

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
MAY 21, 2013**

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00p.m. by Chairman Hamerly, in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present:       Chairman               Randall Hamerly

                  Commissioners       John Gamboa  
                                          Richard Haller  
                                          Mark Rush  
                                          Milton Sparks

Absent:       Vice Chairman       Trang Huynh  
                  Commissioner       Michael Stoffel

Staff Present:Ernie Wong, City Engineer  
                  Lawrence Mainez, City Planner  
                  Jim Godfredsen, Project Manager  
                  Scott Rice, Contract Landscape Architect  
                  Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

**2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT**

There was none.

**3.0 SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

**3.1 Proclamation for Michael Willhite**

Chairman Hamerly presented Former Planning Commissioner Michael Willhite a Planning Commission Proclamation for all of his years and dedication on the Planning Commission. The Commission and Staff wished he and his family best wishes and luck in all of his future endeavors. Former Commissioner Willhite thanked the Commission.

05-21-13.PC

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly on behalf of the Commission, congratulated Commissioner Rush as to becoming the newest Member.

Commissioner Gamboa quipped that both Chairman Hamerly and Commissioner Haller's letters did not work and was reappointed to the Planning Commission!

#### **4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

##### **4.1 Minutes of May 7, 2013, Regular Meeting.**

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Sparks to approve the Minutes of May 7, 2013, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

City Planner Mainez explained there is not a quorum to approve the Minutes, but would be with a majority of Commissioners attending tonight's Meeting.

Motion carried on a 3 – 0 vote with the abstentions of Commissioners Haller and Rush and with Commissioner Stoffel and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

#### **5.0 OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

#### **6.0 NEW BUSINESS**

##### **6.1 An Application by Immanuel Baptist Church requesting an Extension of Time for the use of an existing Modular Building. (REV-013-001). The Project is located at 28355 Base Line, a 40.57 acre Site on the southeast corner of Base Line and Webster Street. (APNs: 1201-181-01, 03, 15, & 16) Representative: Craig Huff, Director of Facilities Management**

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and asked for Staff's presentation.

Commissioner Rush explained that he has a conflict of interest since he is employed by Immanuel Baptist Church and excused himself and stepped down from the Dais then Administrative Assistant III McKeough escorted him out of the Council Chambers and she then returned.

(Note: Commissioner Rush left the Dais at 6:07pm)

05-21-13.PC

City Planner Mainez then gave the presentation from the Staff Report presentation and explained the historical background and the proposed Project to the Commission with the Applicant's request for a one (1) year Extension of Time and then concluded his presentation.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there is one (1) year period of time with the possible total of four (4) Extensions or four (4) years including three (3) Extensions with this one and noticed that the term, "Temporary Structure" was deleted. City Planner Mainez responded that he believed that it would be one (1) of the five (5) remaining and would defer to the Applicant for clarification in order to answer his question.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding when the previous Extension was granted and under the Analysis Section of the Staff Report. City Planner Mainez responded that the proposed Extension would expire in 2014, and would allow the Applicant to request an annual Extension of Time of additional four (4) years on an annual basis.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to make a presentation.

Mr. Craig Huff, of Immanuel Baptist Church, 28355 Base Line, Highland, California, who is the Director of Facilities Management and the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He clarified the first Extension of Time was for five (5) years and concluded on May 1, 2013, and is returning for an additional one (1) year Extension of Time up to five (5) more years on an annual basis. He explained the next major building project on-site is for a Life Center, Gymnasium, other meeting spaces, etc. not only for Church Members, but for the community and as a result, this space will not longer be needed and would raze the Modulars and may be for another three to five (3 – 5) years before the building is completed.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions for the Applicant's Representative.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if Mr. Huff could describe the condition of Modular Unit. Mr. Huff responded they were purchased in the mid-90's and most people do not realize that they are Modular Buildings and did a nice job with the exterior finish on them. There are twelve (12) Modular Units total and are utilized constantly. Approximately one and one-half (1 ½) years ago, the High School Students, Cub Scouts, the Hispanic Ministry meet there and wanted the Modulars to internally look like the rest of the existing Buildings. New carpet, furniture, and fixtures were installed, new paint, etc. and how

05-21-13.PC

different organizations use the Buildings i.e. Boy Scouts and how the youth like to “hang out” there and make them feel comfortable. Commissioner Haller then thanked Mr. Huff.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions for the Applicant’s Representative. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and then opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners.

A comment was made by Commissioner Haller that in the proposed Resolution, it does state that the Modular Unit is a temporary use.

There being no further discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Haller that the Planning Commission Approve Resolution No. 13 - 006 Approving an Extension of Time for the continued use of the existing Modular Building.

Motion carried on a 4 – 0 vote with Commissioners Rush and Stoffel and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

City Planner Mainez stated for the record that he thanked Planning Technician Tafolla for preparing the Staff Report, but was unable to attend tonight’s Meeting.

(Note: Commissioner Rush returned to the Dais at 6:12pm)

6.2 Design Review Application (DRA-012-004) and Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR-013-008) for the proposed Base Line Median Landscape Design Plan and Sign Program related to Conditional Use Permit associated with the Development of a 73,779 square foot Building including sixty-eight (68) Assisted Living Units and sixteen (16) Memory Care Units (CUP-007-014) "Brightwater Senior Living" Project. The approximate 5.2-acre Site is located on the south side of Base Line approximately four hundred feet (400') west of Church Street. (Assessor Parcel Number: 1201-251-12.) Representatives: Randal Corwin, President, Brightwater Senior Living; Steve Yates, Principal, Brightwater Senior Living

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and asked for Staff’s presentation.

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report presentation and explained the historical background and the proposed Projects on the Base Line Median and Landscape Design Plan and Sign Program to the Commission.

05-21-13.PC

City Planner Mainez indicated that Staff had met with the Developer, the Developer's Architect, the City's Landscape Architect regarding the line-of-sight and existing street conditions and that Staff had added an additional Condition of Approval (COA) indicating that once installed, Staff would evaluate the landscaping design further and make adjustments, as needed. He indicated that the City's Contract Landscape Architect is in attendance and that Mr. Craig Elmore who is the Applicant's Architect Representative is in the audience and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the City's Contract Landscape Architect, as well as City Engineer Wong reviewed the Plans and City Planner Mainez responded that Scott Rice, Ernie Wong and Jim Godfredsen all had reviewed the Plans.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly regarding the appearance of the Median and is the Commission's opportunity to address something that is inconspicuously absent all the way down Base Line and that the proposed landscaping materials are fairly small and if there were any line-of-sight studies where a couple of trees could be installed that would not obscure the view corridor between the exit for the Site and the intersection within the Median. Contract Landscape Architect Rice responded that Staff provided him with some parameters for the landscaping design. One of the trickiest parameters was the groundcover and shrubs with a maximum height of six inches (6"). The clear space would allow for some trees, as long as the tree canopy's were six feet (6') clear of the ground with nothing between the six inches (6") and six feet (6'). He had worked diligently with the Applicant's Landscape Architect and thanked him for being as flexible because it was a challenge to find some appropriate material that was also drought tolerant and locally available. The results were primarily groundcover and includes some Crape Myrtle trees, with the condition that it has to be a standard tree and not a multi-trunk tree.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly regarding the Crape Myrtle trees located on Greenspot Road were more of a shrub style and were very low and tend to obscure views and wondered if some different plant alternatives that may increase the canopy to twelve feet to fourteen feet (12' – 14') and do something with a more substantial were considered and if that was vetoed because of the line-of-sight issue. Contract Landscape Architect Rice responded to defer to Project Manager Godfredsen in order to speak on the Engineering side of it.

Project Manager Godfredsen the line-of-sight issue is to be able to see under the trees and that is how the six feet (6') was established and the multi-trunk tree would be a problem.

05-21-13.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if there were other tree species considered that would have a higher, broader canopy or colors. Project Manager Godfredsen responded that he does not know about the trees. Contract Landscape Architect Rice added that the selection of the Crape Myrtle was based further east on Base Line within the East Highlands Ranch and that the Crape Myrtles are the Median Tree.

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly the trees that are located further east are also multi-trunks and Contract Landscape Architect Rice said that is correct. Chairman Hamerly said if that was a valid point of context if the Commission is not matching those for color or trunk style to say that this is a different section of road, completely different character, and technically, not into the East Highlands Ranch yet and that then that limit could be defined as starting at Church Street. If trying to match from Church Street going west on Base Line down to the signal on Webster Street, if that is the section of road is trying to be established as a context for now. This is a first "piece of the puzzle" that is being installed and does not want to establish the context this is what is going to be repeated all the way to the Freeway. Contract Landscape Architect Rice responded there is a Median Tree selection for the Town Center which is a Carrotwood Tree and Chairman Hamerly said that is for the other side of the Freeway and Contract Landscape Architect Rice that is correct and continued by stating that there is a preliminary design plans for the first Median segment east of the Freeway and also includes the Carrotwood Tree. If Boulder Avenue is considered as a cut-off line, then other trees could be explored and was unsure if there were any other proposed Medians between Boulder Avenue and Webster Street given the Carrotwood Trees and where the Median is encountered and thought that bringing in a new species or potentially using the Parkway Tree which is located at Streater / Boulder, as well. .

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that there had been some discussion that after the landscaping is installed, that it would be subject to review and Contract Landscape Rice said that is correct, but did not know how it would play out without expensive 3D modeling, and left the caveat in there, but would be able to move the containers around before the trees are planted to ensure that the line-of-sights are maximized.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to make a presentation.

Mr. Craig Elmore, of Lenity Architecture, 3150 Kettle Court SE, Salem, Oregon, who is the Applicant's Architect, addressed the Commission. He stated that the Commission reviews first and see fit, but the Applicant is ready to go. He explained the Crape Myrtle was the tree of choice based on conversations with the Applicant's Landscape Architect and the City's Landscape Architect and was decided that those trees are located on the other side of Church Street and is not objecting to other trees to be installed and he understands that there is a need for the trees and is anxious to get it designed and to move forward. He noted that the Applicant is in the building process and is ready to move forward and is okay with the Median Landscaping, as well as with the Building Signs.

A concern was raised by Chairman Hamerly regarding the long length of Base Line east of the Freeway and how this is the first stage of introducing the Median and the proposed trees are small and will look insignificant given the broad vistas, the background of the mountains and traveling up a fairly steep hill and had pictured something more substantial and Mr. Elmore said sure and Chairman Hamerly continued and said even the big Crape Myrtles, that he thought the name was "Gigantia" and Landscape Architect Rice said "Nanchez" and Chairman Hamerly said that they are one of the larger species, but they don't really get that big, either and Mr. Elmore added plus it takes a long time for them to grow. Chairman Hamerly said also a long time to brush out and wants something that will not obstruct the line-of-sight view to the signal.

Chairman Hamerly then asked if there were other options that the Applicant would prefer in lieu of the Crape Myrtle that would provide more mass because not having the groundcover that will fill in the ground level and Mr. Elmore responded that he is not a Landscape Architect and does not know the tree selection, as well as the Landscape Architect does and does not have any suggestions, but is open to suggestions that the City may have. At this point, we prefer and provided the Crape Myrtle and asked if it needs to be then changed.

Contract Landscape Architect Rice responded and then asked the Commission and Staff regarding the line-of-sight issue and if the trunk's caliper and maximum width would come into play. Chairman Hamerly responded that is why he was not suggesting to start introducing Palm Trees because their trunks are so broad that they are an obstruction. Project Manager Godfredsen responded that it didn't include and that Caltrans has guidelines and believes one of the widths is eight inches (8") regarding the size of trunk would affect the spacing of the trees and is on a case-by-case basis and for sight distance, the smaller, the better, but understands that smaller trunk means a smaller tree.

05-21-13.PC

Another question was asked by Contract Landscape Architect Rice regarding if the fixed mass of the tree versus a car. Chairman Hamerly responded and suggested the Applicant to work with City Staff to have something that is more substantial other than a Crape Myrtle, whether the coloration canopy shape is matched, but the Directive would be to get something that has more of a canopy, shape and height and little more than the proposed Crape Myrtle that has a mass that will anchor at the top of the hill at Base Line / Church Street because there will not be getting anything between the base of the hill at Webster and all the way up.

A question was asked by Contract Landscape Architect Rice if the Commission preferred deciduous or evergreen species and Chairman Hamerly responded that his preference is more of an evergreen so not to end up with berries, nuts, pods, leaves, etc. dropping onto the road and blowing around.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa suggesting also evergreen and remarked the mass north side of Base Line is already built out and there is only dirt. Chairman Hamerly said that is exactly his point in that this is it. There are no other opportunities to install a Parkway or landscaping because the north side is already built out and not anything is there; but only dirt. Commissioner Gamboa added, but not go too big because of the line-of-sight issue.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that is why he asked about the caliper size and if the Commission felt comfortable with the proposed Directives to Staff and how Staff did a good job and then asked if the Directives were clear enough regarding the color, trunk diameter, line-of-sight and Contract Landscape Architect Rice responded that he believed that he had enough to go off on and quipped that the color would be evergreen.

Another comment was made by Chairman Hamerly that he commended the Applicant regarding the Signage in that it is refreshing to get a Sign where someone actually gets it and knows how to tie a Sign in with the architectural elements and reflects well on the business and Mr. Elmore said good. Chairman Hamerly further stated well done and added that there had been a run on the Commission in how there were issues recently regarding Applicants disregarding image and not understanding that their signs need to reflect their business and Mr. Elmore said thank you.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions for the Applicant's Representative. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and then opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being no further discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then called for the question.

05-21-13.PC



**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Commissioner Gamboa that the Planning Commission:

1. Approve Design Review Application (DRA 012-004) and Accessory Sign Review Application (ASR 013-008) for the proposed Base Line Median Landscape Design Plan and Sign Program associated with Conditional Use Permit (CUP 007-014) with added Directives, and;
2. Adopt the Findings of Fact.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioner Stoffel and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

- 6.3 Negative Declaration for the Realignment of 66 KV Overhead Utility Line (ENV 012-007). The Project is generally located along Boulder Avenue between Eucalyptus Avenue on the north and Greenspot Road on the south within the City of Highland (Golden Triangle Policy Area). Representative: Ernie Wong, City Engineer / Public Works Director.

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and asked for Staff's presentation.

City Planner Mainez gave the presentation from the Staff Report presentation and explained the historical background, the CEQA process in order to evaluate the proposed Project regarding the "Addendum" to a Mitigated Negative Declaration inclusive of adopting a Negative Declaration and the proposed Project to the Commission. He indicated that an Initial Study was conducted and determined, based on the Project, to separate the construction activities, and with additional information and for clarification, there are no environmental impacts regarding the Kangaroo Rats and not involving the existing Edison Easements within the Golden Triangle Policy Area, and noting once the 66 KV high voltage wires are removed from the poles, the small existing 12KV voltage wires would remain on the existing wooden poles and would be chopped / topped so the poles would be smaller in height. There is a separate contract between the Property Owner for the Greenspot Village and Market Place and explained that Property Owner would grade / prepare the property and then Edison would trench / alignment and place the facilities underground. After further Staff review of the proposed Mitigation Measures, the Mitigation Measures are typical ministerial requirements of a Permit and is not habitat for the Kangaroo Rat, nor were there any trappings or substantiation in that there are any Kangaroo Rats within the alignment and had emphasize this and for the record, this is critical. He stated that Edison is ready to go with this Project and

05-21-13.PC

how the City is in partnership with Edison and is part of the \$2 - \$3 Million dollar RDA funds for improvements in that area and are getting the proper Permits from the State and is going to move forward, as soon as this environmental is complete and to get the wires underground. He added that this is also going to improve Greenspot Road because it connects down to the Edison Facility south of Greenspot near Boulder Avenue and will be nice to get all of those large overhead wires underground at the same time with the improvement of the street with curb, gutter, sidewalk, landscaping and lighting and then concluded his presentation.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks regarding why not bury / underground both the 66KV and 12KV at the same time and Chairman Hamerly added as a follow-up to Commissioner Sparks question, that it was his understanding that when the Greenspot Village and Marketplace went in, that all of the utilities along Greenspot Road would be underground and wondered if this is the City's portion with Edison doing the high voltage lines and City Planner Mainezy interject and said yes and Chairman Hamerly continued and then the smaller voltage lines would be done at a subsequent date and City Planner Mainezy said by the Developer, and said that is correct. Chairman Hamerly then asked wouldn't it be better to prepare a common trench for access or is this going to tear up the roadway and/or parkway multiple times. City Engineer Wong responded with the 66KV high voltage line is located on the south side of Greenspot Road from the Edison Substation going west to the Mini-storage Facility and from there, it goes in a northerly / southerly direction on the Greenspot Village and Marketplace Property's alignment. The 12KV line does not go parallel with Greenspot Road on the south side and starts at the Mini-storage Facility going north. The major reason for removing the overhead 66KV line and to get rid of the power poles on the south side of Greenspot Road in order for the City to widen Greenspot Road and add another lane going east. He further explained that City Council had authorized over \$14 Million in street improvements on Greenspot Road and to install the ultimate infrastructure needed to accommodate the future growth within the City. The portion of the overhead line that goes north / south within the Greenspot Village and Marketplace Property has the 66KV line and the 12KV line and as far as the City is concerned in dealing with the 66KV line, and is not concerned with the 12KV line.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Sparks why City Engineer Wong why not concerned with the 12KV line and City Engineer Wong responded that the 12KV line is not located on Greenspot Road and is located on private property and until the private property develops, it can remain there and when the Developer and build new buildings, then the Developer will then underground

05-21-13.PC

the 12KV line at his own expense. Because the 12KV line does not affect Greenspot Road Improvement Project, the City Council is not allocating City funds to do the undergrounding of the 12KV line. Another reason is that the 66KV line is a high voltage and is not usually a City requirement for new development to underground and the City Council knows that. if the City does not use City funds to underground the 66KV line, even within the private property, it may stay there even with new development being there and is not intend to be left there, as part of the Site Plan of the new development, but in theory, the Developer can design their Project in such a way that the Developer can avoid any building near the 66KV line and leave the 66KV line as is. In this case, the City Council claims that because of the need to do the Greenspot Road Project and lack of ability for the City to require the Developer to underground the 66KV line, they are using City funds to do that, but reiterated the City Council does not feel that it needs to be done for the 12KV line, because there are other ways to deal with it.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa if then the Developer would take care of the 12KV and City Engineer Wong responded affirmatively and that the Developer would take care of it.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks if the Developer has to take care of the 12KV, and supposedly from what he understands that it is a “ghetto area” from a description that he had read, why can’t they do the whole thing at one time. That was his question in the beginning regarding the 66KV line and City Engineer Wong states that the 12KV line is on private property, there is a thirty foot (30’) Easement that is going in for the 66KV line. City Engineer Wong responded that on Page 61 of the Staff Report and Commissioner Sparks interjected he had read that and City Engineer Wong continued and said that is the alignment. The green line represents the future 66KV line alignment underground and the north end of the green line shows where it cuts across private property in the future and that is where the thirty foot (30’) Easement will be affecting the property. However, the location of the thirty foot (30’) Easement is actually selected by the Developer. The Developer said if that alignment is used, that alignment will coincide with the Developer’s internal streets and then, everything works for the Developer with the thirty-six foot (36’) Easement is not a problem for the Development.

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the Developer requested the alignment and City Engineer Wong responded affirmatively, the Developer requested that alignment and Chairman Hamerly said that part did not make any sense to him and is a longer trench to take it off of Boulder Avenue and not run it straight up Eucalyptus Avenue and then head west.

05-21-13.PC

Another question was asked by Chairman Hamerly if the route could be shortened because there is already an angle and run it up Boulder Avenue and run it down Eucalyptus Avenue without having the Easement doglegging it and at the north end of Boulder Avenue and turns south, then turns west and then doglegging which would mean digging a longer trench rather than run the Easement in a straight line all the way up Boulder Avenue to Eucalyptus Avenue City Engineer Wong responded if going straight north to Eucalyptus Avenue and go east from there, that Edison has determined that there is “too other much stuff” on Eucalyptus Avenue with other underground utilities and not allow Edison to have the thirty foot (30’) space and Chairman Hamerly stated how the proposed Easement looks very curious on the Map at the terminus at Eucalyptus Avenue and City Engineer Wong said he knows.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa at the terminus at Eucalyptus Avenue, is it going to go back above ground or what and City Engineer Wong responded the undergrounding would go up to the north side of Eucalyptus Avenue and from that point on, it would go back to up above ground.

A question was asked by Commissioner Sparks would it have any affect on Calhoun; is it still going to be on Calhoun above ground and City Engineer Wong responded affirmatively, and that along Calhoun, the entire 66KV line will be underground.

A question was asked by Commissioner Gamboa regarding if the 12KV line would be crossing Greenspot Road and City Engineer Wong responded affirmatively and explained the 12KV’s line location to the Commission and that the City is going to underground the utility by the Mini-storage Facility.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if the KV line would impact the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) line and City Engineer Wong responded that the location selected by Edison when the 66KV line is installed underground, will not impact the MWD line, so then it is not a problem.

Another question was asked by Commissioner Haller if the City received a letter from Edison in writing and City Engineer Wong responded how the City has worked with Edison on their design and City Planner Mainez added that MWD recently submitted a standard letter response to the City showing the Easement, guidelines for developing close to MWD’s pipe.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa with how is it going to affect north on Calhoun and Engineer Wong responded there will be trenching on Calhoun and the pipe line project will be done in phases and try to as much as possible to leave the access open until you really have to trench across the resident’s access and typically, the trenching is finished quickly and backfill

05-21-13.PC

usually the same day so the residents would not be locked out of using their driveways and is a method of coordination, and is pretty standard as part of the construction.

Chairman Hamerly asked if the Commission had any further questions for Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing and then opened the floor for further discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being no further discussion amongst the Commissioners, Chairman Hamerly then thanked Staff and called for the question.

**A Motion** was made by Commissioner Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Haller that the Planning Commission:

1. Approve Resolution No. 13-007 Adopting a CEQA Negative Declaration for the "Realignment and Undergrounding of Existing 66KV Overhead Utility Line" Project (ENV 012-007), and;
2. Direct Staff to file an Environmental Notice of Determination with the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board for ENV 012-007.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 vote with Commissioner Stoffel and Vice Chairman Huynh absent.

## **7.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

City Planner Mainez explained the Items that are tentatively scheduled for the Commission's Regular Meeting for June 4, 2013, at 6:00pm. The Commission and Staff had a brief discussion regarding the historical background and proposed phasing of the Project.

Chairman Hamerly requested that Commissioner Rush introduce himself to the Commission. Commissioner Rush stated that he is a thirteen (13) year resident of Highland, employed at Immanuel Baptist Church as Executive Pastor, has three (3) children, and with one being almost a Junior in Highland and has lived here longer. Both the Commission and Staff welcomed him aboard.

Commissioner Haller explained that he is a Member of the Citizen Advisory Group of the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects and one of his jobs, as a Member, is to solicit input from the community. The Project would be inclusive from Redlands to the Los Angeles County Line, install either one (1) HOV Lane each way or two (2) Toll Lanes each way and would be similar to the Fast Track use. He then distributed a business card from SANDBAG to the Commissioners explaining what the Corridor Projects are about.

05-21-13.PC

A question was asked by Chairman Hamerly what are the offsets and Commissioner Haller responded there is no design yet for the right-of-way / shoehorn lane and would be only an eleven foot (11') wide lane with less than four feet (4') for the shoulder. The few new bridges will need to be modified because the bridges were planned for only one (1) new lane and not two (2) new lanes.

Commissioner Haller said if they would like to provide comments regarding the Projects, to get a hold of the contacts listed on the card or go to the Website.

A comment was made by Chairman Hamerly the merits of HOV versus Toll Roads and the need to be wider than five to six (5 – 6) lanes and use rather than just a few new lanes added and going to all that expense, will not solve the traffic problem and still be shoehorned. Commissioner Haller responded that there still will be two (2) lanes that will still have gridlock. Like the 91 Freeway, two (2) more lanes will not eliminate gridlock, and reiterated there still have more vehicles.

A comment was made by Commissioner Gamboa that the 91 Freeway Fast Track is a different fast track than the one is used on the 10 Freeway from Orange County to Los Angeles County and as same as the 110 Freeway where a person has to have from one to three (1 – 4) passengers that has HOV lanes and not Fast Track lanes. Commissioner Haller responded they are looking at all of those different options. City Planner Mainez added that the City will create a link on the City's Website for that particular Website.

## 8.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Hamerly declared the Meeting adjourned at 7:00p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

---

Linda McKeough, Community Development  
Administrative Assistant III

---

Randall Hamerly, Chairman  
Planning Commission

05-21-13.PC