

**MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
October 22, 2025**

The Imperial County Planning Commission convened a Meeting on Wednesday, October 22, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, El Centro, California.

Staff present: Director, Jim Minnick; Assistant Director, Michael Abraham; Planner II, Alan Molina; Planner II, Luis Bejarano; Planner II, Luis Valenzuela; Clerks – Adriana Ceballos & Aimee Trujillo

Chairman Rudy Schaffner called meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

I. Roll Call: Commissioners present: Schaffner, Kalin, Cabañas, Gallegos, Medina, Wright, Dunn, Roben, Hinojosa

II. Pledge of Allegiance:

III. Public Hearings

1. Approval of Minutes: Chairman Schaffner entertained a motion to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the **September 24, 2025**, meeting as submitted by staff; Commissioner Kalin made motion to approve minutes seconded by Commissioner Cabanas and carried on the affirmative vote by the Commissioners present Schaffner (yes), Kalin (yes), Roben (yes), Cabañas (yes), Gallegos (yes) Medina (yes), Wright (yes), Dunn (yes) Hinojosa (yes)

2. Consideration of Lot Merger #00166 as submitted by Ana Luisa Landeros, who is proposing to combine two (2) continuous lots to create a single and larger lot with approximately 0.172 acres. This newly consolidated lot is intended for potential future mobile home installation. All future developments will be made to County standards. The two (2) subject parcels are identified as Assessor's Parcel Number(s) 021-144-003-000; and legally described as Lots 19 and 20 from Block 28, Townsite of Niland OM 2 81 82, in an unincorporated area of the County of Imperial, State of California; (Supervisorial District #4). [Alan C. Molina, Planner II at (442) 265-1736, extension 1747 or via email at alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us]

Actions:

1. Find that Lot Merger #00166 is categorically exempt from CEQA per Article 19, Section 15305 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) and that no further environmental documentation is necessary; and,
2. Find that Lot Merger #00166 is consistent with applicable Zoning and Building Ordinances; and Approve Lot Merger #00166, subject to the attached conditions.

Jim Minnick, Director: Gave a brief description of the project, and introduced Alan Molina, Planner II, to read the project into the record.

Alan Molina, Planner II: Read the PowerPoint presentation of the project into the record.

Chairman Schaffner: Asked if there was a representative for the project to approach the podium

Alan Molina, Planner II: Planner stated applicant was on her way.

Chairman Schaffner: Opened the public portion of the meeting.

Chairman Schaffner: There were no public comments. He then closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the Commission for any questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Kalin: Made a motion to approve **Agenda Item #2** seconded by **Commissioner Gallegos** and the affirmative vote by the Commissioners present as follows Schaffner (yes), Kalin (yes), Roben (yes), Cabañas (yes), Gallegos (yes) Medina (yes), Wright (yes), Dunn (yes) Hinojosa (yes).

Jim Minnick, Director: Stated **Agenda Item #2** stands approved by this Commission, the applicant or any member of the public wants to appeal must be done by filing the appropriate appeal in the next ten (10) days.

3. **Consideration of Lot Line Adjustment #00343** as submitted by Raul Parra & Maria G. Parra, who are requesting to adjust the north boundary line between Parcel "A" and Parcel "B" to resolve an encroachment issue involving a residential structure located on Parcel "B" onto the neighboring Parcel "A". Parcel: A, with Assessor's Parcel Number 064-240-013 (596 W Brewer Rd, Imperial, CA 92251) is legally described as S 170 FT OF W 250 FT BLK 109 IMPERIAL SUB 1 .98 AC, S.B.B.M.; Parcel B with Assessor's Parcel Number 064-240-038-000 (590 W Brewer Rd, Imperial, CA 92251) is legally described as PAR 4 PM 1663 OF BLK 109 IMPERIAL SUB 1 1AC, S.B.B.M.; (Supervisory District #3) [Luis Valenzuela, Planner II at (442) 265-1736, extension 1749 or via email at luisvalenzuela@co.imperial.ca.us]

Actions:

1. Find that Lot Line Adjustment #00343 is categorically exempt from CEQA per Article 19, Section 15305 (a) (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) and that no further environmental documentation is necessary; and
2. Find that Lot Line Adjustment #00343 is consistent with applicable Zoning and Building Ordinances; and
3. Approve Lot Line Adjustment #00343, subject to the attached conditions.

Jim Minnick, Director: Gave a brief description of the project, and introduced Alan Molina, Planner II, to read the project into the record.

Luis Valenzuela, Planner II: Read the PowerPoint presentation of the project into the record.

Chairman Schaffner: Asked if there was a representative for the project to approach the podium.

Raul Parra, Applicant: Introduced himself.

Chairman Schaffner: Asked if he read and agreed with everything in the project, and if he had any questions or comments regarding the project.

Raul Parra, Applicant: No. Do you guys have any questions?

Chairman Schaffner: We may; but for now, we will open the public portion of the hearing.

Chairman Schaffner: Opened the public portion of the meeting.

Chairman Schaffner: There were no public comments. He then closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the Commission for any questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Kalin: Yes. The Health Department is asking for a Certification.

Jim Minnick, Director: A septic evaluation. The property you currently have has (3) dwellings on it correct?

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yes.

Jim Minnick, Director: The primary property you have (2) and then there is a trailer on the third one.

Raul Parra, Applicant: That is our neighbor's, yes.

Jim Minnick, Director: Oh, okay. So, you don't own that one?

Raul Parra, Applicant: No. So, what we did is we bought the back part of it. And what we are trying to do is adjust the property lines on it. And make it part of our property.

Jim Minnick, Director: The question would be on the smaller lot; the lot is being reduced where is it's septic system I think would be the right question.

Commissioner Kalin: Have they asked for that?

Jim Minnick, Director: No. Just the comment letter we received. It doesn't really specify.

Commissioner Kalin: And the Health Department doesn't have a record of any of the septic tanks?

Jim Minnick, Director: According to the email they don't. I am assuming you use your restroom on a regular basis.

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yes. We have our septic tank in the back. And she has hers behind her house. Nowhere near the lot we are trying to adjust the line at.

Commissioner Cabañas: So, for your property you have (1) septic tank for (2) dwellings?

Raul Parra, Applicant: No. It's my house and my father's house together. We each have our own septic tank. The property we are trying to adjust the lines for has its own septic tank. We just purchased the back part. We are trying to add it to our parcel.

Jim Minnick, Director: So, the North part doesn't have any septic, leech fields, nothing?

Raul Parra, Applicant: No. nothing. Just an empty lot.

Chairman Schaffner: Yours is actually going to get bigger.

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yes.

Jim Minnick, Director: {Referencing PowerPoint} So there on your left side, is what your parcel currently looks like in relation to the other parcel, and your parcel is going to magically grow bigger.

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yes.

Jim Minnick, Director: Ok. Is your small building on her lot already?

Raul Parra, Applicant: No, I just think the line is wrong right there.

Jim Minnick, Director: By the looks of it, it's like a garage — it's probably OK. I'm talking about the little outbuilding there.

Raul Parra, Applicant: No, it's just a little storage but it's on our property.

Jim Minnick, Director: Ok.

Chairman Schaffner: This would be a battle — you can go along with it. Yeah, the septic tank people are there. Have you ever built something?

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yea exactly.

Jim Minnick, Director: So, there's a comment. They want to know if this is going to be added to the conditions; that's what I think—the question we have of your department or your Commission.

Commissioner Roben: What's the condition?

Jim Minnick, Director: The letter says "I researched our records, and we do not have a septic file for 590 (five hundred ninety) Brewer Road, Assessor's Parcel Number 064-240-038. Therefore, prior to the lot split, a septic evaluation and certification in accordance with Policy 8305, attached hereto, must be performed and submitted to our office for review and approval. Once we have this information, we can provide your office with our final comments". This was submitted on October 15th.

Chairman Schaffner: We're not building anything, and we've never done this before. I don't like it. Do you like it?

Raul Parra, Applicant: No, it's new for me. I didn't know we had to do council meetings for a lot line adjustment.

Commissioner Kalin: And hiring somebody to come out and do that is not cheap.

Jim Minnick, Director: No, this is a comment letter we received; we provided it to you.

Chairman Schaffner: Do you like it?

Jim Minnick, Director: Make sure the record shows I am indifferent.

Commissioner Kalin: How old are these houses?

Raul Parra, Applicant: The trailer has probably been there for 30 (thirty) years old; our house has been there since '05.

Commissioner Cabañas: To be clear, the two (2) houses you guys own have your own septic tanks, correct?

Raul Parra, Applicant: Correct

Commissioner Cabañas: So, you're just adding this piece of property to make your property bigger? You're not going to put a house or a mobile home there?

Raul Parra, Applicant: Not anytime soon, No. That's not the plan.

Chairman Schaffner: And if you did the study and they said, "Oh gee, you still don't have quite enough property," what's he supposed to do? Move out? There's nothing he can do.

Raul Parra, Applicant: I was just buying the piece of land to make sure nobody moved in right behind us. That was the reason.

Jim Minnick, Director: I understand, just making sure the Commission sees the comment letters.

Commissioner Roben: I can see one concern that would come up. If the leach lines actually go out onto that property, then yes, if you go to build something, you're going to be digging through their leach lines.

Raul Parra, Applicant: She said they go straight behind her house; they don't touch that empty lot.

Commissioner Hinojosa: I don't see why they would. If you see the image on the left, I don't see why those leach lines would angle back to their property.

Commissioner Kalin: I don't understand why the Health Department doesn't have a record of it. It was built in 2005 (two thousand five)?

Raul Parra, Applicant: They have our record. I don't think they have the neighbor's record. The 590 (five hundred ninety), correct?

Jim Minnick, Director: Raul, what's your address?

Raul Parra, Applicant: We have 596 & 598.

Jim Minnick, Director: So, they're referencing specifically the trailer, which is losing land.

Commissioner Kalin: So, Environmental is requesting a certification of the septic system on the adjacent property?

Raul Parra, Applicant: I think so yea that's what they're asking for.

Chairman Gallegos: But that's not your problem.

Raul Parra, Applicant: Correct, all I'm doing is adding the piece of land we bought in the back to our parcel—that's it.

Chairman Hinojosa: And you already bought the property, correct?

Raul Parra, Applicant: Yeah, years ago we're just finally doing the paperwork.

Chairman Kalin: So, they're requesting that you do a certification of the septic system on the neighbor's property.

Jim Minnick, Director: Well, the neighbor's property is involved with the lot line adjustment, so there's no statement as to who has to do it, just that prior to recordation, the lot line adjustment has been done.

Chairman Gallegos: It has nothing to do with what he's doing.

Jim Minnick, Director: It has 100% to do with what he's doing because of his action the lot is reducing in size, they're asking for information on the smaller lot. After it's done, does it still have room for it? They're both in the boxing ring at the same time, so they both have to address the issues. The question is, do you want to add that as a condition of approval, or just refer to it as a comment letter received? That's your Commission's choice.

Chairman Kalin: I'm going with just recognizing that we received the comment.

Chairman Schaffner: Opened the public portion of the meeting.

Chairman Schaffner: There were no public comments. He then closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the Commission for any questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Kalin: Made a motion to approve **Agenda Item #3** without the condition of doing a certification of septic tank seconded by **Commissioner Cabañas** and the affirmative vote by the Commissioners present as follows Schaffner (yes), Kalin (yes), Roben (yes), Cabañas (yes), Gallegos (yes) Medina (yes), Wright (yes), Dunn (yes) Hinojosa (yes).

Jim Minnick, Director: Stated **Agenda Item #3** stands approved by this Commission, the applicant or any member of the public wants to appeal must be done by filing the appropriate appeal in the next ten (10) days.

4. **Consideration of Conditional Use Permit #25-0004 and Variance #25-0001** as submitted by VB BTS III, LLC, the applicant, to install a 120-foot-tall wireless telecommunications monopole tower with a 10-foot lightning rod for a total height of 130 feet. Said tower will be located within a 1,600 sq. ft. leased, fenced area and Variance #25-0001 to exceed the 60-foot height limitation for the A-1 (Limited/Light Agriculture) zone by 70 feet. The proposed project site is located at 1734 Underwood Road, Holtville, CA 92250, with Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 045-600-017-000, and further identified as BLK 65 & W2 OF VAC ST ADJ TSTE TR 87 15-15 5.51AC. Latitude 32° 49' 16.0176" N – Longitude 115° 23' 9.1932" W., County of Imperial; State of California (Supervisory District #5), [Luis Bejarano, Planner II at 442-265-1736, or via email at luisbejarano@co.imperial.ca.us].

Actions:

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration by finding that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment as recommended at the Environmental Evaluation Committee (EEC) hearing on July 24, 2025; and,
2. Approve the attached Resolution and supporting findings, approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) #25-0004 subject to all the conditions, and authorize the Planning & Development Services Director to sign the CUP upon receipt from the Permittee; and,
3. Approve the attached Resolution and Supporting Findings for Variance #25-0001.

Jim Minnick, Director: Gave a brief description of the project, and introduced Luis Bejarano, Planner II, to read the project into the record.

Luis Bejarano, Planner II: Read the PowerPoint presentation of the project into the record.

Commissioner Kalin: Has the Airport Land Use Committee passed this? And were the agricultural applicators notified?

Luis Bejarano, Planner II: Yes, they were notified.

Chairman Schaffner: Asked if there was a representative for the project to approach the podium.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Introduced herself and shared PowerPoint presentation.

Chairman Schaffner: Asked if she read and agreed with everything in the project, and if she had any questions or comments regarding the project.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Yes, I agree and no comments.

Chairman Schaffner: Before we open this up to the public. Mr. Minnick do we have the in-kind thing we used to have people give?

Jim Minnick, Director: No, not since (2015) twenty fifteen.

Chairman Schaffner: So, we don't have that at all anymore?

Jim Minnick, Director: No.

Chairman Schaffner: Ok. How far are you from the next closest tower?

Samantha Herman, Representative: It's about a mile and a half.

Jim Minnick, Director: We do have the co-location, when possible communications ordinance, and the propagation requirement. But in terms of any kind of benefit for the asset being there, we don't.

Chairman Schaffner: Ok, I notice that you have in here that if they co-locate, the person who does the co-locates has to pay for that.

Jim Minnick, Director: Yes.

Chairman Schaffner: We used to have people put that in already. That tower that is little over a mile away has co location setup, installed meters and everything for like four more people right off the bat. And a mile or a mile and a little bit is way too close. We never allowed to put another one up there that close. We turned them down when they are three, four, five, and miles away.

Jim Minnick, Director: It depends on the propagation, the height of the tower, and supplying the site for the co locaters and the antennas.

Chairman Schaffner: So, I don't see any use for it when the other one is not filled already. You guys can go and locate on theirs; it's ready to go. You can do it tomorrow.

Samantha Herman, Representative: So, the carrier that's proposed on this tower is T-Mobile currently and it would be available for future co-locaters as well. There is a T-Mobile tower that is a mile and ½ and I do have a slide within this presentation that kind of shows where the existing towers are in relation to this one. If you are open to this presentation.

Chairman Schaffner: I am open, but I will tell you right now I am not in favor right up front.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Understood.

Chairman Schaffner: Opened the public portion of the meeting.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Introduced himself. I am against this tower being put in here for several reasons. For one thing, we don't need a tower there. Mr. Shaffner was saying that. We have another tower right next to the Holtville athletic club that is already ready to go; It is not even a third of the way filled and an ideal location right there. There are no trees around whatsoever. When you are talking about a mile and half away, where is your first tower here in the Imperial Valley? Here in Holtville?

Samantha Herman, Representative: The existing T-Mobile tower?

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Yes.

Samantha Herman, Representative: It is South. It is about a mile and half away from this tower. It is off of Bonds Corner Road.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: There is also another tower on East Mesa, Holtville. Does that have anything to do with you folks?

Samantha Herman, Representative: No sir.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Okay. So, you got Bonds Corner Road, which is about a mile, let's say, a couple of miles away. You got plenty of coverage right there. In fact, there are people that I know from Holtville that have T-Mobile and they have no problem whatsoever with receptions. Like I say it's nicer right there, it's a hazard right there. Is it going to be what? A 120-foot tower.

We have crop dusters that fly through there and their altitude right there; they can't fly anything over 300 feet. And there are also several fields out there which are their passways. There is also a field by Camm Road, right next to John Schimdt's house right there, and it's being farmed right now by Vessy. And we have crop dusters that come through there. When they make their path, they come up to the field, then they make a turn right there. That tower is right on the way. In case something happens to that plane or he has to make an emergency landing and that tower is in its way somebody will be killed. I hope nobody does. Knowing that we have the Osprey with the military comes through there. They come through just about every night. They fly through daytime, nighttime and they are about 300 feet above the ground if that sometimes. We also have military helicopters coming down through there. It is just a bad area for it. Not only that, but you are going to have strobe lights on it, correct?

Samantha Herman, Representative: It is a condition. Yes.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Red for night, white for daytime. Okay, so when that strobe light goes out, they do go out. And then a white beacon comes on, I don't feel like I have to, it is going to light up that whole area. It happens with the white beacon even with a red beacon. I don't feel like I have to buy another set of curtains, another set of blinds, to keep that red light out or the white light out. It is just uncalled for, it just is. It is a bad location for it. And not only that, but also property value goes down. I have talked to several realtors here in Imperial Valley. If there is a cellular tower that goes up there, how does my property value out; it comes down. And in fact, the property right across the road from me belongs to John Hawk. In time, he is going to put apartments there, or housing there. Which is fine. You know, we need some of that. Yet think about all the people that would have to put up with the white light, red light, it is a hazard. Some people will have health issues, that if that light bothers a person, it will get to them. They might have hypertension; but yeah, it is just a bad area to be in and I will say I am against it 100%. There are plenty of other towers here in Imperial Valley that you guys can attach to. And I will say this again, I do not know why you want the north side of town. Can you explain that to me.

Samantha Herman, Representative: There is a coverage gap. So, it is to fill the network with the existing T-Mobile tower serving the North area of Holtville.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Ok, so there is a coverage gap. Has there been any science, any reports that you guys are not getting the right reception.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Yes, the coverage evaluation is evaluated by T-Mobile engineers, and they do prepare propagation maps that show the existing coverage compared to the proposed coverage and it is based off of dropped calls, lost service.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: OK, and how come when we got the flyers for that it didn't say about the coverage and everything. That is stuff that was left out.

Samantha Herman, Representative: It is provided within the report. And within the propagation maps and justification that the engineers provided.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: Okay, and you say you are going to have a six-foot fence around if it goes through, which I hope it doesn't go through. I will use as an example, cell towers out there at Superstition Mountain about six months ago, some people got through the six-foot fence and burned the building. I don't think a six-foot fence will stop people. Some kids, when they get the sh*ts and giggles, excuse my language.

Chairman Schaffner: We are getting a bit far off track here. We normally would give you three minutes, and we didn't tell you that. So, you need to go ahead and wrap it up please.

Michael Potter, Public Speaker: I will just say I am against it. Thank you.

Diana Roben, Public Speaker: Introduced herself. I own the property on the corner of Melon and Ninth street. I am totally against this cellular tower going in. We have too many residential people living there. We do not need this. We have a high school a block and a 1/2 away from us. We have track kids that come this way and everything. And also, we are looking at the radiation that is coming from these towers. It is a health issue. Another thing is, where you want to put this tower in is light agriculture, the whole area is light agriculture. So, that means you are going to have to re-zone if you will go in there and this is approved. And you are going to pay for that.

Samantha Herman, Representative: No mam, I am sorry, it is permitted within the A-1 zone per the code.

Diana Roben, Public Speaker: So, it has already been re-zoned as commercial?

Samantha Herman, Representative: No, it is permitted within the existing zone. So, it won't have to be re-zoned.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Well, I don't feel like it should be there because I don't want to walk out and see a tower in front of me all clutter up and everything. Reach comes in and reach had to land there about five months ago because of Mr. Fussy's business there. A worker got hurt. They landed there. And that is not the first time. It's been three times where a helicopter has had to land there in that area. And reach comes first before a tower does. When a helicopter comes in Holtville, they land in the baseball field, and when they take off, they use that path right across there, and reach comes first before a tower does. Thank you.

Chairman Schaffner: If there are no other public comments, I will close the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the Commission for any questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Gallegos: I have a question. In a lot of places, the culture residential, sometimes they require, instead of an ugly-looking tower, they put like a palm tree with the deals, like in Austin. I see them in Austin.

Chairman Schaffner: We started that.

Jim Minnick, Director: We do from time to time, when there's appropriateness to it. If there's nothing around it, it doesn't really do anything. Several years ago, on Edward Bruce Property, he had some tall trees, and when we permitted that one, it included a camouflage component. We also did it when we had the Nextel. We had a lot of (55) fifty-five foot tall towers. They're all palm trees with one co-locator ability, so the scale is important and location is important. Ideally, we'd love it, but if you know, create an even bigger visual, we can make artwork.

Commissioner Cabañas: I do have a question for you. It was mentioned in the presentation something about the emergency service. Can you explain that to me, what is that you're planning to do? Then I'll ask you a second question.

Samantha Herman, Representative: Yeah, so the Vertical Bridge, the owner of the tower, has come to a public benefit agreement with the IVCA, and this ensures that Vertical Bridge will provide tower space for the IVCA to mount their communication antennas and infrastructure on the tower.

Commissioner Cabañas: Ok, so another scenario not long ago, we went to something similar with another tower in another town, and I don't see that you guys have an emergency generator on site.

Samantha Herman, Representative: There is currently a proposed generator within the compound.

Commissioner Cabañas: Is that correct?

Jim Minnick, Director: Yes.

Commissioner Cabañas: Ok. That answers my question, Thank You.

Commissioner Medina: I have a question; how many residential dwellings are in close proximity to the target?

Samantha Herman, Representative: The nearest residence is about 500 (five hundred) feet away; it's between 3 (three) to 500 (five hundred) feet.

Commissioner Medina: How many families?

Samantha Herman, Representative: There are 2 (two) residences within about 500 (five hundred) feet.

Commissioner Medina: Now, is there any issue that the residents should be concerned about regarding health because of the tower?

Samantha Herman, Representative: No sir, no. There's nothing—no studies have been conducted that would indicate any health concerns from the emissions. There was a report on the emissions from this specific tower, and it would be at a minimal percentage compared to the FCC regulations, about 8% of the FCC standards.

Chairman Schaffner: He then closed the public portion of the meeting and turned it over to the Commission for any questions and/or comments.

Chairman Schaffner: Ok, my comment again is that I own some property that is almost identical in distance from where you're trying to put the antenna and the one that's existing 2 (two) years ago. I don't know, you get all kinds of room on the other tower. One of the things we've been doing since day one was trying to figure out how to get by with fewer towers here, even letting them go up a little bit higher because the short ones they had to have off, and all that. The space is there. I hear no complaints from anybody on the cell service. Now we have phones on that, I live 3 or 4 (three or four) miles beyond that, and so far it's all great. It's existing, it's there, and I can't see it.

Commissioner Gallegos: It's like you were T-Mobile. The tower he's referring to isn't that Verizon?

Samantha Herman, Representative: So the tower that's existing has multiple Co-located carriers on it T-Mobile is not on that tower I believe Verizon is .

Commissioner Gallegos: So, you guys want to put your own?

Samantha Herman, Representative: Yes. Would you mind—for the slideshow, I believe maybe 8 or 9 (eight or nine)? So, the existing T-Mobile tower is at South Point. Then there are two others: Imperial Valley Irrigation owns just a microwave tower, and there's another existing tower there. This proposed tower is intended to gap the coverage from the existing T-Mobile tower at the south in Holtville and in the north section of Holtville. If there is available space on the existing towers, it wouldn't meet the same coverage objectives that T-Mobile is aiming to gain with this proposed tower due to the existing infrastructure.

Chairman Schaffner: We might have the same problem. Last 2 (two) or 3 (three) towers that we turned down, they were just sick of the other tower because they didn't want to pay rent to the other people. Well, the other people were there, it's existing, they made them co-locatable, and so we don't need another tower. We're trying to have less towers. I get calls from the ag people, the pilots, and every house out there, and they want to know why it came this far, because anybody can put an application into anything they want. That didn't mean that it should be there or needs to be there. So anyway, I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Cabañas: Hold on. Have you guys studied any alternative locations?

Samantha Herman, Representative: Yeah, so we assessed over 20 (twenty) alternative sites and locations for the tower. They are all within a similar area to this one to meet the same coverage objectives. I believe it's on the slide after this. We assessed 24 (twenty-four) alternative locations for the new facility, and we also assessed the tower that's existing. The engineers confirmed that it would not meet the same coverage objectives that they are aiming for. We received 7 (seven) responses from property owners, and they were either not interested or the negotiations in the process fell through. But we did look into various areas.

Chairman Schaffner: Another thing about that area—it's all going to be houses in a few years. It's the only direction Holtville can go; we've got the rerun on two sides of it, and that's the only place they can go. They just zoned one of them a while back to put a bunch of houses over there. They haven't built it yet, but it will happen as soon as somebody goes and buys the project. But that's the least of our worries. We don't need it; we've got a tower there. You guys can go rent it like everybody else is supposed to do.

Samantha Herman, Representative: T-Mobile will be leasing from Vertical Bridge, so it would be a similar situation if they were to locate on one of the existing towers they are leasing from.

Chairman Schaffner: Similar?

Samantha Herman, Representative: If they were to locate on the existing tower, they would be leasing the space. They are also leasing the space on this Vertical Bridge tower.

Jim Minnick, Director: T-Mobile isn't going to own the tower; the company is.

Chairman Schaffner: I don't care who owns it; we don't need another tower; that's the whole point. We've got a tower sitting there ready to go and put four (4) more antennas on it. Power's there, everything's ready to go—fences, roads. The damage has already been done, it's been put up, we don't need any more out there. That's my argument. If I thought we needed it, I would have let them go right by my place over there and put another tower, but we don't need it.

Commissioner Kalin: Made a motion to recommend denial **Agenda Item #4** seconded by **Commissioner Cabanas** and the affirmative vote by the Commissioners present as follows Schaffner (yes), Kalin (yes), Roben (yes), Cabañas (yes), Gallego's (no), Medina (yes), Wright (yes), Dunn (yes), Hinojosa (yes)

Jim Minnick, Director: Stated **Agenda Item #4** failed by this Commission, the applicant or any member of the public wants to appeal must be done by filing the appropriate appeal in the next ten (10) days.

Jim Minnick, Director: Chairman Mrs. Landros from our first item is here, the Lot Merger if you want to hear from her to confirm that she was agreeable with all the conditions.

Chairman Schaffner: It's all good we took care of you. Thank You.

IV. Public Comments: NONE

V. Planning Commissioner Comments: NONE

VI. Director's Comments:

VII. Adjournment: Chairman Schaffner: Adjourned meeting. Meeting adjourned at 9:44 a.m.

Submitted by Rudy Schaffner
Chairman of the Planning Commission

Attest:

Jim Minnick, Director of
Imperial County Planning Commission

Aimee Trujillo & Adriana Ceballos - PC Recording Clerks
AT\S:\Clerical\MINUTES & RESOLUTIONS\2025\PC\10 22 2025 PC MINUTES .docx