

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Lemoore Planning Commission
March 14, 2011**

Chairperson Kendall called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Attendance: Kendall, Elgin, Clement, Meade, Marvin, Norgaard, Garcia

Absent: None

Public Comments and Inquiries: There was none

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of December 13, 2010

It was moved by Commissioner Norgaard, seconded by Commissioner Clement, to approve the minutes of December 13, 2010 as submitted.

AYES: Norgaard, Clement, Garcia, Marvin, Meade, Elgin, Kendall
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Election of Chairperson:

Chairperson Kendall stated that she would turn the meeting over to City Attorney Behrens.

City Attorney Behrens mentioned that nominations can be made without a second and opened the nominations for Chairperson.

Commissioner Clement nominated Commissioner Elgin for Chairperson, Seconded by Commissioner Norgaard.

Commissioner Garcia nominated Commissioner Meade for Chairperson. Attorney Behrens asked for any other nominations.

City Attorney Behrens stated that under the Roberts Rule of Order he would take the votes based on the order of nomination for the elections and the first to receive 4 of 7 votes would fill the office.

Behrens took votes for Elgin.

AYES: Norgaard, Clement, Marvin, Elgin, Kendall
NOES: Garcia
ABSTAIN: Meade
ABSENT: None

Newly elected Chairperson Elgin took the gavel.

City Attorney Behrens turned the meeting over to Chairperson Elgin.

Election of Vice-Chairperson:

Elgin opened the nominations for Vice-Chairperson.

Commissioner Garcia nominated Commissioner Meade for Vice-Chairperson, seconded by Commissioner Norgaard.

Elgin asked for any other nominations.

Elgin took votes for Commissioner Meade.

AYES: Garcia, Marvin, Norgaard, Meade, Clement, Kendall, Elgin
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Newly elected Vice-Chairperson Meade moved to the Vice-Chairperson chair.

Outgoing Chairperson Kendall was thanked by all for doing an excellent job during her term as chairperson.

Request for Extension of Tentative Subdivision Map #2005-02 by Tim Palmquist representing Pharris Lemoore LLC to extend Vesting Tentative Tract Map 845 for Victory Village Subdivision for 245 homes and related approvals on the west side of Highway 41 and north and west of West Hills College

Smyth stated that about four to five years ago the City Planning Commission and City Council approved Tract 845 for Victory Village containing 71.31 acres into 279 single family lots in two phases. She stated that the tract is located on the north and south sides of the Bush Street alignment, west of Production Avenue alignment and west of the West Hills College Lemoore site.

Smyth stated that through State passage of a couple of senate bills this project received three automatic extensions with the current expiration date of June 6, 2011. She stated that the applicant has submitted a request for a two year extension of Tract 845.

Smyth reviewed the five questions/criteria for extension. She stated that in this case civil drawings have been drafted for 39 of the lots, as well as final map. Due to the housing market with its downturn the project is not ready to move forward at this time. She stated that the General Plan and Zoning Amendments that were tied to the original project are already complete and remain intact and do not require extension.

Smyth stated that Section 8-7B-10 of the Lemoore Municipal Code generally grants only a one (1) year extension but allows for extensions greater than twelve months if granted by the Planning Commission.

Smyth stated that during the time that we approved this project there have been several policy changes that have occurred including the Williamson Act contracts on the property have expired, new Public Facilities Maintenance District were created to supersede the Lighting Landscape Maintenance District, comprehensive updates to all impact fees were adopted and are annually increased by a cost index factor with the most current update adopted April 2010, new Westside streets and thoroughfare impact fees were established in November 2010, the 2030 General Plan was adopted in May 2008 which included new noise / energy efficiency / green building policies, the downgrading of Production Place as an "arterial" street crossing the railroad to a local street, Brooke Street being changed to Marsh Drive, and the development boundary stopping at the 21st Avenue alignment), FEMA has modified the 100 year floodplain

that now includes the project and the State and City adopted a Water Efficient Landscape of Choice Ordinance.

Smyth stated that the most complex is that this area in the AICUZ noise study area. Smyth stated that most of you might of have looked at the noise study as submitted by the navy. She stated that that the new AICUZ document does not show this area higher than 60 db. She stated that they will base their policies based on those documents. Smyth noted that a copy of the letter from the navy is attached to the staff report and they might want to speak during the session.

Smyth reviewed the City Council Resolution draft which incorporates additions, modifications, and deletions to account for each of the policy changes mentioned. She stated that staff recommended only a one year extension because of changes that are upcoming within the next year. She stated that this is up to the Planning Commission. Smyth stated this is a recommendation to City Council.

Smyth stated that project has requested that they be subjected to whatever noise mitigation is in place at the time they pull building permits.

Smyth stated that Condition #20 pulls out all the text currently in the general plan, in this particular subdivision when noise is greater than 65 db as outlined in figure 8-4 noise contours, whatever is in place at that time is what will be required. It is written such that should the general plan policies change this project will have these in place at that time. Normally we can't require more restrictions at a later time.

Tim Palmquist representing Victory Village stated that at this time they are requesting a two year extension. He stated that they have been working on this project for quite some time. He said that they are one of the few entities that he is aware of to have a vested stake in the project and have purchased the property outright. He stated that they went out and got the Planning Commission and the City Council approvals. Subsequent to that they got final engineering on civil plans and final map for phase one and two. He said that they worked with City Engineer on FEMA, and has had challenges on noise and a down turn in the housing market. Given all the changes and factors of what they are looking at, what they would request is a two year extension because they are trying to get some traction on this project and move forward and by the time they finally sit down with a merchant builder/contractor to negotiate bonding for financing and other things of that nature, it would be difficult to tell the third parties that they have to come back again. For that reason he would request the granting of a two year extension.

Norgaard asked how extensive was the FEMA requirements? Palmquist stated that its two foot and he worked with City Engineer Harry Tow and Stan Harbor and he thinks that they got it addressed and should there be a change, which they don't suspect it will happen, they spent quite a bit time, energy and dollars to address the issue. Meade asked if the 2 ft. level is above ground level. Palmquist stated that pads were elevated to like 5 feet outside the line with a 2 to 1 slope in other areas.

Norgaard stated that it does seem like the reasoning for two year extension is valid. Palmquist stated that one year goes by fast.

Dave Brown of 89 Devon in Lemoore stated that he can understand what the developer is stating, but his worry is having the city holding the bag with what he is trying to build out there. He stated that if we are going to give him an extension, one of his issues is that he doesn't have to live out there. He stated that he does not care for building out there west of 41; you have the noise and the smells from Leprino. He stated that he is pro business and pro residents but lets

build smaller. He stated that he just wants the two year extension on what's already been approved. As he reads it he doesn't have to worry about anything that comes from the JLUS. He stated that in the general plan it states that when you build out west of 41 the recommendation is for fire and police. The volunteer fire department states if you build west of 41 you better build fire out there because of response time. These are some things that when the general plan was brought up and all this was approved, we need to really look at before you sign. As far as giving a two year blanket he wouldn't, if you are going to do anything give him a one year and make him go by what the general plan states and when JLUS comes out with the final results, for those people who are going to buy out there, lets give them that benefit because what you do today is going to affect the city a number of years to follow.

Captain Knapp Naval Air Station Lemoore stated that they don't support this particular growth west of Highway 41. It's residential but we don't consider residential to be compatible with what they are doing at the air station. He stated that they support residential growth they support Victory Village but not at its present location. The navy's definition of encroachment is any non-Navy action planned or executed that inhibits, curtails, or possesses the potential to impede the performance of Navy activities.

Captain Knapp stated that their navy activities are man trained equipping 14 squadrons that carry every piece of ordinance in the navy's inventory and its very important that their pilots train safely and they are allowed to take off with that ordinance and come back with that ordinance. They take a lot of pride in their safety record and things happen and they are trying to mitigate things happening. They constantly look at the map of the area around here and the flight path and doing what they can to turn where they need to turn and fly over uninhabited land. When they return they watch closely where they are flying. The air space is various levels, you go above 3,000 feet you no longer own the air space around the airport. He stated that he thinks they have done a good job in the last 50 years. The wrath that were talking about here is a ground track for radar arrivals when the weather is very poor and its predicated on turn rates based on air speeds that are driven by physics and you can't get it any tighter and still be safe. He stated if you asked him why you can't just adjust the patterns, and he adjusts the patterns he is impacting safety. We have tried and have fast rules based on 100 years of naval aviation on what that turn rate is gong to be and sadly it equates to flying over the West Hills College multi-purpose center and Phase 1 of Victory Village. It's the noise and safety aspect that he is concerned about. He stated he was based in Japan and that is encroachment. He stated that he trained in El Torro, Marimar, Oceano, it was orange groves and by the time he got there the orange fields turned out to be developments and that's encroachment.

Captain Knapp stated that as the first development Victory Village is not going to be the encroachment issue, what he is worried about is that the 48 years that the air station has been around it was 41 and no development west of 41 and in 2008 you said 21st Avenue is where we are going and that is encroachment by definition. He said first 41 was a good number and 21st is not a good number, but once you bring all this in your hope as a Planning Commission is that it generates business, tax revenue, shopping malls and people coming in for a reason then the next step is what. Does it go north of Victory Village, closer to Kings River, he doesn't know but in the navy's eyes that is what leads to the El Torro, Marimar, Oceanos and everywhere else we built. That's why we continue to come back to these meetings to say we don't support it because this type of development is incompatible with what we are doing and we don't want the pilots to be concerned about what is below them or the residents to be concerned about what is above them either from a noise aspect or a safety aspect. He asked if anyone can tell him what 60 db or 65 db is or a nuisance. He said that people come in and see the house with not a lot of flying going on, they are excited and sign their lease, 10 years later after hearing all that noise they don't like him and that is what he dealt with in El Torro because he was the one producing a whole lot of noise at night. He said he has nothing against this it's just the wrong place.

Commissioner Garcia asked Captain Knapp, historically with the other bases that you mentioned, at what point do residents start complaining. Knapp stated that in the case of El Torro, it was encroached upon huge retirement complexes, those people it was on speed dial, the noise complaint line. He stated that they tried the highest altitude they could, and coast down to descend as quiet as possible and they still got complaints. He stated that in the day time you had lots of ambient noise, but at night it is a different dynamic at night and that is why in California they penalize you a whole lot more for noise. He stated that he was restricted training his marines at night before they went to the boat.

Knapp stated that their db levels are based on the accepted norm for California CNEI averages which is 60 db and they tend to think that at 65 db they will be upset. It's not the single event, your trying to take something that is different to everybody and rationalize it on the chart. They take the whole swaff of noise and turn it into a single event, is it 65 db or 60 db yes the average is but at some point as it could be that 100 db it's those continual disturbances of peoples life styles that tends to grade on.

Knapp stated that what we have seen is not the first year it's the 10th and 15th year and his job as the base CO is to make sure that the next CO is not affected with decisions. He stated that we do want the base to be viable for the next 50 years and this is the importance of encroachment because this has the probability for impact of future operations.

Norgaard asked why the navy didn't bring up more of these questions when the College was built. Knapp stated that they were not as well organizationally designed as they are now. He stated that he wasn't here at the time. Norgaard stated the problem is the city made a lot of comments, and the city turned over backwards to make this a viable area and this is no small feat. Knapp stated that again he would like to see Victory Village but he does not think it's compatible at that location. Norgaard stated that the area around the West Hills is going to be a waste land which seems so tragic.

Clement asked why more of the air space travel couldn't be on the west side because there are no inhabitants on the west side of the base. Knapp stated that this is how the air field is designed. He stated that the idea is to take off to the northwest from the east runway and come back and land on the west runway. It's only when the winds are from the southeast that we take off from the west side. If the pattern is full, the only time your going to see dual approaches on the east runway is when a lot of traffic coming back at the same time. They will split them up and send half to the left runway and half to the right runway.

Meade stated that we have proposed industrial development west of 41 and asked about concerns on other types of development west of 41. Knapp stated that they have more concerns about density of people per square mile or square foot. Light industrial for the most part they find very compatible west of 41 unless it's higher than normal. Knapp stated that the AICUZ just got published and took the best available F-35 data there was which is included in the letter, same engine carrying a much larger airframe. Hopefully with the joint strike fighter study going on we will see what transpires there.

Norgaard stated that we're kind of at a loss as the West Hills area is not going anywhere unless we come up with a compromise so to speak and you're saying you're totally not willing to and the applicant is in a bad situation to and it's not going to be an easy thing for the applicant. He stated that there is an awful lot of money being extended both sides. Knapp stated that they will have a noise study by next 2 years and they will have a home base within the next 2 year. Norgaard stated that he would like the city to make a comment to not go any farther than we are now. Knapp stated that if you move slightly one way or the other it's just where West Hills is that is the issue and we talked about a greenbelt underneath the flight path or replacement with

light industry or moving the residential developments even a parcel over. Knapp stated that can we look at individual parcels, but the problem is if this man is forced to move, that entire infrastructure in place kind of Macs next to him because he has to start over and he understands that. He stated if you build it will work and it will draw in people in business because that is where the stuff is and then they want to go some place else because it's going to continue to grow and that's when he gets concerned.

Knapp stated that light industry, non residential even one acre parcels he is just looking for the lowest density possible for noise and safety purposes.

Smyth stated that we do have impact fees in place for future fire location, as far as general plan it currently does take 21st Avenue there are some recommendations moving forward this week on the joint land use study. She stated that the policy committee will review the 140 page document the consultant has been working on with policy recommendations for the City of Lemoore. She stated that because there still a lot of questions out there and it is written so that if there still are noise issues and the City wants to mitigate we have the opportunity in place.

Smyth stated that the applicant is in agreement to this, if they record the map by June 6, 2011 they would not have noise mitigation in place. The general plan does designate the wetland area and that's where you get some of those things in place. High intensity power lines and the old raised railroad bed and that is why council at that time chose the boundary line. She stated that she shares the concerns with both the applicant and the air station because back when the noise contours did not go off the base and back then it wasn't the industry model in that way. It wasn't until the general plan that they found that they did not have accurate noise contours at that time. She stated that council will be reviewing next month and making formal comments and what the consultant thinks is best practice. The base is asking for high down to 60 which may impact some of the areas.

Norgaard asked about the legal aspect of the city with the applicant having had this approved and if we say now you can't. He asked what his legal rights are.

Behrens stated that he has a tentative map that he can file and a final map before June 6, 2011 what he is asking for is an extension to give him the opportunity to file a final map. There asking for two years to file the final map. Right know they have a vesting tentative map and they can file it by June 6, but they are saying that the market is not there. It's a discretion act whether you want to request a one year or two year.

Marvin asked if we were to turn this down the request does he have legal recourse. Behrens stated that if you don't extend he does not have a cause of action for damages against the city.

Meade stated that what is the basis for not granting an extension? Smyth stated that in past we usually approved the extensions based on the criteria in the staff report. In past policy we have ever not granted a request for extension and there usually has to be some progress shown so that it is not just another approval.

Norgaard stated that we have never had any problem with the base or anything to warrant this map for extension.

Jeff Britz stated that what Holly was trying to explain is that if during the general plan the underlining land use of this area had changed, then tonight we would have recommended not granting the extension because the application would not be consistent with the general plan. So if you consider granting an extension you ought to reference the general plan and in this case those items were taken into consideration during the general plan and this area remained as residential for a variety of reasons, one thing because there was a vesting tentative map

already approved there and to the east residential use which are still planned. He said why would you not extend it and the city has the right to make those changes regardless of the owner of the property or the entitlement of that property and if changes had been made the city would not have recommended the extension.

Meade stated that having said that this application is consistent with the general plan and movement is being made to get it off the ground, so what is the basis to deny at that point and there isn't one.

Britz stated that staff's recommendation is to grant the extension with the validity of items. He said the second question is, why would we recommend one year, because largely we anticipate some policy changes in the general plan and if you extend further we could have new policies in the general plan as in noise and if the final map is recorded you would not have the opportunity to add those additional conditions. If you give them one year it meets the general plan and that would give you an opportunity to say there have been a couple of changes and that would be the opportunity to impose them. He stated that the Council provided a two year to all site plans for economic reasons. Britz stated that the reason we are recommending the extension is because it complies with the general plan.

Tim Palmquist stated that Victory Village greatly respects the military. The issue tonight is about land use. He stated that he lives directly underneath John Wayne airport, have owned his home for 14 years, his grandfather spent his life in a retirement adjacent to El Torro air base. He stated that noise, air quality, traffic are all factors, and where he lives they have thoroughly enjoyed their house and its one of the biggest blessings they have and it is directly underneath the airport. He stated that this is factor of where he lives; he bought the house knowing that. He stated that they cover the phone when planes go by. It was a lower priced home on the other side of the city that were not as impacted of the flights and that is why he could afford it. He stated that his home has gone up in value and down in value. There are other homes that have value but they back up against the freeway. For their personal choice they would not have bought a house that backs up against the freeway because of the lights and they have tremendous view of the harbor. He stated that it is simply a function of you analyze a house, you look at it, you buy it, you can afford it and if they buy a home here they are not anticipating investor purchaser but owner occupied. Noise considerations similar to traffic considerations, similar to school districts is a huge factor, noise issue is not the only consideration in buying a home but to help people quantify what noise is they have standards with various mitigations they do as builders.

Palmquist stated that he is convinced as he shared this in front of this Planning Commission many times it is a beautiful area, he loves when the planes go by and that is just him. He stated that there not all going to buy there if that is not their predisposal on what if that is not what they are looking for. He stated that they have invested serious dollars, hard firm family money that has been invested. They invested based on your dreams for the west hills specific plan. You built the college we saw your vision we said we believe in your vision and will build your vision next to the college. He stated that if had they known that 41 was some magical line between the city and the military they would have second guessed the diligous. They were completely unaware of this line. He said they bought in to the dream along side of the city. As they went through the General Plan 41 became 21st and Mr. Peterson was here as well as this did affect his pocket book and agreed to by the Planning Commission and City Council. He stated that they made a commitment based on all the facts as articulated. He stated that their request is for a two year extension and to go forward they would appreciate the support.

Garcia stated that he is sympathetic to his situation on that land and if you build it they will come, this is what he is afraid of. He stated that he has mentioned it before; it's never too late to do the right thing. He stated that there are no homes on the ground now and he thinks that

the wrong decision was made. He stated that he does not think it's the right place to put homes, but it's a nice place for a college because it's isolated. He doesn't know if having houses around West Hills will make an impact on enrollment. He would suggest changing direction before it is too late.

Elgin stated that when we originally approved the general plan with an AICUZ overlay and she would be inclined to go with staff's recommendation to go with 1 year extension and gives us time to make changes.

Meade asked if this means that we are talking about a potential rezoning because it is no longer consistent with the general plan. In contrast to that, given the economic times, we should grant two years, otherwise don't grant it at all and just shut it out.

Garcia stated that he would argue that this is significantly different from what we have had to look at before. Elgin stated that we have never had a situation like this before.

Norgaard stated that if we feel that it needs to end here maybe this is what we need to think about. He stated that as he understands it legally, the applicant has no recourse if we were to turn it down.

Behrens stated that even though a map is denied and he doesn't say you should, if the general plan and zoning allowed that use they can file again which creates another issue and this is why it is before you as an extension.

Garcia asked if we do not approve the extension they continue with the June 6, deadline and if they do not record at that time what happens. Smyth stated that the resolution before you is a draft resolution which would go to council with your motion. Marvin stated that it seems no matter what we do the Council has to hear both sides. Garcia stated that he feels it has a big influence and it is important.

Norgaard stated that the AICUZ bounces back and forth and we don't have the foggiest idea what is going to happen. He stated that the applicant will never know what he has to meet and he doesn't know if the applicant does get the extension, would the houses be built anyway given the economy.

Garcia stated that historically this is not a unique situation and this has happened to other bases and we need not repeat what other communities have made.

It was moved by Commissioner Elgin motioned to recommend to Council to approve a one year extension for Tentative Tract Map 845, Victory Village.

Motion died for lack of second.

It was moved by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Marvin to deny the extension to Tentative Tract Map 845

AYES: Garcia, Marvin, Elgin
NOES: Norgaard, Kendall, Clement, Meade
ABSTAIN: None.
ASBSENT: None.

Behrens stated that you have several choices, the no extension was defeated the one year died for lack of second, no one made a motion for a two year extension and the only thing left is no recommendation because there was no action taken.

Garcia asked if he could re-introduce his motion.

Meade stated that his concern is that we have the general plan that we are suppose to implement to the best of our knowledge and this project was approved under the prior general plan and is still approved under the current general plan and he feels we are obligated to follow the general plan policy and recommendation to the best of our ability. He said he thinks our only option is a two year extension.

Kendall asked if we don't approve this he can file another map. Behrens stated that sometimes this kills a project. He said theoretically it's possible but practically it's probably very difficult.

Behrens explained that if there is another motion it would have to come from a party that voted no. He said this is under Robert's rules of order. Kendall stated that she agrees with Commissioner Meade and unless we change the rules. Garcia stated that he still has the approval until June.

It was moved by Commissioner Meade, seconded by Commissioner Kendall, to recommend to Council to approve a one year extension to Tentative Tract Map 845 for Victory Village.

AYES: Meade, Kendall, Norgaard, Clement, Elgin
NOES: Garcia, Marvin
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Smyth noted that this would be on the April 5th City Council.

Discussion Regarding Sign Ordinance Modifications

Smyth stated that a couple of months ago City Council had a discussion on the time frame in which Banners are displayed. She stated that Council suggested that staff take a harder look at temporary signage and she gave examples on the overhead as to the types described as temporary signage such as banners, stick signs, and A-frame signs. She stated that the signage that was brought up was L E D signs to be reviewed for the illuminations.

Smyth stated that the counsaultants had already drafted the downtown signage that was given to Commission last fall which staff used at the public imput. She stated that the activity report that commission receives shows a list of sign violations.

Smyth gave examples of A-frame signs on the overhead and stated that signs being up against the wall would be in places such as Downtown vs being set out on Public Right of ways away from the building would be areas such as the SaveMart Center. She stated that one of the examples that she had for the A-frame was of one that was about 5 feet in height which ours currently are 4 feet but most are 3 1/2 feet in height and if they are placed on the curb were they going to be seen. She stated that Council wanted to have them in a more visable location and only one sign is allowed per business with the differance of several businesses in one building with one entry only one A-frame. The Downtown portion of the policy talks about the A frame signage boards leaving a 4 foot ADA path of ingress egress throughout downtown which brings the question of placement. She stated that the sandwich boards don't have a time frame of being up, they can be put up every single day 365 days a year vs banner signage that can be put up 12 days up 30 days down. Smyth pointed out one flag in a teardrop shape. She stated that staff thinks that in some places it might be more appropriate than a banner that is tied to a tree which might cause harm to a pedestrian.

Smyth stated that Council had two areas that they wanted Planning Commission to review temporary signs and illuminating signs, but did not want to limit Planning Commission on those sections. She mentioned that over the past 7 to 8 years that the sign ordinance had been modified 8 times. She mentioned that Staff looked at other City sign codes for comparison.

Chairperson Elgin ask if there was anyone from the Public with a comment.

Dave Brown of 89 Davon stated that when approving signs to keep in mind the elderly and the wheelchair bound and to keep the small town community atmosphere also.

Commissioner Marvin stated that he thought the City looked good and he felt that it was well code enforced.

Chairperson Elgin asked if this was an ADA issue. City Attorney Berhens stated that it was not necessarily an ADA issue. He stated that if it blocks physical access that is the issue.

Planning Commission agreed that it was fine for businesses to have A-frames and their sign need not be up against the wall but in front of their business before the main parking not the face of curb. Commissioner Meade stated that he did not see anything wrong with the metal stick signs.

Smyth stated that LED signs such as the WalGreens sign should only change every 24 hours and the sign is very bright; almost blinding. She stated that Staff has been working with a sign company on another project and they have stated that those signs can be programmed to dim at night. Smyth stated that the ones that completely go black before the next message scrolls are less distracting than the ones that are scrolling across.

Director Smyth summed up what Planning Commission directed Staff to bring back. She stated that what staff heard was to bring back the best practices for the location of a-frames to the parking lot, taller height for a-frames, keeping the same time limits with ADA being the main priority, and to dim the setting on LED signs after the dusk hour and not allow the message board to change more than once every 24 hours.

Bikeway Information for review and comments

Smyth stated that staff has been working with Kings County Association of Governments on a 5 year Regional bike plan. Smyth asked that committee members take a close look at the map that was included in their packet it shows the class one, two and three as a single line. Staff is working with Recreation Department and Lemoore PD on the new bikeway plan to show what the class one, class two and class three are and where there are gaps. They are currently pulling together an inventory as to the existing bikeways that are striped.

Planning Director's Report:

Planning Director Smyth stated that she was handed ACUZ Citizens brochures from Roman Benitez of LNAS. A meeting will be held on March 24, 2011 at the Lemoore Civic Auditorium for a noise demonstration from San Diego on the ACUZ and debriefing with the ACUZ document states. JLUS meeting is this week and if interested the report in on the JLUS website.

Commission's Report and Request for Information:

None

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9.40 p.m.