so we will be here a little while you guys. I understand the applicant is going to pay five hundred and fifty thousand to cover the cost of the improvements. Do we have an estimated cost of what the improvements are going to be?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — We are still working with Metro to get on the final design. Once we have a final design we can get a final cost.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Lets say it is 1.5 million or 2 million or whatever the improvements are anything above the five fifty, who bears that cost?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — So again we spoke about it last time but there is a project that is committed to implement that improvement.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Well who bears the cost?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: The project applicant for the other project. Again, this is not, you know, it's not related to the project.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: So the City is not going to incur any cost?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: The City will not, no.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Okay, cool. I got a question for the attorney. Do you feel confident that we meet the CEQA by only having an MND and not an EIR?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Well the requirement to push an EIR would be if there was substantial evidence to support a fair argument that there are significant and unavoidable impacts from this project. After my review of the CEQA analysis, I don't think that they identified any significant and unavoidable impacts.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Very good, I just want to make sure they are covered. Part of that reasoning, was that I believe you guys stated, was they are looking at the former tenant what they truck traffic or what it was, and that is back in 2020. Now Pepsi Cola was built in, I think 1956 okay. Now here we are putting nine-thousand plus square feet for office, seventeen-thousand for light manufacturing, and I think one-hundred and three plus thousand feet for warehouse. This is two years ago that you guys are taking in consideration for the CEQA, for the environmental or for the report that you guys did. My thoughts are that every day things are changing with the e-commerce, with the internet and everything else, and Amazon, and everybody. I can tell you that two years ago on my street there wasn't half the traffic there is now. I would just see maybe on UPS truck maybe a week. Now there is numerous Amazon trucks, numerous FedEx, you know all of them. I guess I don't quite buy that, that you can use that two years ago and using what Pepsi Cola had when this place is going to be a whole much larger. So I don't know. To the applicant, you guys are, I don't know where the numbers come from if you are just speculating who is going to be there, because you have no idea yet, unless you do have an idea who you are going to go ahead and rent to. Mike, you want to come up? So Mike let me ask you a question now. Have you been in talks with Amazon?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ: No.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Okay.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Just to clarify, so the thirty-eight million square feet that we have in Southern California almost one-hundred thousand, just one-hundred thousand square feet of that is Amazon. It is because we bought a building and Amazon was a tenant and they have a lease. I am not sure how long the lease runs one, two, three years, but it's not a client or tenant that we pursue or we build our buildings for. If we had an incline that it would be an Amazon this building would not be a spec building, because Amazon has such specific requirements; electrical, condition warehouses. This is not that. This is a tenant this is going to be anyone other than Amazon.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Alight, very good.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — One thing, you had a question. I want to just point something out. Your concern about once you get up to the stop sign going north on Azusa Canyon and making that right on the private road. We sat down with the private road owner and said, what we can do on the north side of our property we have an entrance gate, driveway one, which trucks can enter if they want to. We will push that back into our property to allow for driveway two for fifteen three foot trailer trucks to sit idle, if the Director of Operations or the manager who has the incoming and outgoing trucks who manages that traffic, if they thought that it would start to queue on that private road. We made that adjustment too. I just wanted to throw that out there.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — On your north-west elevation, you show us there along the Dalton, you know, can you enhance that at all? I mean it looks like maybe this wall behind you there is not a whole lot of aesthetics to it. I know other buildings that we done here in the City, we have asked them to enhance such a façade like that since it's so long and so big. They have complied. They dolled it up. I understand you are showing me a building that was built in 56 and now he were are in 2022, of course there is going to be a difference. I would like to see a little more enhancement if that's possible. I don't know what the Commission thinks but we have design guidelines and, you know, I am sure you are following them and they fall within all the parameters of that. Personally, myself I would like to see a little bit more aesthetically pleasing than just what you have on your rendering.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — The leader of our design team is listening and if we did meandering sidewalks and the Welcome to Irwindale fountain, we can definitely do something with that elevation wall.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Now, talking about the Welcome to Irwindale fountain, personally myself I see, I don't know if we have it up but it shows Welcome to Irwindale on top and then real big it has the address. I don't know what the rest of the Commission thinks, I would like to see it swapped.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — That is something I thought about, you would probably want to see the letters bigger than the numbers.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — That is something to think about. I don't know how the Commission feels about it. I just looked at that when I was looking at the packet. I'd like to see that reverse.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yeah, as far as the ratio and the size we can definitely work on that. But if you don't approve the project there is no meandering sidewalks, no water fountain, just kidding.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — That's right. I understand. Now, you said the City is going to be getting quite a bit more revenue. I am sure you've done your studies, what type of revenue are you looking at?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Well there is none now, but say for instance this was a building with sixty-two thousand square feet and there was a tenant in there, not knowing if it was Pepsi or another tenant. We just did an economic impact analysis for a similar project in the City of Santa Ana were it went from essentially say seventy-thousand square feet to one-hundred and thirty. This has gone from sixty-two vacant to one-hundred and thirty. So we took that we can apply it. That's three times the revenue in tax base that we would get for a new development as oppose to keeping our existing property, which we haven't rent. We got fifty seven tenants right now so we use that as a barometer so it's two and a half to three times that you get with a new development.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I understand we are getting zero now. Some is better than nothing. I do understand that.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Okay. On the options, you showed an option one for a crosswalk and I think there was an option two, which one would we be approving. Myself personally, I like option one because there was three cross walks instead of two.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — We presented both options, and what I believe your City Traffic Engineer says, "I like having options they both work let's take them both forward." So that would ultimately be the City's call as to what gets approved.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Daniel, one.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Again, once we go to the final design we will have to take a look at elevation and comments from Metrolink, but we will defiantly take that into consideration.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES

My last point, or question, or comment was, first of all on my notes I put Decorative Specialties because I have heard nothing about them in this study or nothing else. Decorative Specialties has been part of the City for over twenty years. They have been a good neighbor. They have been a good, you know, business here for the City. There seems to be a disagreement on the traffic, how are we going to do this with them. I think it would be prudent, if we can get maybe Mr. Porter and the owner, and you guys and your owner and your attorneys, our City Manager, and our attorney and sit down and hash this thing out until a happy medium, because I would hate to be living in my home and have someone come in there and us have issues right off the bat. That doesn't make for good neighbors. I am hoping you guys can tell me you are going to set a meeting up, and come to a happy medium with this so we can go ahead and approve this tonight. Those are my thoughts we have done it in the past. We have done it with Ready Pac and with Athens. We sat down when there was issues they couldn't resolve. We sat down in round table and we figured it out. I liked to see that done here. I like to see everybody walk away feeling good about what we are doing. That is all I have. Thank you.

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA

Chair and Commission, we will make every effort to do so.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ

I do have Jack Lansford, from decorative specialties wishing to speak. Is that okay?

CHAIR GOMEZ

We are still at questions.

JACK LANSFORD

Alright, this is Jack Lansford, can you hear me?

CHAIR GOMEZ

Yes.

JACK LANSFORD

Thank you for allowing me to speak. I am the president of Decorative Specialties. We have been in Irwindale since 1982, so that is forty years. Irwindale has been a good City to live in and we appreciate cooperation of our government and neighbors. We try to be a good neighbor to everybody around. Actually, when I look at those buildings, the renderings of the buildings, I mean they are gorgeous. I don't know who wouldn't want them. Our main concern is, we have one access and that is on that private drive. There is no other access to 4414 North Azusa Canyon Road. We can't be impeded at all. We were able to live with Pepsi, no problem. It was really no issue and we had more employees then, because we were the only location for our company. Now we have three other locations across the country. We had more employees on the site, we had more truck traffic on the site, and Pepsi had more truck traffic on the site. We know we can live with someone there, as along as the pattern is worked out right. My biggest concern, just to be brief, is and we meet with Rexford once in our driveway.

They were very friendly, very nice, but it did raise big concerns. The south west driveway is probably the biggest concern for me for truck traffic. If you can imagine either turning south on Azusa Canyon Road and turning left into our private drive and then immediately turning left into the first driveway, the southwest driveway. It crosses all the lanes of traffic and if there is an issue, it is almost a U turn. I mean it is a U-turn right. What Rexford told us, and this is what really drove our concern is that two-thirds of the truck traffic was going to come in the south east drive, and one-third is going to come in the south west driveway and go all the way around the building. The reason that they gave us for that, is because of the number of doc spaces that are on the right hand side, I don't know, I guess it's the west side and they couldn't turn their trucks that way. So they had to come that way. That just threw up a lot of red flags. I am sorry that this all took so long but, you know, we had a hard time finding a consultant and it took a while to get it. They had to do their work and then we approved it. We got it out to Rexford as soon as we could. I would love to sit down and hash it out, because I think there is something there especially if you know, I just think there is a solution there. I don't want an empty building there. I don't want to have a beat up building there. I want to have a beautiful building that says, "Welcome to Irwindale" there. I am not against this project what so ever but I am concern for our access. We have one. If it makes it too difficult we will have to do something else because it is just unbearable if we can't get in and out. Anyway thank you for your time and attention, I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — What was your name again, sir?

JACK LANSFORD — Jack Lansford.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Okay. Jack, I got you on the line now, we got Rexford here, we got our attorney here, we got our City Manager here. I want to know if, Mike can you come up? Are you speaking on behalf of Rexford? Can you guys agree right now at this meeting to go ahead and sit down and come to a happy medium, with you and your attorneys, Jack and his attorneys, and let's get this hashed off so we can move on with this project.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Of course.

JACK LANSFORD — Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Can we set a date up now? I like something in writing because I would like to approve this if possible. Mr. City Manager?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Madame Chair, we would need direction from the Planning Commission as a whole to agree to that on the City's side.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — So do I make a motion or what do I do? Or do we just say consensus?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — I think that umm, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Okay, can you ask Jack if he agrees? We agree.

CHAIR GOMEZ — The thing is we have agreement, the City Manager has agreed, and we have you both here so we are just going to rely on you that you will have this meeting with the City Manager. We don't really need a date right now.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I'd like a date.

CHAIR GOMEZ — You'd like a date. Okay so let's do the res….

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I mean they can say yes tonight and thirty, forty days from now they still haven't done it yet.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Before the City Council?

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I would like for you guys to meet right away so we can get this done with.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yeah.

JACK LANSFORD — When is the City Council Meeting for this?

CHAIR GOMEZ — It is not certain yet. We haven't…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — We haven't even approved this yet so.

JACK LANSFORD — Oh I see. I have my calendar in front…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — You okay with that Mike?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — I mean, today is Wednesday.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Yup.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — I would say within the week if everyone is available.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Jack, what date do you have? So we can get the date. We won't mandate it from the Commission, but we would like you to tell us what date you are going to meet.

JACK LANSFORD — Is Paul Porter still on the line?

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — And Staff will need to be there too also.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Yes, so the Staff, and Engineering, probably the CEQA and Traffic Consultants as well would all need to be included and…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Yeah there is too much going back and forth going on here

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — and the final design.

JACK LANSFORD — I'll tell you want, we can figure something out. I am just looking at my calendar. I am not, I can't do it tomorrow.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — It is going to be the availability of everybody.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Let's set it up then. Just make it happen.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you. Thank you. I am going to rely on you to set this up. I am sure our City Manager and our Staff will be in contact with you.

JACK LANSFORD — Alright, very good.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, okay at this time is there any other…

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — We got a lot of hands up.

CHAIR GOMEZ — A lot of hands up. Let's just go by the tiers Mr. Hernandez. If they have already spoken and they exceeded there time limit.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — It is only one now.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: I am going to unmute, Erin Thrash.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Mr. Thrash there is a three minute time limit so please go forward.

ERIN THRASH: Hey, my name is Erin Thrash. I work for Rexford. I am the Vice President of Design and Architecture. I had the pleasure of meeting with Jack, on that meeting that he mentioned out back in March. Where we disused this…

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ: Sorry, give me one second.

ERIN THRASH: Hey, my name is Erin Thrash. I work with Rexford. I am the Vice President of Architecture and Design. I had the pleasure of meeting with Jack, out on that drive way conversation that he mentioned back in March. Rexford has been a partner, we actually recommended the traffic consultant that he could go and get a third party recommendation with. While not oppose at all to the proposal of going through that northern driveway, I think there are concerns from the City which are very valid as to why it doesn't work. As a remedy Rexford has proposed that in the event that there is ever a truck that were to be say sticking out onto Los Angeles from our own driveway trying to enter the site, if there is a another driveway. This would be so much easier if we were able to talk around the site plan. I don't know if that is possible to pull up. I would just like to say that there are options and we have already told Decorative Specialties that we would be writing this on to all of our leases, that any tenant that would take that facility would need to keep that Los Angeles Street clear and not have any trucks that are hanging out. Otherwise there will be severe consequences. We have every intent to put that into all of our lease moving forward. If there is an event where a truck is needing to get into the truck court then go around, they can use on our own property, they can use the imitate auto drive there and wrap around the building and have a fairly long queuing session. So there is a lot of pressure relief valves on this site. There is a lot of options. Everyone's goal is to keep Los Angeles Street clear. We made that abundantly obvious from day one. We are all very happy to go and sit down again, but I would just like to state for the purpose of the Council, we have been doing this for five months. This is nothing new. Hopefully, if that is what it takes is another meeting that's fine, but I think the site plan and this project allow for a lot of flexibility to appease each party as is. That is all.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Thank you. Mr. Hernandez are there any other hands?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Paul Porter, but he spoke already.
CHAIR GOMEZ	We will waive the time limits, go ahead and unmute him. Mr. Potter you have three minutes to address the Commission, thank you.
PAUL PORTER	I am sorry, I only had my hand up when Jack asked the question whether I am still here. Jack to let you know I am still here.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Thank you Mr. Potter for letting us know. At this time I am going to close the Public Hearing and open it for discussion of the Commissioners.
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING	There being no speakers, Chair Gomez closed the Public Hearing at 6:47 p.m.
COMMISSIONER FUENTES	I'd like the rendering of the building except for the Northwest, I'd like to see some embellishment or something there if possible. I don't know if it's possible but I would sure like to see it. Okay very good, and I would like to get the issue with Decorative Specialties ironed out and make sure, you know, everybody is good that's all. We want happy neighbors. That's going to be all my comments.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	I've got one. Daniel, I would like the timeline on the traffic signal. Is it going to be before development? Is it going to be during development, or is it going to be after, or before the Occupancy Permit?
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO	Yeah, I can touch base with the designers and Metrolink and kind of get a better idea. We can bring that back, Luis can bring that back at the next meeting.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	And we are planning on having it done before a tenant is in the building?
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO	As soon as possible.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	So as soon as possible, it means before a tenant is in the building?
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO	Again, it depends on getting approval from Metrolink and getting a design completed and approved. It is up to the other agency.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	It does state that an Occupancy Permit won't be given to the tenant until after the traffic signal is put in. Is that correct? Is that correct?
ASSISTANT CITY	Could you repeat the question?

ENGINEER CO

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — So in the condition it says, that the traffic signal will be in place before Occupancy Permit will be issued.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — That their fair share of payment will be paid to the City prior to building permit issuance, I believe is the language.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, so I read that wrong. So they can actually go into the building before this traffic signal is even constructed.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Yeah, if we don't get the approval from Metrolink that could be the case.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Will that would be a lot of problems I would think. Everything we are talking about here would, you know…

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Yeah, unfortunately, because of the location of the railroad track requires us to get…

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — No, I understand that. Is there a timeframe we can put on this? Or have the traffic signal done before the Occupancy Permit is given, is that something we can do? Because then this problems were for nothing, all these Mitigation Measures were for nothing.

CHAIR GOMEZ — I think, if I may Daniel, I think that when we listen to the City Council meeting this has come up several times and there is a history to the street light, the signal. All agencies contributed to ironing it out and working it out, including the main property that is paying for it. Can you tell us a little bit about that progress because what I am hearing in the Council Meetings is that we are doing all of our best to put the signal in, but because it is multi agency it is taking a bit of time so therefore, we can't guarantee the time. Is that accurate?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — The hurdle that we have to cross is getting the approval from Metrolink, a railroad authority. It is really out of the City's hands in terms of the final approval. It is really dependent on…

CHAIR GOMEZ — I understand from input that we've become more aggressive and assertive. Even the Council, one of the Councilmen has reached out to other public officials to get this traffic signal. Is that correct?

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — I am not sure.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Oh okay, I heard that in a meeting. So we are doing our most to get this taken care of, much more so then we did in the past. Much more aggressive than even last year.

ASSISTANT CITY — We have been. Like I said, I spoke earlier about we have reached out

ENGINEER CO — to Metrolink staff. We have a contact there and we are driving them.

CHAIR GOMEZ — We just want to make sure on the record that it is reflected, that we think it is an up most important on the Commission that this happens so that we can mitigate the traffic, especially, under this current circumstances. However, we defiantly do not want to penalize anybody for the delay, which is not U.S. bureaucracy basically.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — Would be beneficial to all parties.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Good lobbying might help with the Metro. Okay, thank you for that, I appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Hey Mike, I got a question Mike. From start to finish, from groundbreaking to topping off, what is the schedule like?

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yes, so let's assume tonight we get approved.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I mean when you go ahead and you break ground.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Break ground would be December 1st. We have most of our building permits, well are TI's that are going to be issued. Twelve one, we break ground that is a fourteen month build. After we get Certificate of Occupancy we want a tenant in there within three months. So figure…

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — We are looking approximately eighteen months ,seventeen months.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ — Yeah if you said seventeen, eighteen months.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Hopefully they can get the…

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — I don't know if eighteen months is enough time.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Daniel.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Daniel, please step forward to the podium. I know it is a late night, Daniel, and you work all day.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — I am just going to stay up here.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Daniel, you worked all day, we appreciate it. We really appreciate you being here tonight.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Daniel, do you think eighteen months is enough time? I know you'd just be guessing because I know how Metrolink, and UPR, and all those things how they lag when you need something.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: I can't say yes or no and commit to any timeline because of that.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: Okay.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO: It is out of the applicants hand and the City's.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES: I understand that, I understand. Okay, thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Okay, so at this time, any other questions? At this time then, I will be calling for the question and we just need some clarification because the other Commissioners interrupt rules of Robert different than I do. We will have to have the City Attorney to help us. So I need a motion. So when we do the motion, do we read the resolution first or the way that I understood it is that we do the motion and then we do the resolution, so please give us some input here.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: So the way it would work is, you would make the motion to approve, for example, Resolution Number 813(22) and read the title of the resolution, and that would be part of your motion.

CHAIR GOMEZ: So if somebody is making a motion to disapprove or approve they read the resolution and then we take a vote.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Correct.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Rather than taking the vote and then reading the resolution.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Correct that is the ideal situation.

CHAIR GOMEZ: Alright, thank you.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER: Ideally I just want them in the record.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you, so I need a motion. Okay, I will make the motion then. A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council approve Site Plan and Design Review (DA) No. 04-2020 for the construction of one (1) speculative industrial tilt-up building totaling ±129,830 square feet for property located at 4416 Azusa Canyon Road, Irwindale, CA 91706 (APN: 8417-004-006) in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone and making certain findings of fact. Can we have a Roll Call please? Oh I need a second.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — You need a second, yes.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Can I get a second?

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — I second with the condition that they have the meeting to go ahead and resolve the issue with Decorative Specialties.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — We can include that with the Resolution language.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — A condition?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — It wouldn't be a Condition of Approval necessary but I would include it with direction to Staff in the Resolution to meet. The Planning Commission right now would be approving a recommendation to the City Council, well 813 is with regarding to the Mitigated Negative Declaration? So you would be approving the Mitigated Negative Declaration as proposed.

CHAIR GOMEZ — With no further discussion, let's take a Roll Call.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — So we are approving both Resolutions, correct?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Right now we just have a motion on the floor for Resolution 813, which is the recommendation of approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — I think she read 814.

CHAIR GOMEZ — I read 814.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Oh did you read 814, I apologize, for some reason I was thinking 813.

CHAIR GOMEZ — So are we doing two resolutions?

SENIOR PLANNER JONES — 813 and 814.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — Yes.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Okay, so let's do…

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — I apologize, so the motion should first be to approve CEQA and then do the Site Plan and Design Review.

CHAIR GOMEZ — We are going to start again. Do we have any discussion as to Resolution by the Commissioners for 813(22). Okay so I need a motion for the Resolution 813(22).

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Motion

CHAIR GOMEZ — Do you have to read it?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — I can read the title. The recommendation is approval of Resolution No. 813(22), "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale, Recommending that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as amended by the imposition of a Substitute Mitigation Measure, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Construction of one (1) speculative industrial tilt-up building totaling ±129,830 square feet for property located at 4416 Azusa Canyon Road, Irwindale, CA 91706 (APN: 8417-004-006) in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone and making certain findings of fact, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Do I have a second?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Second.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Roll Call.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY — Commissioner Chico.

HERNANDEZ COMMISSIONER CHICO	No.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Commissioner Fuentes.
COMMISSIONER FUENTES	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Commissioner Hartman.
COMMISSIONER HARTMAN	No.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Vice-Chair Burrola.
VICE-CHAIR BURROLA	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Chair Gomez.
CHAIR GOMEZ	Yes.
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Thank you.
CHAIR GOMEZ	We move on to Resolution No. 814(22), can you read that please.
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER	Yes, so this is Resolution No. 814(22), "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council approve Site Plan and Design Review (DA) No. 04-2020 for the construction of one (1) speculative industrial tilt-up building totaling ±129,830 square feet for property located at 4416 Azusa Canyon Road, Irwindale, CA 91706 (APN: 8417-004-006) in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone and making certain findings of fact. This is as modified with the condition that the parties meet with all parties involved.
COMMISSIONER FUENTES	Motion.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Second.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Roll Call please.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Commissioner Chico.

COMMISSIONER CHICO — No.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Commissioner Fuentes.

COMMISSIONER FUENTES — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Commissioner Hartman.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — No.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Vice-Chair Burrola.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Chair Gomez.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ — Thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Moving on with our Agenda tonight. Thank you sir, thank you for all of your input. Hopefully we work will together, and with our Staff I am sure will you have already done. Thank you for all your input and for attending tonight. We move on next to our Discussion Items and Presentation.

DISCUSSION ITEMS/ PRESENTATIONS

CHAIR GOMEZ — Do we have anything Mrs. Planning Director?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON — Thank you Chair and Commissioners, we have no presentations tonight.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Now moving on to your Community Development Report.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON — Yes, the only thing that I have to report, it is all in how you look at it. There is good news and there is some bad news. Well, let's see, Daniel Co is leaving us for orange pastures, or shall I say behind the Orange curtain?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Where is that located?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON — He is going to be working for the City of Cypress. It is good news for him. It is very bittersweet. Bad news for us. But here is the other good news. We have Luis Pimentel, who is here, who can step into, sort of, into his shoes here. I don't know if you guys have meet Luis.

CHAIR GOMEZ — We support Luis, welcome. Daniel, how could you do this to us?

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — After we drilled you.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — You guys made the most out of this last meeting for me. I got exercise.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Daniel, who am I going to call when there is all kinds of noise outside the door? Daniel, congratulations.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — It's been a pleasure.

CHAIR GOMEZ — You are a brilliant mind, Daniel, we really appreciate you. You started here, you were a nice asset to the City and I am sure you are going to be a benefit to the other City as well. There is a lot of traffic over there Daniel, good luck.

ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER CO — I am sure it will be the same issues, different place similar issues.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And this is um…

ASSISTANT ENGINEER PIMENTEL — My name is Luis Pimentel, I am with the Public Works Engineering Division. I have been working for the City of Irwindale for the past eight years now almost. Around there, no sorry, no seven. So I have been working here and I am the Assistant Engineer for the City.

CHAIR GOMEZ — So we will be drilling you in the future.

ASSISTANT ENGINEER PIMENTEL — Yes. That will be me, so any questions I am happy to answer.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Well welcome, thank you so much for coming tonight.

ASSISTANT ENGINEER PIMENTEL — Thank you, nice to meet you all.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Anything else Mrs. Simpson? Great, thank you, any comments from Legal Counsel?

LEGAL COUNSEL COMMENTS

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER — No thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIR GOMEZ — And we are going to put here, I don't know if he is going to continue visit with us but we appreciate the attendance by the City Manager. Any comments by the City Manager?

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA — It has been my pleasure.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Thank you.

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA — I will keep coming. I thank you very much for having me, I am just looking forward to future progress.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Yes, thank you.

CITY MANAGER MIRANDA — Thank you.

CHAIR GOMEZ — Number 7, Commissioner Comments.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — I have a comment about the Zoning Map. That was on my mind and I want to know where we are at with it and, you know, if we are going to be finalizing it this year or is it going to be next year.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON — We are hoping to get that, our consultant is still updating that. There has been some new legislation, you know, so they are trying to get the latest with that. We are anticipating in October, that we will have it for public review.

VICE-CHAIR BURROLA — Okay, thank you

CHAIR GOMEZ — Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER CHICO — I just want to express my no vote. I did not want to take the time during Roll Call. I am not comfortable with the Traffic Element. I know that there is a lot of equations, and analysis, and so forth. One of the things I noticed and maybe I missed it, like my colleague over here I am not an expert on traffic analysis, but I didn't hear anything in reference to the existing diesel truck traffic which amount to two-hundred truck trips a day, in the very same area. I didn't hear any reference to that, or how it dovetail, or how it's related. That still bothers me and that is why I voted no. Also, one of my colleagues over here made mention that the bases for the Traffic Analysis was from the Coke, I mean the Pepsi-Cola Plant, which was obviously out dated and so forth. Maybe, I understood his comment. Maybe I understand his concept behind it, but I am just not comfortable with it. We will see. This is one of the reason I asked, what happens if they exceed the parameters. You know. And what are they going to do, a lot more paperwork while the traffic continues? Is that what we are going to do? That seems to be the only answer, that I heard. Again, that is why I voted no.

COMMISSIONER HARTMAN — And I liked to say that is the same reason I voted no. I am not comfortable with that traffic study. I've lived closed to that intersection for a long time. I know what the traffic is like now, it is insane. I can't see how this is going to be better.

CHAIR GOMEZ

Thank you for that. I think what happens is, the ramifications are that we follow the CEQA guidelines, which may or may not address the City's needs. That is why we sit here, and we are using the business that is coming in and seems to be willing to address some of these issues. We have a traffic signal coming in. We are going to continually have to address these as a City and the different departments, to make sure that we have a safe environment, traffic, and congestion. That is the goal of all of the departments in the City and including the Commission, we do the best that we can under the circumstances. Maybe we need lobbying effects to change the CEQA requirements, and also implement more of the Environmental Justice component in communities, that have congestion or traffic beyond with what they should in terms of their health issues. I respect and appreciate your input. I am going to adjourn this meeting in the memory of Lydia Gomez. She was my aunt. Who lived in Irwindale, who recently passed. Also Jimbo, who was also a long time loving resident of Irwindale. I adjourn this meeting on their behalf, thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Suzanne E. Gomez, Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

Jesus Hernandez, Administrative Secretary

Approved as presented at the meeting held December 21, 2022