



City of Corona

400 S. Vicentia Ave.
Corona, CA 92882

Minutes - Final

Infrastructure Committee

MAYOR JASON SCOTT
COUNCIL MEMBER WES SPEAKE

ADVISORY MEMBER
PLANNING & HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Wednesday, August 7, 2019

8:00 AM

Council Board Room

1. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order by Vice Mayor Jim Steiner at 8:03 a.m. with Mayor Jason Scott. In addition to the Committee Members, the following individuals were in attendance:

Mitch Lansdell, Acting City Manager	Michele Nissen, Asst. City Manger
Kerry Eden, Asst. City Mgr./ Admin Svcs. Dir.	Joanne Coletta, Com. Dev. Dir.
Jamie Raymond, Chief Deputy Attorney	Nelson Nelson, Public Works Dir.
Tom Koper, Asst. Public Works Dir.	Sandra Yang, Sr. Planner
Naomi Ramirez, Management Svcs. Asst.	

Others Present:

Stacy Brown, AT&T	Brandon Leaks, AT&T
David Enlow, Resident	Julio Figueroa, AT&T
Shanon Myl, Verizon	Joe Morgan, Resident
Tim Brown, Crown Castle	
Karen Alexander, Planning & Housing Commission	
Tim Jones, Planning & Housing Commission	

2. Public Comments

Mr. Joe Morgan, Resident, commented on the need for Committee agendas to include staff reports and/or attachments when posted.

3. Agenda Items

- A. [19-0706](#) Discussion of the Overlook Development Impact Fees for Nelson Street, Courtney Street, Howe Street, and Duncan Way.
(Public Works Department)
Action: Information & Discussion

Attachments: [Overlook Development Impact Fee Nelson Street, Courtney Street, Howe Street, Duncan Way](#)

Mr. Tom Koper, Assistant Public Works Director, introduced item and provided the Committee with a development impact fee study. Mr. Koper noted that new residential developments have created a demand to construct the missing street improvements, and explained that the fee study is to fund the completion of the street improvements on Nelson Street, Courtney Street, Howe Street and Duncan Way. Mr. Koper commented on the Development Impact Fees and the purpose of the fee study to determine the fees associated with the new development and reimbursement. Mr. Koper provided an overview of the properties with proposed roadway improvements, completed street improvements, properties with liens, and property paid City improvements. He then provided the Committee with the cost breakdown and development impact fees.

The Committee was in favor of moving forward with the impact study and thanked staff for the presentation.

- B.** [19-0707](#) Discuss and Review Sidewalk Replacement, ADA Curb Ramp, and Infill Request.
 (Public Works Department)
 Action: Information & Discussion

Attachments: [Sidewalk Replacement and Infill](#)

Mr. Nelson Nelson, Public Works Director, introduced item and provided background on the requests being presented for consideration. Mr. Nelson noted the requests were for the following items: sidewalk replacements, upgrading existing curb ramps to ADA compliance, and infill.

Mr. Nelson provided the Committee with an overview which included scope of work and total estimated cost of the planned projects: 2018-19 CDBG sidewalk improvements, the 2019-20 Citywide sidewalk improvements phase II, and the 2019-20 Citywide ADA ramp improvements. Mr. Nelson continued to provide the Committee with potential sidewalk projects: South Smith Avenue Sidewalk, El Sobrante Road Sidewalk. He noted the three areas for potential projects are Oak Avenue Sidewalk, East Chase Drive Sidewalk, and South Sherman Avenue Sidewalk. Staff provided the Committee with a project cost summary of recommended projects and a cost summary for the optional projects.

Mr. David Enlow, Resident, commented on the need for improvements to the Oak Avenue sidewalk. He noted that the installation of sidewalk would improve the traffic issues as well as safety concerns for both residents and

students.

Ms. Michele Nissen, Assistant City Manager, inquired about possibly partnering with the Riverside County Flood Control to assist with funds for the drainage improvements needed at the Oak Avenue location.

The Committee provided staff with feedback on the recommended projects and noted that they would like to see projects that have a higher impact to residents, be priority and done first.

C. [19-0712](#)

Discussion on a proposed amendment to the city's Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance (CMC Chapter 17.65) to amend the regulations for small cell sites described in CMC Section 17.65.050.

(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Joanne Coletta, Community Development Director, introduced to the Committee a proposal to amend the City's development standards for small cell wireless facilities which are regulated under Section 17.65.050 of the Corona Municipal Code. Ms. Coletta provided a background on the small cell standards which were originally created in 2016 in response to interests from wireless carriers back then. Due to changes in technology and FCC regulations over the years, staff has received requests from three wireless carriers to update the City's small cell standards to be more applicable and consistent with current technology and FCC regulations. The changes to the standards are also intended to support 4G wireless network technology as well as prepare the City for 5G roll-out in the future. Ms. Coletta provided an overview of the proposed changes to Section 17.65.050 and the packets of information that were provided by the carriers which were distributed to the Committee.

The Committee inquired if the existing code or amendment has language that require the removal of existing equipment if a more advance network technology comes up in the future. Ms. Coletta responded that the existing code and amendment do not.

Julio Figueroa, representing AT&T, stated that the license agreement between the City and carrier address removal of equipment.

The carriers discussed how new small equipment will eventually replace existing and older small cell equipment as technology evolves over the years. The carriers also described their small cell deployment plans with Crown Castle currently deploying facilities for Sprint and T-Mobile which are all currently 4G network. AT&T is a year away from deploying 5G facilities, and Verizon is currently deploying 5G facilities.

Ms. Coletta described the first big telecommunications facility roll-out back in 1995 which began with monopoles followed by monopines as technology advanced. Due to a lack of suitable land, it would be difficult to continue to install macro-facilities (monopoles and monopines) so it was always anticipated for small cells to be the next big roll-out since small cells can be placed in infill sites and collocated onto existing structures such as utility poles. Also, the installation of small cells will require more sites as their coverage is more limited compared to macro-facilities.

Ms. Coletta also brought up for discussion a possible change in the development standards to allow for small cells to be installed on local residential streets as the development standards currently prohibit this. Having small cell facilities on local residential streets would support the macro-sites in those areas by offloading capacity from the macro-sites to the small cell site.

Stacy Brown, representation AT&T, added that the feedback they have received from realtors is that homebuyers are seeking neighborhoods that have good wireless coverage.

Mr. Figueroa added further that prohibiting small cells in residential areas is prohibited by the FCC and made referenced to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the recent FCC order that was issued in September 2018.

In response to Mr. Figueroa's comment, Ms. Jamie Raymond, Deputy Chief City Attorney, acknowledged the tight restrictions that local agencies face with telecommunications facilities in general, but clarified to the Committee that local agencies can still regulate the location and design (aesthetics) of small cell facilities. Also, the recent FCC order is currently being challenged in the courts. In general, the City still has some authority over small cells and so staff is seeking direction from the Committee as to what they would like to see in terms of a standard design for a small cell facility and noted that some communities are going towards having clear and concise design guidelines for small cells to avoid visual clutter.

Sharon Myl, representing Verizon Wireless, expressed concerns over the City's current 720-foot minimum separation requirement between small cell sites. Verizon's technology emits shorter waves compared to other carriers and thus, requested that a shorter 400-foot minimum separation be considered. The 720-foot separation requirement would limit the quality and efficiency of 5G coverage that Verizon will be providing to their customers.

Ms. Brown also shared her concern over the 720-foot separation requirement stating that it would limit AT&T from placing their own small cell

facility in a particular location if another carrier already has a small cell installed within 720 feet. AT&T's goal is not to pepper the City with small cells but to provide coverage where there is currently a gap in coverage that cannot be met by a macro-facility.

Tim Brown, representing Crown Castle, added that having a distance separation requirement may create competition between carriers. Small cells should be based on coverage needs and not be limited by distance.

In response to the concerns, Ms. Raymond stated that the proposed amendment contains language that would allow small cell sites to be placed within 720 feet of each other as long as the carrier can demonstrate that a lesser distance is necessary in order to increase capacity or provide wireless service.

Ms. Coletta offered propagation maps as an example of the type of documentation that can be submitted to the City to demonstrate a carrier's need for a shorter distance separation requirement.

Ms. Brown stated that AT&T may not be able to provide numerical data, but would be able to provide exhibits showing a small cell's capacity needs. Ms. Brown also asked if staff can look at the restriction on the length of cross-arms on wooden electrical poles.

Overall, the Committee did not object to the amendment for small cell development standards.

4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.