



TUESDAY, February 22, 2022
701 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745
6:30 p.m., Via Zoom

MINUTES

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Members: Chair: Charles Thomas Vice Chair: Chris Palmer Louie Diaz
Carlos Guerra Del Huff Jaime Monteclaro
Dianne Thomas Karimu Rashad Vacant
Alternates: Frederick Docdocil Richard Hernandez Leticia Wilson
Staff: Planning Manager: Betancourt Assistant City Attorney: Jones

"In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you require a disability related modification or accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please call the Planning Department at 310-952-1761 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting." (Government Code Section 54954.2)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: C. Thomas, Palmer, Diaz, Guerra, Huff, D.Thomas
Rashad, Hernandez, Docdocil, Wilson

Absent: Monteclaro (EA)

Planning Staff: Betancourt, Sandoval, Jones

3. ORAL COMMUNICATION FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

The public may at this time address the members of the Planning Commission on any matters within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. No action may be taken on non-agendized items except as authorized by law. Speakers are requested to limit their comments to no more than three minutes each, speaking once. *(see below)

McKina Alexander Vice Director for Membership of the American Planning Association (APA) presented the following information: The American Planning Association (APA) is a professional organization representing the field of urban planning in the U.S. The Los Angeles section of the American Planning Association is one of eight local sections of APA's California Chapter, with more than 1,300 members in the Los Angeles area. APA Los Angeles helps its members share knowledge, advance their careers, and guide change in both the profession and our communities. APA Los Angeles is a not-for-profit entity under the American Planning Association, California Chapter. She asked the commissioners if they would be interested in joining the APA Los Angeles team that they are welcome to email director@apalosangeles.org or reach out to her directly for more information.

***DUE TO CORONA VIRUS COVID-19, NO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE ALLOWED INTO CITY HALL DURING THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. THE**

MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED VIA REMOTE TELECONFERENCING USING THE ELECTRONIC “ZOOM” APPLICATION.

Any members of the public wishing to provide public comment for the items on the agenda may do so as follows:

1. Live via Zoom Application. Members of the public wishing to provide public comment in real-time will be invited to join the Zoom meeting remotely to provide their public comment live with their audio/video presented to the Planning Commission. Members of the public wishing to do so must email planning@carson.ca.us, providing their real name and the phone number they will use to call in from, no later than 3:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting. For further details/requirements and meeting invite information, please email planning@carson.ca.us no later than 3:00 p.m. on the date of the hearing.
2. Email: You can email comments to Planning@carson.ca.us no later than 3:00 p.m. before the meeting. Please identify the Agenda item you wish to address in your comments. Your comments will be read into the record.
3. Telephone: You can record your comments at (310) 952-1720 no later than 3:00 p.m. before the meeting. Please identify the Agenda item you wish to address in your comments. Your comments will be read into the record.
4. Box outside of City Hall: You can provide hand-written comments by dropping off a note at the box located in front of City Hall (701 East Carson Street) no later than 3:00 p.m., on the date of the meeting. Please identify the Agenda item you wish to address in your comments. Your comments will be read into the record.

NOTE: Members of the public wishing to observe the meeting live without providing public comment will be able to do so by watching it on the City's PEG television channel (Channel 35 on Charter or Channel 99 on AT&T for Carson residents) or via live streaming on the City's website, <http://ci.carson.ca.us/>.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

A) Minutes Approval: January 25, 2022

Commissioner D. Thomas (1st) Motion to approve, Commissioner Huff 2nd; Motion passed with 8-1 abstain (Diaz).

5. PUBLIC HEARING (Continued from January 25, 2022 Meeting)

A) Site Plan and Design Review (DOR) No. 1865-21

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Herman Architecture and Design, is requesting to consider approval of Site Plan and Design Review No. 1865-21 to demolish a former chemical manufacturing facility and associated ancillary structures and construct a new 124,324 square foot tilt-up warehouse building with 5,000 square feet of ground floor office space, an additional 5,000 square feet of mezzanine office space, 15 truck loading docks and surface parking.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Assistant Planner Castillo presented staff report and the recommendation to ADOPT Resolution No. 22-2823, entitled, "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON APPROVING SITE PLAN AND DESIGN OVERLAY REVIEW NO. 1865-21 FOR A PROPOSED TILT-UP WAREHOUSE FACILITY AT 2104 EAST 223RD STREET.

Chair Charles Thomas opened the public hearing for questions from commissioners and staff.

Commissioner Guerra asked about the time element involved for the rehabilitation of chemical substances at that site.

Assistant Planner Castillo stated that he did not have a timeline specified and referred the question to the applicant Tom Ashcraft to answer.

Tom Ashcraft stated, thank you Chairman Thomas, Members of the Planning Commission my name is Tom Ashcraft. I'm managing partner for 9th St partners with project developer we're very excited to be here tonight to present this project to you and I want to thank you for your time and services as planning commissioners. I thought Max provided an excellent overview of the project as stated by staff project the designated as heavy industrial and the city zoning code and was originally developed in the late 1950s is a PVC manufacturing compounding and distribution facility and has operated as such until our acquisition. Our proposed development meets or exceeds all the city's zoning and development regulations is compatible with the city's general plan and the surrounding uses. I believe our architect has designed a very attractive building to meet the needs of today's industrial users. January 25th before our item was extended, we heard from many community members that support for the project citing the desire for more jobs located within the community and continued investment in the city of Carson these were all members of the surrounding community that live work and play in Carson. On a personal note, I am very excited to redevelop this site and outdated manufacturing facility on an environmentally challenge site that was originally developed over 60 years ago. I formed Main Street partners approximately three years ago to redevelop underutilized sites in locations and I'm excited by the new jobs that will be created here and the investment our team is making in the City of Carson. I want to address the one question that was raised already surprisingly for the historical manufacturing use that this property was used for there isn't as much environmental contamination as you saw on the site next door so we do have a couple spots where we're doing the digging haul contamination dig and haul of the contaminated soil now there's a little bit of vinyl chloride that needs to be removed from the soil and so that's what we're working with DTSC on but we didn't have the massive you know groundwater impacts that that happened on the site next door that took a long time for remedial action to take place .So I'd like to thank staff for all their efforts on this project our team is here and I'm available to answer any other questions that you may have concludes my introduction. Thank you.

Commissioner Guerra stated with specificity in mind, what is an estimated timeline of how long it would take to clean up that site.

Tom Ashcraft stated, it will take 30 to 40 days of work in there and then we are going to install a vapor barrier underneath the building because of the groundwater issues and in the region not associated with our site so it is not a long cleanup process that we have to go through.

Commissioner Diaz posed a questions to representative Tom Ashcroft in regards to the project itself a tenant says I read has not been selected or known and I saw the letter that was presented in regards to delaying the project based on some traffic studies etc. and then I also read a letter submitted by Monchamp Eldrum LLP and rebuttal to that and I guess the concern that I raised I still have will this site ultimately become a last mile delivery station and that's a concern that I have in relation to traffic generation pollution and noise. Maybe you can answer that?

Tom Ashcraft stated we designed this building to accommodate a wide variety of users. We don't have a tenant. We haven't started marketing this site yet. We haven't even gotten it approved by the city yet that's why we're here tonight so you know what I can say is that we would look for a user that would be consistent with the city's zoning code and requirements and permitted uses within the zoning code. We don't have a user; it could be the wide variety of users. I mean it could accommodate warehouse distribution user it could accommodated another permitted use within the zoning code.

Commissioner Diaz thanked him for the answer. However, stated that the question was not answered. His concern relates to the last mile delivery stations which is a broader larger utilization. He stated if he has further questions, he will let him know.

Chair Charles Thomas asked if applicant is aware of the conditions of approval and if the applicant was comfortable with the conditions of approval including conditions one and two which are the interim DIF fee and the CFD fee.

Tom Ashcraft agreed that he was aware and was in agreeance with the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Diane Thomas thanked her colleagues for the questions that they have asked. It has been her concern as well. She stated that the applicant would be constructing a building that has not received marketing. She asked if the applicant had a vision as to who would likely occupying the building. As she was reading the specs, she noticed that they would be setting up 15 loading docks and noted that was a lot. She stated that loading docks equates to trucks which reference that there has to knowledge about what will/could be used at this site.

Tom Ashcraft stated we designed it again to accommodate a wide variety of users. It is standard when you're developing warehouse industrial facilities are about one dock door for every 10,000 square feet of a building and so that's really what the what the building was designed to be a standard in the market. I think in the market we've seen a lot of different types of tenants a couple of big ones that have been attracted to Torrance lately are related to aerospace and you know manufacturing production facilities. I think the other big difference that we're seeing now is a lot of jobs into office and we're proposing 10,000 feet of office in this building that would accommodate a lot of workers and you're seeing consolidation of warehouse facilities and headquarters facilities at the same time so I mean that's really what we're looking for is as a corporate user that's looking for is a high identity

Class A building and you know that's the intended user that we're going after, that's the reason for the high quality design and the office space that we are going for. I think if you were to see it as more of a last mile facility you would see more dock doors going into that and it would be a larger building generally they're larger than what we're proposing here.

Commissioner Diane Thomas stated the other question that I have is because we did have a lot of speakers before, and they are obviously very interested in the project relative to jobs can you give me a feel for or have you do you have any stats relative to pre-construction and post construction. How many jobs will be available and how many of those jobs will be permanent in each of those cases.

Tom Ashcraft stated that's a good question. You know there will be hundreds of jobs during the construction time period of all the different trades. You get everything from the graters, concrete workers, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and landscaping, there's a lot of jobs that that go into construction. On a permanent basis again we're looking with the high office component to somebody with a high office user 10,000 square feet of office would generate probably 50 jobs and then there is 125,000 feet in the warehouse. It's dependent on the ultimate user and what their uses. If it was a manufacturing, it would be a higher job count. We would be looking at probably over 100 jobs total in that facility.

Commissioner Diane Thomas stated so if you're looking for an organization that's going to be coming into use the building that's after you have completed your construction those may not necessarily be new jobs but companies who are moving into your building that already have an existing employee list, is that accurate?

Tom Ashcraft stated it could be you know. It could be companies in Carson that are looking to grow with it they need more space and they've outgrown their current facilities and need a new facility to continue their growth. I mean I think that would be a great success story to see you know a Carson company growing into a new building within Carson and being able to stay within the city as opposed to having to move to another to another location and take their jobs somewhere else because they can't find space.

Commissioner Diane Thomas stated it's always optimistic to hear that jobs are coming but I think we need to be very clear as to the permanency of those jobs which we know during the construction era there will be a lot of jobs because they have to do the construction but after that that number can be reduced significantly because those companies that who could potentially occupy that building may have their own staff already in existence but that does answer that. I had a number of other questions but since we don't know who's going to occupy that I will yield the floor Mr. Chair.

Chair Charles Thomas asked I have another question and that is are you aware that as it relates to traffic count and parking that we have been utilizing a standard for a traditional warehouse facility that is a little bit different than the standard that we would have if it was for a different use such as a last mile fulfillment and so I just wanted to ask staff and/or the applicant in terms of the difference between those standards because we want to be clear in terms of what we're approving and what it could potentially be that is different than what we are originally did our analysis on.

Tom Ashcraft stated yes Commissioner Thomas I'm going to start but I do have our traffic team on the phone here on the zoom so I'm going to turn it over to them. But we did do the

traffic and technical memorandum to really satisfy the requirements in the city's code to ensure that the project was going to satisfy convenience and safety of circulation for pedestrians and vehicles and so that's you know what we were looking at and we looked at the queuing lines to make sure it wasn't causing any traffic issues into the street or causing any other safety issues with that I'm going turn it over to the Dudek team, Dennis is on an is going to go into more detail and answer further questions cause that's very technical.

Dennis Pascal (DUDEK) states I'm Dennis Pascal from Dudek. I'm the transportation services manager and we did prepare a transportation assessment for the project. Based on the characterization of the project on our end we understand it was a warehouse project we looked at the ITE which is the institute of transportation engineers trip generation manual, and the project meets the definition of a standard warehouse use. We understand that some of the questions were related to a high cube fulfillment center which is similar to these Amazon's out there and those generally are at least 200,000 square feet and this project is well below that and that's why we did not look at those other types of uses that that are much larger buildings. But when you compare the trip rates and this is how we generate traffic, like for example the warehouse rate that we use from ITE it had a 1.71 trips per thousand square feet daily and then for a high fulfillment center which is land use code 155 and ITE it generates a 1.81 trips per thousand square feet. So, it's not significantly higher number in daily trips and then for example in the am peak hour a warehouse used generates 0.17 trips per thousand square feet high cube fulfillment center generates 0.15 trips it's actually a little lower than a warehouse and then in the PM at warehouse generates 0.18 trips per thousand square feet in a high fulfillment center generates 0.16 trips per thousand square feet which is a little lower. I think the perception is that people see a lot of cars coming from these fulfillment centers. If you look at the rates, it's because these centers are much larger in square footage, so I mean you're looking at well above 200,000 square feet to 500,000 square feet that's why you see those higher trips for those larger buildings.

Chair Charlies Thomas states: I guess there are differential standards though, that is what you're telling me and for some of the standards we would be higher and then other standards would be lower in essence?

Dennis Pascal (DUDEK) stated, yes depending on the use. The different numbers I told you look at daily trips over a 24-hour period. Then to look at the AM and PM peak hour trips generated during these commute hours when the traffic is the busiest on the streets. When you compare the two land uses a warehouse which is a high cube fulfillment center, they're pretty similar in terms of generation based on square footage they are similar.

Commissioner Diaz stated my question is not for the traffic engineer at this time. It goes back to Tom Ashcraft the project developer representative. In your remarks/statements you're talking about utilizing skilled trades to do the work and you name a number of them. Are you entered into a project labor agreement PLA with the LA Orange County building and construction trades to develop this project 100% union? That's one question. The second question is, will you be utilizing local hiring residents from our Carson community and surrounding sister cities and will these jobs be full time at the end when it's constructed, and will they be providing a living wage for that workforce?

Tom Ashcraft stated, so I want to make sure that I answer all those or address all of them so please jump in if needed. As far as a project labor agreement we have hired a general

contractor former construction that is going to be doing the construction on this they have a master agreement signed with several other trades, union trades, and you'll see several of those unions supporting the project tonight and they were here last time as well. I think you asked a question about transitioning too, can you re ask the question so I make sure that I get it right?

Commissioner Diaz stated, will you be utilizing local hire to do the work as well as filling these full-time positions and will they be a living wage full time jobs available?

Tom Ashcraft stated as for local work, I will check on that with the contractor. With their policy ending generally they like to keep people close to where they live and the jobs that they work on and we can discuss a formal proposal for that and the living wage that's going to be dependent on their who ends up being inside the building.

Commissioner Diaz stated, So Tom you hired a general contractor and you've got some skilled labor that's going to be doing the work but possibly not all the work and I guess the answer is no, you have not entered into a project labor agreement with the Los Angeles Orange County building and construction trades that represents all the industries doing craft work. So, you're saying that the general contractor will hire some, but you have not entered into a PLA. Are you open or are you opposed to entering into a project labor agreement? The premise is it's built right, it's built on time and it's done with the union labor and that's why I mentioned the project labor agreement.

Tom Ashcraft stated I'll definitely talk to our contractor about it. I mean we definitely have a lot of Labor unions that that will be involved in the project and we'll definitely discuss it with him and see what we can come up with.

Chair Charles Thomas asks Planning Secretary Sandoval if there are any speakers from the public.

Planning Secretary Sandoval commences on calling on each to speak.

Ralph Velador states, good evening honorable chair and planning commission my name is Ralph Velador, and I am member of Labors International Union North America. My colleagues and I fully support the project presented before you tonight. I must emphasize that the developer proposed to put the warehouse in the right location. The area can use some new development and LIUNA has partnered with developer because they support our ideology of using well trained union craftsman who are professional in their craft and provide area standard wages and benefits to the workforce. If the project is approved tonight the construction of the project will have well trained union tradesman who are professional in their craft and build to the highest standard. It will also produce good paying jobs with benefits for our members. This project will allow local members to work close to home, avoiding long commutes and spending more quality time in our community. It is essential that we support developers that are willing to use private money in our economy and community to provide an opportunity to put residents to work. To summarize this project not only makes sense but it also helps our local economy at this critical time and our members who are ready to build it.

Alfonso Sanchez stated, thank you for the opportunity to speak my name is Alfonso Sanchez. I'm a second generation, 38-year member of the laborers International Union of

North America. We fully support this project. Communities should support these projects that provide living wage jobs by utilizing skilled and trained union members. As laborers we are always working ourselves out of a job. These short-term jobs that people think aren't worthwhile are what they are careers. This project not only makes sense but would also help our local economy at this critical time. Please support this project. Thank you.

Emily Mandrup stated, Hello commissioners thank you for having us here today. I am the development manager working with Tom Ashcraft on this project. I just wanted to supplement a few things as well. As with partner, I've been doing ground up development for about 20 years and you'd see the whole spectrum of developments and developers and I just wanted to reiterate that Tom and his partners are long term holders. They're looking to hold this far beyond when I'll be here for decades they go above and beyond for quality, there's a lot of what we call merchant builders who are looking to do a real quick and cheap build and flip it. This is not that team. We are going to hold it for over thirty to forty years. We are looking for quality tenants. We absolutely understand the concerns for jobs and them being long-term jobs. If you remember the picture from Max, the property right now is vacant and very dilapidated and so you know we can't guarantee exactly what's coming in, but I can absolutely guarantee you it's getting better and it's going to break out in a higher quality of tenants at this time. So, I'm just really excited to be here in Carson. I am a south bay girl, and my family was too and so I'm excited to see this project move forward and I appreciate your time.

Jason Bias stated, thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Jason Barnes and I'm a member of Labor International Union of North America and I fully support this project. You know for years I was a member of victory outreach Carson and I served as the evangelism team minister and I combed the streets of Carson a lot. I spent hours and hours days and days with my team combing the streets. Now when you just drive by our streets you wouldn't really know what's going on in there, but you start to walk down the boulevards at night when you go into the apartment complexes to the parks and to the homeless encampments into the bad neighborhoods you begin to understand the real vibe of our city and I want to tell you there's a real need for opportunity. People are crying out all over the place. It is easy for us who have good jobs and forget where we came from and to close a blind eye to what's going on around us. But I want to tell you there is a need for good jobs and opportunities here in the City of Carson. This project can be a launching pad for those interested in the career in union construction. Tonight, you have the opportunity to not only change the lives of many young local residents but also the circumstances in their families for generations to come. Usually when someone joins a trade union a lot of their family members will follow into next generation after generation and once, we are gone this facility will continue to be a wellspring of opportunity for the community as it'll provide jobs for every everybody from spouses and retirees looking for a job due to the high cost of living to graduates looking for first time employment. A lot of employers don't want someone without experience or a former job, but these types of jobs open up the doors to those new to the employment field. This project is located in excellent area and there's a big empty lot in that spot and for those of us who are familiar with empty lots in this city we all know the dangers so something new down here would be wonderful we have an opportunity tonight to take a hindrance in our city and make it into something promising for the community. How can we not take advantage of this great blessing? It is a wonderful opportunity. Honorable commission let's not let this opportunity pass us by. Let's get this facility built and beautify another section of our city thank you so much.

Bill Quisenberry stated, thank you commissioners and staff my name is Bill Quisenberry. I'm also a member for Liuna and I am here tonight supporting this project. I had no idea what this project was about until I looked at it today and I thought something needs to be replaced here and I think warehouse facility will fit perfectly for that location. These are the times that we are in, e commerce, and we've also in the past recent developed relationships with these developers and our contractors that are putting our members to work so and when the when the project is complete there will be new jobs in the area. The construction jobs are going to be good paying jobs through our union, defined benefit pension, medical benefits for the family and these projects also could be another opportunity for apprentices to get on the job training that's required them to complete their state approved apprenticeship program. So, all in all this is a great project and I ask that you support your staff's decision on the design overlay review and vote yes. Thank you very much.

Josh LaFarga stated, I'm also with the laborers union and I just want to echo all the support comments for this project earlier today. It met all the requirements. It's the right project, it's the right use and the right location and it utilizes the right workforce. I hope you guys approve the project. Thank you.

Jose Radillo stated, Good evening Chair and fellow commissioners thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak this evening. My name is Jose Radillo I am a member of Liuna. As such I am here in support of this project. Passing this project would contribute to the growth of the local economy as well as provide local hire and much needed well paying jobs for skilled laborers. The developer is willing to pay the remaining wage and hire union labor craftsmen and they will also allow us to obtain the hours that we need to submit into our benefit package every year so that we can receive our health insurance benefits plan. In addition, Liuna is an accredited labor training school that is located in the City of Azusa. Both the Department of Labor and the State of California has recognized and approved the apprentice program. An apprentice program that provides highly skilled, well trained, and motivated workforce, qualified construction craft laborers. So, you can assure this project will be done professionally. In the construction industry we travel from city to city once the project jobs are completed. We spend a lot of time away from our family. Supporting this project will allow our members to work close to home. Avoiding long commutes and allowing families to be close to home in evening to participate in family activities. Projects such as will support new jobs and a healthy family lifestyle and a positive future. I am asking you to support our future and to support this project. Thank you for your time.

Jose Garcia stated, Good evening honorable Chair and Planning Commission my name is Jose Garcia and I'm a 34-year member of Liuna (Labors International Union of North America) and I stand in support with my brothers and sisters on this project. All the check marks have been checked on this project. We got a great develop and a good contractor providing local jobs stimulating our economy taking away and depleted site, something that's not nice to drive by. The design looks great. I stand in full support of this project and I hope that you do as well thank you very much for your time tonight.

52:52-Nelson Motto stated, Good Evening Commissioners, my name is Nelson Motto. I'm the organizing director for laying the Los Angeles alliance for any economy and we are an organization that works throughout the county. We build coalitions and we are a bridge between labor and community around access to good education, good jobs and also the

environment. We do support the development of a project, its union, and we are very supportive of our brothers who testified here today. A big concern that we have is who the tenant will be and how can we make sure that the tenants do follow the example that is happening right now. That the jobs that are coming in are good jobs with benefits and they are not jobs that are going to be breaking bodies like we have been seeing in so many of the warehouse. We also are very concerned in terms of the type of tenant, in terms of like what additional type of impact it's going to have on the roads and traffic and on the quality of the air as well. We understand that right now it fits all the criteria but once a tenant comes in, what type of other impacts that are not being tested right now can come to the community and so we really want you to also figure out a way of how you can guarantee that these are dignified jobs that it won't they won't have any changes to the to the quality of the air and the roads that tend to happen with warehousing types of jobs that come in. Thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas closed the public hearing.

Chair Charles Thomas had a question for Staff/Assistant City Attorney and stated, I have a question for our staff and assistant city attorney as I understood it from the testimony there were two standards and I don't want to get into the details so much of those standards for traffic counts and parking but between what we will call a standard warehouse and a fulfillment center and we were talking in those two areas and so I'd like to know, is there, I'd like to be clear that we are our analysis is based upon that standard warehouse and not the fulfillment center because that's a very different analysis as I understand it at least according to those standards. I don't want to get into the technical details so much as just pointing to the fact that we are approving A and we want to be clear that we would not be approving B.

Planning Manager Betancourt stated, what I would recommend is that Nick is with us our traffic engineer and he could begin the conversation or begin to answer your question and at the same time Dennis is still with us to make sure that there were no discrepancies between what the applicant proposed and what was contemplated and evaluated, and we may want to reopen the public hearing if we want to gather more information.

Chair Charles Thomas opened the public hearing to answer further questions and information.

Nick Lowe was called upon by Chair to speak he stated, So for ITE the traffic standards for trip generation to forecast what these new projects are going to produce, ITE has gathered data from around the country for certain types of land uses. In those categorize them together to come up with aggregate data to help increase the accuracy of this forecast. Now there are several different warehouse types in the latest version of the ITE manual general warehousing is one of them, high key warehouse, fulfillment center warehouse, cold storage, and there's several others. So, they're all different rates. This project as was presented to staff review was as a standard warehouse with no fulfillment center details or cold storage details it was just a standard warehouse. So, the difference between a standard warehouse and something like a sort facility could be the representative of the applicant said it could be very close depending on the type of sort warehouse or it could be vastly different if it's a similar to like a last mile facility. So, it can range from like you said 1.7 to 1.8 trips per thousand square feet too over 80 trips per thousand square feet so it's

quite a vast range. So, what was analyzed here was a standard warehouse and that was what I reviewed.

Chair Charles Thomas then asked, would you like to speak to the parking as well?

Nick Lowe then stated sure parking as it is in the municipal code site is conforming to what's in our code as a high doc use. Which is just based on number of doc doors and the square footage used by the tenant which is assumed to be one based on the size of the building so that is that is conforming, and municipal code has been updated to include these kind of new land uses for E-Commerce so things like that weren't taken into consideration.

Commissioner Diaz stated, I am bit more confused because all along its purported that it's a standard warehouse use, a general warehouse use, not a fulfillment center not a last mile delivery station. But then I'm hearing ultimately or whomever the tenant may be once it's developed or even another future tenant it might meet the standards of last mile or fulfillment center so I think that's where I generated my initial concerns and I still have concerns that because it's unknown who the tenant will be, and I understand that. But my true concern is that it does not become tomorrow or in the future a last mile delivery station that then generates a lot more traffic and creates other issues of concern for the community that are not addressed or mitigate. So, I still raised that concern. I appreciate the supporters the brothers and sisters who spoke. It does seem that it's from Liuna, the laborers. When I asked a question of Tom Ashcroft the project developer, will this be a project labor agreement that encompasses all the crafts union labor that were customized to under a project labor agreement that it's not only one labor unit but it's a host. That the project is built right on time and you know within the cost that it said that's usually what a project labor agreement spells out and they've been very successful so that's my second concern as well. Other than that, you know I'm going to end here and continue to listen for the deliberation before I render my opinion or my vote.

Chair Charles Thomas stated let me just confirm with staff before going further just to confirm that we don't have any more facts that we need to gather before I close public hearing because we can do much of this deliberation of ourselves after we close public hearing but if we have further factual information, we want to gather we should ask those questions at this time.

Commissioner Rashad stated one quick follow up question for Nick Lowe, he mentioned a higher rate trip in his statement. Saying up to 8 trips per day or per thousand square feet. Can you verify what use that is, because that's a big variation from the numbers we spoke about earlier.

Nick Lowe stated, so the 8 daily trips daily per thousand square feet. That is for a sort facility so it's an E commerce last mile kind of facility. So, it's very high staffing compared to a normal warehouse and that's a lot more trips. So that is one of the categories of the warehouse.

Commissioner Rashad stated, is that sort facility different from a last mile fulfillment? Are they similar or the same?

Nick Lowe stated, they would be the same.

Commissioner Hernandez stated Mr. Chair thank you. I know we are talking about union jobs and union jobs to me is quality work, but Commissioner Diaz mentioned permanent local jobs and I don't know if we answered that because I know that we don't seem to know who is going to occupy the building, but Commissioner Thomas also mentioned 16 docs. Now anybody who travels that area like I do right now they're doing a lot of developing and redeveloping in that area and these are not going to be automobiles these are going to be trucks. It's going to add into the area. Now have we environmental impact report on that heavy duty traffic. Thank you.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated, I can speak to that if you like. Commissioner Hernandez I would direct your attention to the resolution in the staff report which points out that the project is not subject to CEQA. So, no environmental impact report was done.

Chair Charles Thomas stated that goes beyond what we have authority to look at design overlay review. However, we are certainly concerned about traffic and the safety of pedestrians. As traffic in the surrounding area that would certainly be within our scope.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated, I can clarify why that is if you like Chair Thomas. I would like to point the commission's attention to the required findings for what we're looking at here this is a site plan and design review pursuant to partial municipal code section 9172.23. The required findings for the approval are in subsection D and so the Commission is really just looking at those required findings (A-F) and whether it can make those findings in the affirmative. One of those subsections C is that the project will provide for convenience and safety of circulation for pedestrians and vehicles so that is the authority to look at traffic trip generation parking impacts and things of that nature as it pertains to circulation on this site and access to and from the site.

Chair Charles Thomas stated, and would there be a way for us again to distinguish between that general warehouse standard versus the last mile sort facility designation?

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated that's a question I believe for Nick Lowe as well as the developers traffic engineers but from what I understood there is a difference which is that you know there's a certain trip generation figure that's used for the general standard warehouse facility that was analyzed in the traffic assessment study and there's a separate standard that's used for the fulfillment center sort facility last mile delivery station or high cube parcel hub warehouse type of facility.

Chair Charles Thomas stated, well I'll ask it differently and then I'll open it up I guess what I'm saying is that the analysis that we've done thus far we can make a finding associated with a standard warehouse, but we haven't necessarily done the analysis necessary for high flexibility as an example.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated subject to Nick's input I would say that is a correct statement.

Commissioner Diaz stated yes Mr. Chair just question that commissioner Hernandez asked about was an answer one about local hiring be used not only in the constructing of the project but to fill full-time positions being a living wage etc. Usually that's done from a

collective bargaining agreement, but I just stated living wage and then again there is no project labor agreement that encompasses all the multi labor entities that perform work that I'm accustomed to in some of these projects. I'm not saying that I want to condition that because I know that we have some restrictions within the city purview of the Commission and usually when it state or federal money you know we could pose conditions, but I just wanted to piggyback off of Commissioner Hernandez. All the questions that I asked were not fully answered by Mr. Tom Ashcraft. But once we're done with the deliberation, I do want to add a condition of approval. Thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas closes the public hearing.

Commissioner Dianne Thomas stated thank you very much Chair Thomas after hearing all that we've heard fact gathering, etc., it's almost like what I'm gathering and my interpretation of the things that I have heard we have been asked to approve a project before that we're being asked to approve by those who have spoken and I understand where they are in the request for the approval of project but there seems to be a second if I may say project because this one is saying approved the beautification of that site .I am at that site and go through that area a lot. I know that there are many issues as it relates to the light that is currently there. We'd love to see it develop so that it can make the site look esthetically beautiful. At the same token we've got so many trucks in that area now and the and the traffic condition is horrific. There's a traffic signal at the corner of Wilmington and 223rd and still you will miss that like twice trying to get through because of the traffic backed up into the intersection. So, there are a lot of things to be considered. So what I'm saying and I agree with what I've heard so far from Commissioner Diaz and Commissioner Hernandez we may need to look at this from a two-step process and it's something to be considered as the approval of the project so that it can get built and then there's the let's look at who's going to actually occupy it because we're not getting much information when it comes to who's going to actually occupy that space and we cannot speak on their behalf as to whether there will be permanent jobs once the construction portion of this project is complete. So, I just wanted to put out there that we may need to look at this from a two-step perspective and how that needs to happen. I also understand that there is DTSC involved and so we know that they will make sure that all of the contamination if there's any at whatever level there that it will be taken care of and while because we cannot impose environmental conditions in the approval process it does not eliminate our concern for the environmental issues that may exist. So, I just wanted to make that statement thank you Mr. Chair.

Chair Charles Thomas stated, what I wanted to hopefully consider was the notion of safeguarding against the shall I say the sort facility use because it is a little bit different analysis in terms of our concern about the pedestrian and traffic and trip generation at that particular location and so I'm looking to my assistant city attorney is think about figuring out a way to consider the approval that has gone through the analysis which is the standard warehouse and give us a way to protect against this later morphing or turning into a facility that has a completely different traffic and pedestrian profile.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated Chair Thomas I can definitely propose a condition of approval that I think could address those issues and if you'd like we can check with the applicant but if the public hearing is closed at this time, we can reopen it and ask if they're okay with that otherwise we don't have to. But I can certainly propose language that would be added as a condition of approval that would address this issue about the approved use

being what was analyzed from a traffic trip generation standpoint and that if the actually use it any point it becomes clear that the actual anticipated use is going to be going to seek to have it be something different that has a higher trip generation such as a fulfillment center, sort facility, last mile delivery station or high cube parcel warehouse as opposed to a standard general warehouse facility that they would need to return to the Commission at that time and obtain a further Planning Commission approval under 9172.23 the same section we considering tonight. Particularly the subsection D1C the required finding of about convivence and safety of circulation for pedestrians and vehicles which would require it wouldn't be issued to tell an analysis was conducted of that proposed intensified use in terms of traffic and so that that could then be studied, and further approval would be required by the Commission on that potential different views than what was contemplated and analyzed for purposes of disapproval.

Chair Charles Thomas stated, so again I certainly am proposing for you to sharpen your pencil to begin you know thinking along those lines because I think that was one of the considerations. I'd like to see Commissioner Diaz had another condition of approval he wanted to suggest and so just want to make sure I get all the ideas first and then if we feel it's necessary, we can go to the applicant and reopen the public hearing at that time once we have a fully thought out set of conditions. So, Commissioner Diaz if you may.

Commissioner Diaz stated, thank you Chairman Thomas and I think with our Assistant City Attorney adding a condition of approval that speaks about this project changing at any time after it's been built from a proposed standard warehouse user general use to something to a last mile delivery station or fulfillment center high cube etc that that is what I was articulating from the beginning that is my concern as you state Mr. Chair that it doesn't want to something else and I think that that condition of approval would be not only to whom the new tenant is but would be a perpetual that any tenants that could come back before the Planning Commission for approval of then and changing to something broader than what we initially the scope of this job here the development. So, I think I would like our City Assistant City Attorney to propose or to draft an additional condition of approval that spells exactly what we're articulating here. I did ask the project developer reference I have, Tom Ashcraft again about the PLA he mentioned he has a general contractor and he would speak to the general contractor but speaking to him I didn't get a warm fuzzy feeling that there's really going to be a PLA but I would respectfully request that they'd be in contact with the Los Angeles Orange County Building and Construction trades for at least having a discussion in regards to a full PLA so that that project is built fully with labor 100% so I'm complete thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas stated thank you Commissioner Diaz. It looks like you and I are on the same page as it relates to providing some safeguards in relates to finding subsection C in particular. I will go ahead and state and just make a strong request for many of the union pro union stance that you were taking as a relates to the construction and longstanding use of the project. I don't know that we can pursue make that a condition of approval, but I will echo your comments in terms of saying it important and that it is a great indicating your commitment and connection to this city and all the themes that this applicant was expressing from his presentation today. So, I'd like to continue to urge that as well along with commissioners Hernandez and Diaz. Any other comments or questions? So, I don't know if we get Assistance City Attorney Jones enough opportunity to craft something witty for us.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated yes, I can read something into as it relates if you can give me a moment.

Chair Charles Thomas stated we can certainly re open the public hearing to ask the applicant, but it appeared to me that the applicant was not working from the intention of having a last mile facility. Was always working in the analysis was on the basis of a general warehouse and so you know I could be shocked but I don't know that they would be tremendously concerned with us limiting a use that they were never contemplating especially since the second representative indicated that this was a whole strategy meaning that they were going to keep this building for upwards of 40 years and so again that's at least my thoughts on it but again we'll reopen the public hearing after we move forward once we have an idea and then we'll see what their thoughts are. So, think about it if you're applicant listening in.

Assistant Attorney Ben Jones stated, I can read it now and then if the commission's comfortable with it and if the commission wants or feels that they would prefer to get the applicants consensus then we can invite them back up or you may decide you don't want to. But I think first it would probably be best for me to read it to the Commission and then you guys can deliberate on it and we can work out any of the kinks before proposing something more final to the applicant for just approval. So, hear me out as I try to avoid unnecessary wordiness but it's still a bit long. So the condition would read as follows the applicant and property owner shall record a covenant on the subject property which shall run with the land and which shall be in a form acceptable to the city attorney to the effect that the subject property shall not be used as a fulfillment center, sort facility, last mile delivery station or high cube parcel hub warehouse or other use that would generate a significantly higher rate of actual traffic trips to the subject property than that analyzed in the Dudeck traffic assessment report dated November 8th 2021 that was prepared for the project which was ITE trip generation manual land use code 150 for the contemplated standard/general warehouse facility without the then current property owner and user first obtaining further Planning Commission site plan and design review approval pursuant to Carson municipal code section 9172.23 without limitation as to any other applicable city approvals including an affirmative finding as to safety and convenience of pedestrian and vehicular circulation pursuant to CMC 9172.23 D 1C based on analysis of the anticipated project trip generation figures using the then applicable ITE trip generation manual land use code whether that's one 155, 156 or other than applicable standard for then proposed use.

Chair Charles Thomas stated it's a mouthful, but I get it. So, at this point let me see, Commissioner Diaz is that encapsulate your concerns?

Commissioner Diaz stated I think it wholly encapsulates what the concerns that I've raised as well as certain other commissioners. I just want to state one thing it's not only trip and pedestrian but we're talking about the quality of life we're talking about air quality noise etc and air emissions and so forth all of the above. But that meets my concerns in perpetuity. So, I think that's what I was looking for and I thank my fellow commissioners for joining in that and I'm complete thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas stated do we have any other concerns with that language? I guess at this point we can certainly ask the applicant their thoughts on the language, but it seems as though at least a couple of folks are pretty resolute in terms of including it one way or the other so.

Assistant City Attorney Ben Jones stated I believe the applicants attorney is present and that would be Melissa Monchamp. If she's here and you do see fit to call her up you may.

Commissioner Diaz stated I just thought that we post the condition and let our City Attorney deal with the applicant and their representatives in their attorney because that's the only way I'm going to approve this project and I think it's a good project. I don't want to denote anything else other than that condition of approval must be implemented. Thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas stated thank you we fully appreciate it Commissioner Diaz. I think it would just be helpful and just friendly to just know exactly where they stand on it. I don't know that they'll change our minds but at least we'll know where they stand. I would like to reopen the public hearing for the purposes of inviting Amanda Monchamp and we can see if they have any comments before we move forward and they don't have to.

Assistant Attorney Ben Jones stated if not we'll assume it's okay.

Amanda Monchamp stated so that was quite a long condition and I have obviously not been able to confirm with my client, but I do see a few issues with the language that was read. It's one thing to have a condition of approval as to this entitlement but I think there was a language about recording a covenant against the property versus just having a condition imposed on the permit. I don't see why it would need to be a covenant recorded against the property that's not how conditions generally work. They're generally conditions on a land use approval. Recording a covenant is an agreement between two parties and not applicable here in my opinion. Secondly there is a definition of sort facility that I am familiar with. There is a definition of last mile facility that I'm very familiar with. The inclusion of the word fulfillment there isn't an agreed upon definition of what that even is so my concern with using that particular term is it's just not it's not a clearly defined term. I've worked on a lot of these projects and I've litigated several of them it's not a term that has a solid definition. So, while I understand the ITE code has used that term their high cubed warehouses they're usually much taller than much larger they're over 200,000 square feet and they have many more dock doors. This also is not a transloading facility. There are only dock doors on one side it's actually a portion of one side so it's simply not designed as a building that could be used for those uses. So, like I said I haven't been able to confirm with my client but to the extent the condition was amended did not say it was a covenant but rather just a condition of approval and it didn't. I didn't even quite catch so read that phrase it started with sort and ended with last mile but in between I didn't quite catch exactly every term, but I think that the terms if you could re-read that I was just concerned.

Attorney Ben Jones stated, yes fulfillment center, sort facility, last mile delivery station or high cube parcel hub warehouse and I was trying to use the terminology from ITE trip generation manual land use code 155 and 156 as well as the terms that have been used by the Commission.

Amana Monchamp stated I appreciate that. The high cube facility is also fine. This facility is not a high cube high cube facility it. So, it couldn't be used for that use. So the term from code 155 is high cube fulfillment center warehouse and I think you had fulfillment center separate. There isn't really a fulfillment center that's not a thing. A high cube fulfillment center has a definition, but I don't think you can separately just use the term. Anybody who

says anything to anything is a fulfillment center so that that term just doesn't have its own independent meaning.

Assistant Attorney Ben Jones stated so then we would say as a sort of facility last mile delivery station or high cube fulfillment center warehouse? Not parcel hub warehouse.

Amanda Monchamp stated there's no way this site could be used for that so that's fine. But not for fulfillment center on its own.

Assistant Attorney Ben Jones stated okay so you don't want to use the term fulfillment center at all but it's okay if we keep high cube parcel hub warehouse correct and facility is also fine. So as of right now I would just be deleting fulfillment center so let's say shall not be used as a sort facility, last mile delivery station or high cube parcel hub warehouse or other use that would generate a significantly higher rate of actual traffic trips and so on and so on. To respond on the point about the covenant I think the thinking on that is that we haven't defined an approved use per say in the actual application and permit approval findings and recitals in the resolution we haven't defined a limited use for the facility that still remains open ended and so instead we're using this condition as the means of just ensuring that the ultimate use does not end up increasing the traffic in a way that would undermine our finding on do you want see about convenience and safety of circulation for pedestrians and vehicles but since we haven't limited the approved use in that way we feel we need the covenant requirement to ensure the enforceability because alternatively without that we would need to limit the approved use. So, we feel since we're not limiting the approved use and just going with the route of this condition, we need the covenant requirement in the condition and since the condition is not intended to prevent you from using the property for the way it was designed as the standard general warehouse. I don't see the covenant as being necessary a promise intended to you know interfere with your ability to you know use the property for the design and contemplated use. It's more to ensure that in the event one of these higher traffic uses is ultimately going to be sought then we have a chance to study that and then it further approval is given to make sure that that more intensified use would still remain in compliance with D1C and protect the safety and convenience of circulation of pedestrians and vehicles on into the side. We have utilized conditions such as that in other projects that have required covenant. We don't expect it would be a problem. It could be fairly short and simple. We can propose a form if you'd like.

Amanda Monchamp stated so there's a there's a lot to all of that, but I would just not address and say could you read it again just so I understand it one more time.

Assistant Attorney Ben Jones stated yeah, the applicant and property owner shall record a covenant on the subject property which shall run with the land and will be with a form acceptable by the City Attorney. To the effect of the subject company should not be used as a sort facility, last mile delivery station or high cube parcel hub warehouse or any other use that would generate a significantly higher rate of actual traffic trips to subject property then that analyzed in the DUDEK traffic assessment which was IT trip generation manual land use code 150 for the contemplated standard general warehouse facility without the then current property owner user first obtaining and then as I mentioned that the further design review approval based on an analysis of those higher traffic rates. I understand if you need to consult with your client and if you know if you're not able to agree with that tonight and we can always continue the hearing to allow for that consideration and that

consultation to occur and then we can pick this up at a later date in that case if you're not if you're not agreeable to the covenant I would also need to check with the city attorney.

Amanda Monchamp stated right so I don't want to hold this up and continue it any longer. I think part of my concern is that the language could change in further negotiated covenant that you're referring to, but I think we will agree that it won't be any broader than anything you just said. I also think your language about under the new IT code or something as it changes. I just don't want to be subject to the code changing and the current allowable uses somehow being negotiated by the fact that you're locking in the IT code or not locking in the IT code which is why I'm more comfortable just talking about the type of facility that type of use because that's not going to change.

Assistant City Attorney stated what if we use the term like and as may be amended. So we say the current land use code one 155,156 or other applicable standard for then proposed use as may be amended.

Amanda Monchamp stated yeah but I guess what if 150 is amended is where I'm really going with that. But it's fine well agree to figure out the covenant have another time.

Commissioner Diaz just a rebuttal out of respect to the conversation in our assistant city attorney Ben and would develop the owner Amanda in relation to deleting or removing fulfillment center that was discussed that was brought up by you Chair that in its own fulfillment center doesn't fulfill or there's a gap, but I understood that Amanda say that high cube fulfillment center used in the same sentencing or whatever is acceptable. So, I want to put that back to Ben that it wasn't the intent to remove fulfillment center yes on its own merit but not when you add high cube fulfillment center.

Attorney Ben Jones stated I see what you're saying so we delete fulfillment center but, in the phrase, where it says high cube parcel hub warehouse, I can add it back in by saying high cube fulfillment center or parcel hub warehouse.

Commissioner Diaz stated yes sir.

Amanda Monchamp stated I actually don't really like that, but I think it shouldn't say fulfillment center. I think it should say high cube parcel hub personally. But we can agree to disagree.

Attorney Ben Jones stated can we agree that the intent is to address types of facilities that may have required analysis under land use code 155 or 156 of the ITE trip generation manual.

Amanda Monchamp stated yeah, we can. I mean we could use that phrase instead of those definitions. We could just use the ITE codes.

Attorney Ben Jones stated well I would prefer to keep using the phrases but at least now that we know that commissions intent, we have that on the record to give us that to massage the language to define mutually acceptable terms after the fact, so we don't keep holding the up the commission up. Sorry for the delay commissioners.

Commissioner Guerra stated I have a question for Attorney Jones. Does the covenant specifically state in perpetuity? I didn't catch that when you read that. If it's required.

Attorney Ben Joes stated that a great question. The covenant that it shall run with the land and what that means is it's not just a personal obligation of this property owner and this applicant. It's that if it goes onto the land so that what the covenant does. So that is what is recorded with the company you state that it runs with the land. It's a burden on the land. So when it is conveyed or the entitlement conveyed it remains as an obligation on that next property owner or that next of the transferee because what we're concerned about is that although this property owner and this applicant does not intend to use the property as high cube fulfillment center or parcel hub warehouse they may convey at some point the property or the entitlement to someone else who then would have a different idea and may try to use it. Even though this developer doesn't think that the property is being built sufficient to accommodate that type of use you never know transferee could try to take liberties and try to use it that way anyway and so I think that's the concern that we're trying to avoid or address.

Commissioner Guerra stated absolutely thank you. That's my concern as is most of the commission as it would appear. Thank you, sir.

There being no further input, Chair Thomas closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Diaz moved, seconded by Commissioner Guerra, to approve staff's recommendation of the resolution and adding the changes to the conditions agreed upon with Assistant Attorney Ben Jones and the applicant's Attorney Amanda Monchamp, thus adopting Resolution No. 20-2824. Motion carried, 9-0.

6. DISCUSSION ITEM

A) Determination of General Plan Consistency for sale of City owned property

Applicant's Request:

The City of Carson, is requesting to consider approval of making findings related to the proposed sale of real property owned by the City of Carson on 223rd Street (APN: 7315-012-900, 7315-012-804) as consistent with the General Plan.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Project Manager, James Nguyen presented staff report and the recommendation to ADOPT Resolution No. 22-2824, entitled, "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON MAKING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE PROPOSED SALE OF REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY THE CITY OF CARSON LOCATED ON E. 223RD ST. IN THE CITY OF CARSON, IDENTIFIED AS ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 7315-012-900 AND 7315-012-804."

Chair Thomas asked if there is any question for staff.

Commissioner Rashad stated this question is for staff. It related to the initial map that was passed related to affordable housing. I understand that Carson fulfilled the requirements for this particular well not this particular but all of their requirements, but I would like to know in planning on the sale of this property how the city has considered the initial affordable housing situation and if there are there any plans to address that as part of this sales process.

James Nguyen stated yes so, I can try to share my screen again. So yes, this process this property so every property that the city sells that's in general with a few exceptions are subject to the surplus land act. So, what that means is the city must make these properties available to affordable housing developers. So back February 2021 the city did declare the land a surplus. As a part of this process, we solicited this property to affordable housing developers all throughout the state. So, each city has a database of all that formal housing developers and we sent this property out to probably several 100 developers. As you can see on the map here on this particular property it is really not well suited for affordable housing and so it's surrounded by freeways and rails and oil refineries and there's only one access point really to the property. So, in the end we weren't able to negotiate with any affordable housing developers and so the council direction then therefore was to sell the property to anybody and from that process we are where we are today, and the council selected in closed session to select a Win Chevrolet. So, I hope that answers it but there's one more thing to add even though we did not sell the property to any affordable housing developers we are required to record covenant affordability covenant on the property even for Win Chevrolet or whoever buys this property. That stipulates if we build more than 10 units that at least 15% of it will be affordable. But because our covenant is only applicable to you know housing projects it's not going to be applicable in this case where we are selling, we're proposing to sell the property to Win Chevrolet.

Commissioner Rashad stated okay just to follow up on that yeah what you said made sense in terms of the land uses and their zoning and the fact that it didn't really meet the requirements for residential usage. However, my question is more so because the proceeds from these sales are going to go to the city is there any plans for the city to then build some of that into addressing affordable housing. Has that been I thought through? Has that been talked about?

James Nguyen stated we haven't gotten that far ahead yet. We just got direction to sell the property last week and then as part of that I don't think a decision has been made as to what to do with the proceeds. Typically, they just get put into the general fund and generally can be used for General Services and whatever council wishes to use the funds for, but I don't believe there's any earmarks for the revenues from this particular sale.

Commissioner Guerra stated thank you Chairperson Thomas. By the way James it was an excellent report and I appreciate your endeavors. I just have a quick question if I may because I don't think I saw it in the report. What was the fair market value of that property?

James Nguyen stated well Win Chevrolet is offering 8 million dollars. We did not conduct an appraisal for this property. As part of the process Win Chevrolet offered 8 million and that is the offer that Council accepted. So, in a sense 8 million.

Commissioner Guerra stated so there was no research as it relates to a fair market value. But I'm happy we got the 8 million. I'm complete James. Thank you.

There being no further input, Chair Thomas called for the motion.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Dianne Thomas moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to approve the staffs request, thus adopting Resolution No. 22-2824. Motion carried, 9-0.

7. PLANNING MANAGERS REPORT

Planning Manager Betancourt stated thank you Chair Thomas and thank you commissioners. Lucille sent out an email I think the last couple of weeks trying to organize some meetings. I believe she's gotten a response from most of you but if you haven't please do so or check your inbox. Also, March 8, 2022 is a city holiday so we will not be having another meeting until March 22, 2022. Thank you.

8. COMMISSIONERS ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Wilson stated thank you Chairman Thomas I've been listening to the meeting it's very interesting. I'm excited about all of the good work that's happening. Just a little background about me and wanted to share a little bit about me because I just kind of popped up I wasn't really clear on what my role is as an alternate. I actually thought it I was going to be called but I had a really great conversation with Lucille about that as well, so I want to thank you for the welcome. I know I see some familiar faces. Del worked for supervisor Burke when I was serving as mayor in the City of Lynwood. I have many years of working in this community as a public servant in education. I taught indicating K-12 system. I also taught in the Community College system, particularly Compton Community College. I worked for a former Congressman Ruben Dimely back when he was in congress and represented our Congressional District at the time which included Carson, Compton and Lynwood. But I have been in this community for many years, and I look forward to serving as an alternate with all of you and I'm really excited about all of the wonderful work that's happening in Carson so thank you.

Commissioner Docdocil stated I'm excited to see that slowly but surely things are returning to normal. Hopefully everybody continues to be safe, but I know for instance just this Saturday we do have Black History Month celebration in Carson and actually this Thursday we're already going to be having a planning meeting for Filipino Independence Day celebration in June. So again, you know things are slowly but surely coming back but again I just hope that everybody continues to be safe. That's it for me thank you.

Commissioner Hernandez stated thank you Mr. Chair just want to say that I appreciate the team here. It's an honor and a privilege to fly with Eagles. I've been here in the community for 40 years and I've watched a lot of things develop and it's an honor to be a part of that. I appreciate and thank you very much.

Commissioner Rashad stated yes, I just want to echo your sentiment and welcome miss Wilson to the team here and again everyone stays safe and be healthy.

Chair Charles Thomas stated by the way commissioner Hernandez I believe you're a regular member now and I wanted to acknowledge that that promotion is well.

Commissioner Dianne Thomas stated thank you so once again great meeting Commissioner Docdocil for mentioning the black history program which I have been a part of the planning process. It is indeed happening this Saturday. It will be in the east parking lot of the Community Center and it's going to begin, I'm sure people will be there early, but the designated time is 12pm-3pm. Lots of wonderful things planned. Great information, food, entertainment. It's going to be great. So, we're praying that it does not rain, and the weather will return to something that will make us want to be outside in the fresh air. So that's that part. Then the other thing I wanted to bring up and Alvie I will send you information once I get it, my contact with the LA sanitation district. They have tours that are available for the commissioners and anyone who wants to tour the facility that is here in Carson so that you can get a real great understanding of what they do there and how it's being done the whole process of coming up on recycling. So, my contact there is going to be sending me information for some dates and times for those who might want to sign up for a tour so if you're interested, I'll be I will send that information to you and Lucille and then you can see how you want to work that. They're also making it available to the environmental commissioners so that they can also have a chance to tour it both in person or they will also offer a virtual tour as well and they're going to be working very closely with the WRD the water district as they're going forth with the project to try to recapture and recycle over 150 million gallons of water per day for the LA area. So that's information that's going to be coming up once get it I will share it so that those of you who want to avail yourself to learn more about those processes it will be available to you. With that I promise you that's the last announcement I have with tonight. Have a great evening it was great seeing you guys I'm signing out thank you.

Commissioner Huff stated good evening to everybody. I want to say hello. This was a wonderful meeting. I think this is the very first meeting that I had absolutely nothing to say. I did have my my list of questions and watching it go back and forth to different ones from this team. This is a great team to be on. I'm glad to be here. Thank you all for doing such diligent work and going through my questions were just only a few of them. Thank you so much Lucille for getting all the information to us I know you had to make a couple of trips. Welcome aboard again Commissioner Wilson with everybody else. I love this Commission. Everybody be safe I'm complete.

Commissioner Guerra stated thank you Chair Thomas this was an outstanding meeting very informative, and it proves that we're getting the work done. I believe commissioner Huff stated that we need to do all the positive things to grow Carson and that will then be able get better grocery store, better restaurants, etc. I'm pleased to be a part of this outstanding Commission. I'm complete thank you.

Vice Chair Palmer stated I have nothing. Thank you.

Commissioner Diaz stated I do not have anything to report. But I do echo the sentiments of my fellow commissioners with reports with keeping us abreast of what's going on in our great city so that we can try to participate. I did want to mention to Diane Thomas that I was privileged to work at the joint water pollution control plant in Carson for several years so thank you for updating us and it is a tour that must be taken to really understand what goes on there. I also wanted to welcome Commissioner Wilson as you mentioned in the beginning Chair Thomas. Again, all the information that that comes out of this is great. I want to take the privilege to say that in the many planning commissions that I participated in this great city of Carson I always think that when my term when I when I'm serving it that's the best Commission that I've served with, but I can say truthfully and honestly that this has been a great experience with this full Commission that we have. We all get it, we all participate, we don't always agree on everything

and I think that's the beauty of it. But respectfully Mr. Chairman you're conducting these meetings very professional and with the help of our staff it's it has been very pleasant too to engage in these discussions. So, thank you for giving us the opportunity for all the insight and for also assisting and in formulating and guiding us through some of these difficult items. Again Alvie, the Assistant City Attorney and are Planning Secretary everyone that's involved the planners I can't say enough. I think that everybody is very professional, and I think also that on this Planning Commission everyone is very respectful of all of our opinions whether we agree or not on some of them so thank you for giving me the opportunity and it is my honor to serve on this Planning Commission. Thank you.

Chair Charles Thomas stated thank you Commissioner Diaz. I apologize and I will point out that when I initially served on this Commission, I will always know you as my chair because you with the chair of the Commission when I initially served, and I model much of what I do based upon what I saw with you in that particular role. I again I harken back to the process of just I remember just saying to myself I never want to run the meeting this seems too much there is way too much going on here and all of a sudden here I am. So again, I just want to thank all of you. It's a matter of participating and bringing a lot of energy to these meetings. I think we have a lot that will be coming in front of us just in terms of in the next couple of months and so I encourage you all to stay rested. I do want to also point out that there is the Carson homeless count that will be conducted tomorrow. I don't know if it's too late to actually register. If you do want to register you certainly can. It's at www.theycountwillyou.org/carson count. They are doing it in a drive-thru manner with two or three people and again this is a part of a larger effort in Los Angeles and Orange County. They have a tally of the total homeless count within our city and again as we talked about affordability the other side of that is homelessness unfortunately and so it's critically important for us to have an understanding of that and that it's not just a City of Los Angeles side of the freeways issue it is affecting every city including the City of Carson. So, I just wanted people to know about that. I additionally wanted to report in terms of how the university has been doing. We have been open for a week. We have face to face classes. You should know that the campus is probably one of the safest places in the City of Carson with 92% and 94% of students and staff/faculty vaccinated those percentages are very high and we also are required now to also be boosted so all of us are fully vaccinated in that sense. I will also point out that the case rates for January were 97 on the campus and for February we're almost done we're down to 14 and we are starting to see some real movement in that sense. We will not have a mass outside will remain to have them inside. But again, I remind you we've had one week of classes you know the other side of that is there's another form of Omicron is out there. I don't even want to get into that again. I want to stay where Commissioner Docdocil was which was that we are slowly moving forward to normalcy. Thanks everyone.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 pm.

Chairman

Attest By:

Secretary