

## **MINUTES**

**CITY OF CARSON  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
701 East Carson Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Carson, CA 90745**

***February 23, 2010 – 6:30 P.M.***

- 1. CALL TO ORDER** Vice-Chairman Saenz called the meeting to order at 6:37 P.M.
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** The Salute to the Flag was led by Commissioner Park.
- 3. ROLL CALL** Planning Commissioners Present:  
\*Brimmer, Gordon, Park, Schaefer, Saenz, Verrett  
  
\*(Brimmer arrived at 7:00 P.M.)  
  
Planning Commissioners Absent:  
Diaz, Faletogo, Graber (all excused)  
  
Planning Staff Present: Planning Officer Repp, City Attorney Wynder, Assistant City Attorney Konigar-Macklin, Senior Planner Signo, Associate Planner Newberg, Assistant Planner Castillo, Planning Technician Alexander, Recording Secretary Bothe
- 4. AGENDA POSTING CERTIFICATION** Recording Secretary Bothe indicated that all posting requirements had been met.
- 5. AGENDA APPROVAL** Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Park, to approve the Agenda as submitted. Motion carried, 5-0 (Commissioner Brimmer had not yet arrived; absent Commissioners Diaz, Faletogo, Graber).
- 6. INSTRUCTIONS TO WITNESSES** Vice-Chairman Saenz requested that all persons wishing to provide testimony stand for the oath, complete the general information card at the podium, and submit it to the secretary for recordation.
- 7. SWEARING OF WITNESSES** City Attorney Wynder

**8. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

For items **NOT** on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes. None.

---

**9. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A) Minutes: February 9, 2010**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to approve the February 9, 2010, Minutes as presented. Motion carried, 5-0 (Commissioner Brimmer had not yet arrived; absent Commissioners Diaz, Faletogo, Graber).

---

**9. NEW BUSINESS CONSENT**

**B) One-Year Extension of Design Overlay Review No. 1276-08**

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Samoan Congregational Community Church, is requesting a one-year extension. The subject property is located at 324 West Carson Street.

Staff's Recommendation:

APPROVE the extension of time for Design Overlay Review No. 1276-08 until April 7, 2011; and ADOPT a minute resolution extending the approval to April 7, 2011.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to approve the one-year extension until April 7, 2011. Motion carried, 5-0 (Commissioner Brimmer had not yet arrived; absent Commissioners Diaz, Faletogo, Graber).

---

**9. NEW BUSINESS CONSENT**

**C) Modification No. 1 to Design Overlay Review No. 861-04b,  
Modification No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 578-04 and  
Modification No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 579-04**

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Lynn Van Aken for BlackDot Wireless, is requesting to collocate on an existing 60-foot high wireless telecommunication facility stealthed as a pine tree located in the MH (Manufacturing, Heavy) zoning district. The subject property is located at 21038 South Wilmington Avenue.

Staff's Recommendation:

APPROVE the proposed project; and ADOPT a minute resolution and instruct staff to make the necessary change to Resolution No. 04-2007.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to approve the modifications. Motion carried, 5-0 (Commissioner Brimmer had not yet arrived; absent Commissioners Diaz, Faletogo, Graber).

---

**10. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING** None

---

**11. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A) Tentative Parcel Map No. 071206 (corrected to reflect “Tract” Map)**

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Sid Goldstien Civil Engineer, Inc., on behalf of Imperial Avalon Mobile Estates, LLC, is requesting to approve a Tentative ~~Parcel~~ Tract Map necessary to convert an existing 225-unit mobile home park to nominal “resident ownership.” The subject property is located at 21207 South Avalon Boulevard.

Staff Recommendation:

Senior Planner Newberg reviewed staff report and the recommendation to WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 10-2289, entitled, “A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson recommending approval of Tentative ~~Parcel~~ Tract Map No. 071206 to the City Council to permit a mobile home park conversion to resident ownership for Imperial Avalon Mobile Estates located at 21207 South Avalon Boulevard.”

Planning Officer Repp amended the resolution to reflect that if the Planning Commission approves this request, this matter will not go before the City Council, that the Planning Commission's approval is final.

Vice-Chairman Saenz opened the public hearing.

Thomas Casparian, representing Imperial Avalon Mobile Estates, LLC, invited Mr. Goldstien to provide his presentation.

Sid Goldstien, representing Imperial Avalon Mobile Estates, LLC, stated that the applicant has complied with the requirements for a Tentative Tract Map; pointed out that those residents who choose not to purchase the land can continue to rent for as long as they like. He asked that Condition Nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17 be deleted because he believes these conditions exceed the scope of requirements for this application. He added that this application is for a Tentative Tract Map and not a Tentative Parcel Map and asked that all reference to “parcel” map be changed to reflect “tract” map.

Planning Officer Repp advised that Condition Nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17 were also applied to the Colony Cove conversion and that staff is recommending those conditions remain.

Susy Forbath, Gilchrist & Rutter, advised that the residents were provided a Tenant Impact Report which explains this process and highlights what the protections, benefits

and impacts will be upon conversion; advised they have also met with the tenants at length prior to filing the application in August to address their proposal and what the process would be moving forward; that the City, subsequent to this meeting, also conducted a meeting with the residents and explained the issues from its perspective; and added that last week they conducted another meeting with the residents and considered every possible question those residents had in order to make sure they fully understand what the impact of this conversion is going to be, what is going to happen with this conversion, how they are protected, and what their rights and benefits are. She mentioned that the residents found two minor errors in the Tenant Impact Report, pointing out that they will correct the following language: that the park was actually constructed in 1974 and that it is a senior park, for residents 55 years of age and older.

Ms. Forbath explained that this conversion provides the residents with a choice they currently don't have by allowing them to purchase their space, pointing out that they can continue to rent for as long as they choose to live there or they can choose to purchase their space. She explained that this will take place differently in two ways for the residents; that the lower income residents will be provided better protection for those that need it than those who are not low income residents; and pointed out that both lower income residents and non-lower income residents can choose to continue to rent, but reiterated that state law does have different provisions for their rents. She advised that the rents for those low-income residents cannot increase any greater than they have today under the City's rent control; stated that non-low income residents also have state law protections but not to the degree of those low income residents; and that the non-low income residents' rents may go up gradually, phasing those increases in over a 5-year period to what market rate rents would be at that time for mobile homes. She noted that the state wants to encourage lower income residents to purchase by setting up a financing program called MPROP, which provides low income residents long-term financing of 3 percent interest; that it's based on the resident's income, not on the purchase price of the land; and that their monthly payments back to the state on this MPROP loan will not exceed 30 percent of their income and monthly utility bills.

Ms. Forbath stated that for non-low income residents, MPROP provides them an option that isn't available today for financing their mobile homes; that if they choose to purchase their property, they will be able to combine their existing home loans with the land loan at 6.5 percent interest over 30 years; pointed out that other loan options will be available, such as Cal Vet, First Time Homebuyers Program; and noted that some park owners will offer financing.

Ms. Forbath stated that one question which repeatedly comes up from the residents is the care of the infrastructure in the park, noting that while it is an old infrastructure, it has been well maintained; however, to ensure that the actual infrastructure of the park is not immediately thrust upon the residents, the Department of Real Estate will require the current park owner to set up a reserve account for the new homeowners association; and the park owner must fund this account prior to the sale of the first lot. She added that an inspection of the infrastructure for the entire park will be done to determine its useful remaining life and to cover future replacement and repairs; and in addition, there will be homeowner dues - amount to be determined by the Department of Real Estate - appropriate enough each month to ensure that ongoing maintenance and operational costs are covered. She added that the owner must also put up a bond for the first year's dues for every space in the park to make sure all the dues will be paid;

and that after the lots begin to sell, the park owner must continue to pay monthly HOA dues on every lot he maintains an interest in so all of the operational and maintenance costs are maintained.

Ms. Forbath reiterated that those residents wishing to continue to rent may do so or they may choose to purchase their lots, noting that if everyone purchases their properties, the HOA will be making the decisions that impact their community, not the current park owner. She added that purchasing their property gives them the opportunity to build equity which they don't have today; and the conversion also provides financing options that are not available today. She pointed out that even if some residents don't want to purchase their land, when they go to sell their mobile homes, this land ownership opportunity will be available to future residents of this park.

Commissioner Schaefer expressed her belief the applicant's positive spin on this conversion effort is insulting, stating that this is not a positive move for the seniors in this park. She stated that at this late stage of a senior's life, they do not want to be taking out a long-term loan and go into debt and that they are not interested in building up equity. She pointed out that Carson has gone out of its way and worked very hard for the mobile home park residents in regard to these conversion efforts; and stated she is aware that at this time, her hands are tied and that she will likely approve this application this evening even though she is opposed to it. She asked what the price will be for these lots.

Ms. Forbath stated that the lot prices have not yet been determined, noting there are further steps this process needs to go through; pointed out that the market conditions are likely to change by the time the lots are ready for purchase; and that they are not able to determine at this time how long this entire process is going to take. She stated that once City approval is obtained, then an appraisal will be done; and that those appraisal prices will be distributed to the residents prior to making application to the Department of Real Estate (DRE), which can take 6 months to a year for their approval. She explained that the residents will have the appraisal prices locked in for a long while before they must make their final decisions.

Commissioner Schaefer noted her understanding that the rent increases would not be under rental control and questioned how their rent increases are going to be determined.

Ms. Forbath explained that under state law 66427.5, the rents for lower income residents cannot increase more than the average increase for the previous 4 years they've been under local rent control; and that the rent increases will be the average of the past 4 years or by the CPI, whichever is less.

Commissioner Schaefer asked how much the homeowner association fees will be.

Ms. Forbath stated that the DRE will make that determination; advised that they will need to submit a budget of the park's operating costs and park financial records to the DRE as well as a 30-year budget going into the future; and from that information, the DRE will determine how much that monthly fee will need to be. She noted the average monthly HOA dues in other parks of this size, quality and park amenities range from \$120 to \$150 a month. She pointed out that those HOA fees would only be paid by the

owners, not those who rent in the park, and that the current owner of the park would pay those dues on the rented lots.

Commissioner Schaefer stated these “unknown” fee amounts are onerous on the seniors, stating this is not a good situation for the seniors; and she expressed her desire to be able to vote differently than how the law is guiding the Commission this evening.

Commissioner Park asked what will be the frequency of those rent increases for those residents who end up continuing to rent and what will be the guidelines for those increases.

Ms. Forbath stated that the rent would increase on an annual basis but increase by the average amount raised in this park in the past 4 years, assuming the rent was raised once in the last 4 years. She provided an example that if the rent increase was \$30 in the last 4 years, that amount would be averaged out over 4 years and that would be the amount the rent could increase going forward, stating that first increase would be around \$8 a year and restricted to one annual increase.

City Attorney Wynder clarified that increase would only be for the low income residents.

Planning Officer Repp stated there is nothing to keep the park owner from requesting further rent increases until such time as they formally convert the park; and she noted that because the rents at this park are on the low side, she would not be surprised if a rent increase application were received prior to this conversion.

Ms. Forbath stated that a low income individual in Carson would be someone in a 2-person household earning less than \$50,750 annually; and that those residents who earn above this annual figure would have their rent increase in accordance with the appraised market level rent, in equal increments over 4 years; and that those residents' rents would be at mobile home park market rate by the fifth year. She added that they will need to hire a licensed appraiser who is familiar with national standards.

Commissioner Park asked if new CC&R's will be drafted for the newly formed HOA.

Ms. Forbath stated they are required by the DRE to submit CC&R's to the DRE for approval.

City Attorney Wynder stated that currently in place are rules and regulations that are authorized to be promulgated under the state Mobile Home Residency Law, noting they are not really CC&R's.

Commissioner Verrett asked if one's poor credit history will impact their ability to get a loan should they wish to purchase.

Ms. Forbath stated they will work with all the residents to obtain a loan, noting they can work with the City or seek state MPROP loans, which are not based on a resident's credit history; and she explained that an application for MPROP state funds is made to the state on behalf of the HOA, which becomes its own nonprofit entity; advised that they will apply for all those low income residents with one application to the state; and she stated that she has not seen a resident unable to obtain this type of loan.

Commissioner Verrett stated she is concerned with being required to make a decision this evening with the likely settlement in March of the Carson Harbor Village court case, questioning why this is being pushed through quickly.

City Attorney Wynder explained that this is before the Planning Commission at the maximum period of time for the Permit Streamlining Act, which sets forth a maximum timeline for discretionary action; advised that the failure to take action on an application at the maximum period of time deems an application approved by operation of law; and explained that while there is an appeal pending by Carson Harbor Village, that decision is not expected until March 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted that because that decision is expected in March, the Commission must follow the current status of the law.

Planning Officer Repp noted for Commissioner Verrett that there has not been any delay in getting this matter before the Commission; that the application was not deemed complete until the latter part of last year; and that it has been processed in a timely manner. She added that this process does not allow for a lengthy period of time to review these applications.

City Attorney Wynder stated that assuming the Planning Commission is not able to approve this matter, the applicant has the right to appeal the decision to City Council; and stated that the Permit Streamlining Act, which is a 60-day statute, simply requires a decision be made in a specified period of time so that an application does not languish; and reiterated that if the application is not acted upon in that period of time, it would be deemed approved by operation of law. He reiterated that this application is being processed in a timely manner.

Commissioner Gordon asked when the conversion would take place if this process is approved.

Ms. Forbath explained that nothing happens until the first lot is sold.

City Attorney Wynder stated that if no purchase of space occurs, the park will never convert, noting the conversion occurs on the sale of a single space; and that until that one space sells, the park remains a tenant park subject to the City's rent control ordinance. He noted that once the first "space" is sold, the City's rent control ordinance would no longer apply in this park.

Ms. Forbath reiterated that depending on a resident's status, a low income resident will pay the same rent they pay at the date of conversion, subject to an annual increase under the formula of either the average increase in rents over the previous 4 years or the change in CPI from year to year, whichever amount is less. She noted that if they are a non-low income resident on the date of conversion, they will pay the space rent that they are paying as of the date of conversion, which will be adjusted annually over the following 4 years up to an established appraised fair market rate rent for mobile home parks.

Planning Officer Repp stated after that period, the rent will then continue to escalate based on the park owner's interpretation of what would be a fair rent; stated that the appraisal only controls within that first 4 years; and after that point, the increases are open for a non-low income resident.

Commissioner Brimmer asked if there are currently any vacant spaces.

Planning Officer Repp indicated that staff does not have that answer, but indicated there may be some unoccupied units.

Commissioner Brimmer asked if any of the tenants could be evicted by the owner if they don't want to purchase their lot, and she asked if relocation assistance is available.

City Attorney Wynder stated that a resident's decision not to purchase would not be a basis for eviction; and that the only way someone could be evicted is for failure to pay rent or some other for-cause basis for removal.

Ms. Forbath pointed out that relocation assistance is not being considered due to the offering of rental assistance and loan assistance for purchase.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the park owner can purchase a mobile home in this park to start the conversion process.

City Attorney Wynder stated it is his understanding from prior court decisions that a mechanism is in place wherein a park owner could acquire a space that was available for sale and remove the coach on that space, which would trigger the conversion; and he stated that is specifically discussed by the Court of Appeals in the El Dorado opinion.

Mr. Casparian stated he disagrees with City Attorney Wynder's statement; stated that if a park owner already owns the space, he can't buy the space he already owns; and that this would not comply with the intended statute. He noted that the intent of the statute is that once a space sells to a resident or incoming resident, that would trigger the conversion; and stated he is not aware of any provision where the park owner could buy the space that he already owns from himself.

City Attorney Wynder stated that if Mr. Casparian will make a representation that he and his client understand that this park will never convert until a park resident or new park resident other than the park owner purchases a single space, then he would concede that point.

Mr. Casparian stated that is his complete understanding of the law.

Dr. Rita Boggs, resident, stated that the applicant's meeting with the residents left a false impression that it is easy for a mobile home owner to move their coach to another park facility if they chose, pointing out it's not that easy to find another park that will take an older coach; and that if one of these residents wanted to leave the park with their coach, they would likely not be able to find anything close and they would wind up miles away from their family. She pointed out that part of this park has a Commercial designation, questioning if this poses any problem.

Planning Officer Repp stated there is a split zone designation for this property, noting the Commercial Automotive area is in the front; advised that the City's ordinance does allow for existing mobile home parks to remain as legal non-conforming uses; and noted that the mobile home park is allowed at this point to remain indefinitely within that Commercial Automotive zone. She added this is a permitted use within the Residential zone on the west side of the park.



Dr. Boggs stated she is concerned with potential environmental issues just north of this site where there is a landfill under the jurisdiction of the Department of Toxic Substances Control; and stated that because the park is on lower ground, she questioned whether testing needs to be done to determine if any of those landfill toxins have flowed onto the park property. She noted her concern that in the future, toxins will be discovered under their coaches and that the residents will be stuck with property they cannot sell. She added that this landfill is known to have PCB's among other dangerous toxins; and stated that the land in this park should be checked for toxic substances before anyone buys their lots. She stated that seniors are not interested in taking on new mortgages at this stage in their lives.

Planning Officer Repp stated there is a disclosure requirement to report any known or potential issues associated with this property; that the property owner is required under state law to provide full disclosure; and noted that if there are none toxins on this property, that information would likely be available at the Department of Toxic Substances Control. She added that all buyers should use due caution whenever they buy any property.

Jane Osuna, park resident, stated she currently has a mortgage on her mobile home unit and that she can't afford to take on more debt; she pointed out that there is limited money in the MPROP fund and that the moneys may not be available for these residents; stated there is currently only \$412,000 in that fund for Carson residents, which expires this June 30<sup>th</sup>. She noted that Gilchrist & Rutter has offered to the city of Palm Springs a 10-percent discount on 147 mobile home spaces in a park that was recently converted, noting the park owner is having difficulty selling the lots; and she pointed out this could easily happen with this park. She questioned the validity of the appraisals that will be done, expressing her belief the park appraisals conducted at the Palm Springs mobile home park were done without site visits.

Peggy Anderson, park resident, stated that the south side of their park was the former Quaker Paint company, believing there is lead contamination; noted that her research shows it will be difficult to obtain loans on these mobile homes; and stated that many of these residents do not have extra funds to put any money down on a loan.

Rex Levett, park resident, stated he is opposed to this conversion; and stated he is 90 years old and not interested in taking on a loan at this late stage of his life.

Jerry Kefalas, park resident, stated he does not have much faith in an appraiser being hired by the park owner, expressing a need to hire an impartial appraiser; noted he is not in favor of this proposal nor getting away from Carson's rent control program; and stated that most of the residents don't have extra funds to put a percentage down for a new loan nor have extra funds to pay for the dues of the HOA, pointing out that most of the residents are doing all they can to currently meet their monthly expenses.

William Davis, park resident, questioned if a conversion would take place if a resident dies and their heir takes possession of their coach; and stated that he is opposed to this, noting these were supposed to be the years when he didn't have to worry about having a roof over his head. He expressed his concern with property contamination and stated that the seniors don't deserve this in their last years of life.

Rodney Warner, park resident, stated the senior residents should not have to be going through this process at this stage of their lives; and he noted that the conversion paperwork incorrectly reflected this was a family park, pointing out it is a senior park.

Planning Officer Repp stated that any change from a senior park to a family park would not be considered a change of use.

Mr. Warner stated that the residents are used to an increase every 3 to 4 years and that they cannot now afford to pay for an increase every year.

Ms. Forbath reiterated that they held two lengthy meetings in the park and explained that no one has to purchase and no one will be evicted from the park and that they have provided written information on this conversion and made it very clear that buying or renting is an option, not a requirement. Ms. Forbath stated that if the residents are concerned with the potential of land contamination, they should not hesitate to contact the appropriate agency; stated that currently, all mobile homes in California fall under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Housing and Community Development; and that if there are any health and safety concerns, they should be contacting that agency. She advised that the appraisals must be conducted using nationally recognized standards by a licensed appraiser; and pointed out that the purpose of this conversion to resident ownership is for the park to ultimately become 100 percent resident owned. She added that banks today more closely scrutinize appraisals in these economic times, and that she expects all the appraisals to be realistic and stand up to bank standards.

Ms. Forbath noted that some residents are finding better interest rates and terms on new loans; explained that the value a resident has invested in their home can and will become the down payment for the lot, noting that they will not have to come up with any extra money for a down payment; and reiterated that the park owner wants to encourage the residents to buy their spaces. She stated they will work with the residents to obtain loans, noting there are lenders who specialize in this area; and reiterated that they will help facilitate this financing activity and also work with the state in applying for MPROP funds.

Ms. Forbath explained that the MPROP program is funded annually; that there's an open application period at the beginning of each year; that applications are submitted during this one window of time; and that they are done on a point basis, so it's possible today those funds could be depleted from the beginning of the year, but that this fund is recharged with funds every year. She noted the state allots \$2 million per park per year at the beginning of the year; if there are more people than can be funded in that first year based on the applications, they would apply year after year until all the residents who are interested are able to take advantage of the MPROP funds; and mentioned that those residents waiting would keep renting until they received their MPROP money.

Commissioner Brimmer stated she'd like the City to investigate relocation assistance or some other means for the City to help these residents.

Planning Officer Repp reminded the Commission that the staff has had numerous and ongoing discussions with City Council and exhausted every avenue to equitably help the mobile home residents with these conversion applications; and stated that at this time, there are few, if any, options to offer the mobile home residents. She pointed out that these are private-party transactions between the buyer and seller; and that this

City, along with many in California, have budget shortfalls and have no extra funds. She stated that the City is doing all it can to help.

Deborah Lopez, speaking on behalf of park resident Sonia Nylander, stated that a park resident must currently get approval from the other tenants to sell their mobile home and asked if this will still be the case.

City Attorney Wynder stated he is not aware of any requirement in state law for a resident to obtain a mobile home park property owner's consent to sell a coach; and mentioned that a new purchaser will be required to purchase both the lot and the coach if this conversion request is successful.

Ms. Lopez stated that lenders will not loan any money on coaches built before 1975.

Vice-Chairman Saenz closed the public hearing.

Responding to Commissioner Park's inquiry regarding the applicant's request to delete Condition Nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17, City Attorney Wynder stated that those conditions are lawful and can be imposed.

Associate Planner Newberg added the words "*If required*" at the beginning of Condition No. 12.

Planning Officer Repp reminded the Commission of the change to the resolution title to reflect the Tentative "Tract" Map; and to change all reference to parcel map to "tract" map throughout the report and resolution.

Commissioner Verrett thanked staff for their efforts to educate the Commission in this matter; and expressed her belief the City Council should be the body to make this decision, noting she does not want to put her name to a case/law that she does not agree with.

Commissioner Schaefer stated it has been made very clear that the Commission must follow the law, whether the members agree with the law or not, noting her disappointment in these mobile home park property owners.

City Attorney Wynder noted that while a Commissioner may disagree with the law, the Commission is bound to follow the current state of the law as set forth to the Commission this evening.

#### Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Gordon, to approve the applicant's request, amending Condition No. 12, "***If required***, a geology/soils report..."; change all reference of parcel map to "***tract***" map in the Resolution and staff report; change the resolution to reflect "...the Planning Commission of the city of Carson ***approving*** Tentative Tract Map No. 07106..."; and moved to adopt Resolution No. 10-2289. Motion carried as follows:

AYES:	Gordon, Park, Saenz, Schaefer
NOES:	Brimmer, Verrett
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Diaz, Faletogo, Graber

Vice-Chair Saenz recessed the meeting at 8:37 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 8:50 P.M.

---

**12. NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION:**

**A) City of Carson Municipal Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Report**

Applicant's Request:

The city of Carson, Planning Division, is sponsoring an informative presentation by the South Bay Cities Council of Governments Representative. The properties involved would be citywide.

Assistant Planner Castillo stated that this is the first major step in decreasing green house gas emissions for the City, and he introduced Heidi Aten, the City's consultant from South Bay COG. He noted she is present this evening to provide a summary of the inventory, as well as key findings, and highlight the next steps for the City.

Heidi Aten highlighted the municipal inventory results; provided a brief project background, and she commented on issues concerning reductions and climate action planning. She noted that the state has passed a climate agreement to curb emissions; advised that Carson joined COG in this effort in May 2000 to reduce green house emissions in this community; and noted that these inventory results reflect where the City is decreasing its emissions with its natural gas, employee commuting, vehicle fleet waste, electricity, etc. She advised that the next step is to decide on a reduction percentage for a target year; and that following this step, the City will develop a climate action plan, followed by implementation of that plan, then monitor and verify those results. She noted that 2005 was used as the City's baseline year; that these statistics monitored 2007 readings to determine the progress that has been made since the baseline year; and she added that 1990 is a significant policy year for this effort.

Ms. Aten highlighted the summary results from baseline year 2005, noting Carson has accomplished a 9.3-percent decrease of emissions reflected in the 2007 results. She highlighted the need for on-going data management for all cities, noting they are applying for some grants to track this information. She stated that Carson is in the process of doing a community wide inventory to develop an action plan, which includes transportation, commercial, industrial, residential usage of natural gas and electricity.

Planning Officer Repp advised that there are a number of laws which will come into play that will have significant impacts on the City relative to transportation and housing and how those relate to green house gas emissions; and noted her expectation that in the near future, there will be mandatory requirements that are very specific in terms of balancing transportation dollars, how the City gets investment for its community versus the way it decides on housing density and the types of housing projects it approves. She noted that state and federal housing funds will be difficult to obtain if those cities continue to put housing in locations that are not desirable, locations that create negative impacts on green house gasses. She added that the City now needs to demonstrate in its environmental reporting that it has taken into account greenhouse gas emissions and that mitigation measures have been put in place to lower those emissions.

Planning Officer Repp noted her appreciation of Assistant Planner Castillo, Heidi Aten, and the South Bay COG for putting the report together this evening.

Commissioner Park commented on the four surrounding freeways and how those will impact Carson's progress in this effort.

Planning Officer Repp explained that there are two levels of review that's based on the regional air quality; advised that cities cannot control car emissions but cities can control land use decisions, what type of land uses they promote in order to balance where people are working and living so as to minimize the number of trips; and noted that emissions standards on a statewide level will be handled through the Air Resources Board, noting that agency will be working with industry and local air districts to make some changes.

Vice-Chairman Saenz pointed out that Carson is also affected by the activities coming from the nation's two busiest ports in Long Beach and Los Angeles; and stated that improved synchronization of traffic lights should also be addressed.

Planning Manager Repp noted that the ports are undertaking some innovative programs to decrease their emissions, noting that some of those emissions are federally regulated; advised that there are requirements for port expansions to comply with CEQA standards; and she noted they are creating other strategies to decrease some of those emissions.

Commissioner Park asked how the levels of emissions are measured.

Ms. Aten stated that she receives consumption data from Southern California Edison, for instance, then calculates emissions factors to quantify those statistics; and stated that these statistics are then verified by EPA and used to get the statistical data.

Planning Officer Repp advised that there will be future discussions about this issue, and she encouraged the Planning Commissioners to educate themselves on the various state bills that are being passed in this effort.

Commissioner Brimmer and Park commended Ms. Aten for her enthusiastic and informative report this evening.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Schaefer moved, seconded by Commissioner Gordon, to forward this report to City Council for its approval. Motion carried, 5-0 (absent Commissioners Diaz, Faletogo, Graber, and Verrett).

---

**13. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**                      None.

---

**14. MANAGER'S REPORT**

Planning Officer Repp encouraged the Commissioners to attend the South Bay Cities Council of Governments 11<sup>th</sup> General Assembly on Friday, February 26<sup>th</sup> at the Community Center, from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

---

**15. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Park stated he is proud of the Commissioners this evening for taking the very difficult action that had to be taken with the mobile home issue, noting they followed through with their oaths as Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Brimmer stated that the mobile home issue was difficult and heart-wrenching.

Vice-Chairman Saenz suggested the City look into using the housing stimulus money for these mobile home residents.

Planning Officer Repp advised that the stimulus money cannot be used for those purposes.

---

## **16. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:27 P.M. the meeting was formally adjourned to Tuesday, March 9, 2010, 6:30 P.M., City Council Chambers.

---

*Chairperson*

*Attest By:*

---

Secretary