

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held February 2, 2012, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

In Attendance: Chad Anderson Chris Anderson Scotty Ensign
 Bob Hailey Carl Hickman Eb Hogervorst
 Kristi Mansolf Jim Piva Paul Stykel
 Angus Tobiason Richard Tomlinson Kevin Wallace

Absent: Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick, Dennis Sprong

Jim Piva, RCPG Chair, acted as Chair of the meeting, Chris Anderson, RCPG Vice-Chair, acted as Vice-Chair of the meeting, and Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM (Mansolf)

The Secretary determined a quorum was present.

ITEM 4: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes

Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong had excused absences.

ITEM 5: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair) – None

ITEM 6: FORMATION OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Ms. Anderson brought the minutes of January 5, 2012 forward to the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Hailey brought forward Item 11-A-1, the Verizon Cell Site on Calistoga Place for consent. The project is a co-location project, and the South Subcommittee approved the project with no issues.

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 11-A-1, VERIZON CELL SITE ON CALISTOGA PLACE, AND THE RCPG MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2012, TO THE CONSENT CALENDAR, AND TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action) – No Changes Made)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**,

with Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 1-5-12 (Action) (*Approved on Consent*)

ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)

Speaker: Joe Maguire, Ramona Resident

Mr. Maguire lives in the 4 corners area and has 20 acres. He received a notice relating to his property size changing due to the Forest Conservation Initiative ending.

The Chair said the RCPG had this item on the January 5 agenda. Mr. Maguire was given a copy of the January 5 minutes and contact information to further discuss this matter.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke thanked the RCPG for voting against the solar project proposed on Warnock Drive. He wanted the RCPG to apply the same logic in making that decision to the extension of Ramona Street, saying that the Ramona Street extension will affect the same area. Mr. Brennecke felt the safety statistics mentioned in the CEQA document were faulty because they included the entire corridor from San Vicente and Warnock to Dye and Hwy 67. He said the County will have to make exceptions to its own building standards for Ramona Street. The proposed Ramona Street project will create congestion instead of alleviate it. On Hanson, there will be 1500 more trips per day. The cost of the project continues to increase and is now estimated to cost \$5.2 million. The road will not be safer, and the RCPG should not be accepting risk for Ramona residents.

Speaker: Patricia Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Ms. Brennecke thanked the RCPG Chair and Secretary for attending a recent presentation by Jim Cooper to the Department of Public Works on the Ramona Street extension project. She reminded the RCPG that they were elected to represent the community of Ramona, and proper research is necessary before making decisions that will cost a community its beauty, millions of dollars and quality of life. When community members are not given a chance to relay facts, their findings and potential problems with proposed projects, then the RCPG is doing a disservice to Ramona. Ms. Brennecke said this roadway will make a massive gouge in Ramona's rural countryside. Each version of the plan has taken the roadway lower with greater encroachment, and greater ugliness. She did not feel the community wanted a road like Scripps Poway Parkway splitting up prime agricultural land. She invited RCPG members to walk along the proposed Ramona Street extension to visualize possible impacts.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers said the County will be violating their road standards when they build the Ramona Street Extension. The RCPG has not given CFAR a chance to speak about this project as it goes through the design process. Driveways will be blind alleys. The RCPG was not aware of this until CFAR called their attention to it. It has been determined that blasting will be required. The blasting will impact the area and the residents. The proposed work to be done on her property will be a problem. One neighbor will have a tunnel for a driveway. For another, the road will be at the roof of the house.

Speaker: Shelly Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers asked why the section of Ramona Street and Boundary and Warnock Drive have not been paved? She offered reasons why Ramona Street has not yet been paved: 1) paving of Ramona Street from Hanson to H Street was done in November, 1954; 2) paving of Ramona Street from Hanson to Boundary was done in June, 1979; and the south side of Ramona Street up to Warnock was paved in May 1947. The County has said not all driveways will meet current County Road Standards when the road is done. This will create a very dangerous situation. The Fire Department is not sure their emergency vehicles will be able to access the homes with very steep driveways. The water district line and the aqueduct under the proposed road easement will both need to be lowered to a considerable depth, which will cost a lot. If the water district covers the cost, they will pass it on to their customers as a rate increase. Why were these lines not lowered sooner if the road has been on the books since 1890? It has been said the money being spent on the Ramona Street Extension is being spent for circulation and safety for the schools. What about the fact the County says traffic on Hanson will increase with the road extension? Major blasting will have to occur to build the road which could damage up to a 2 mile area. Who will be responsible for this damage? Ms. Meyers believes the reason the project was never paved is because it is not an economically sound project. She asked the project be permanently taken off the books.

ITEM 10: ABC 11-009, ABC License for Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market Proposed for 1326 Main St. (Action)

Jeff Herbst of K.L. Charles Architects, Inc., was in attendance to answer questions regarding the project.

Ms. Anderson clarified that the project was before the RCPG for an ABC Permit.

Mr. Ensign asked what a Fresh & Easy Market is?

Mr. Herbst said Fresh & Easy is a small neighborhood market that is about 14,000 square feet. They try to get locally grown fresh goods. They have daily deliveries and fresh food is replenished daily. The shelf life of their products is limited. They offer ready made meals and a microwave. Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market's typically sell alcoholic beverages.

The Chair said the site previously was a grocery store with a permit to sell alcohol.

MOTION: TO APPROVE

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Bob Hailey, the motion **passed 11-0-1-0-3**, with Angus Tobiason abstaining, and Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong absent.

ITEM 11: Subcommittee Reports

11-A: SOUTH (Hailey) (Action Item)(Approved on Consent)

11-A-1:P12-001, 23401 Calistoga Place, Verizon Wireless Proposal for 12 Panel Antennas to be Mounted at a Centerline Height of 41 feet, 8 inch on an Existing 49 foot Tall Water Tank, and Associated Equipment. Property Owned by SDCE Association. RMWD Owns Tank

11-B: WEST (Mansolf) (No Business)

11-C: EAST (Ensign)(No Business)

11-D: PARKS (Tomlinson)(Action Item)

**11-D-1:Development/Confirmation of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO)
Project Priority List and Recreation Programming Priority List
(Identification of Recreation Program Needs and Priorities) 2011-2012**

Mr. Tomlinson said he was unable to arrange a meeting of the subcommittee members where he would have a quorum present. He will continue to try to arrange a meeting prior the next RCPG meeting.

11-E: CUDA (Brean)(No Business)

11-F: Transportation/Trails (Sprong)(No Business)

11-G: DESIGN REVIEW (Chris Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Ms. Anderson reported that there was no quorum at the Design Review Board meeting.

11-H: Village Design Committee Meeting Report (Brean, Stykel)

Mr. Stykel said he thought Mr. Blackson may be at the next meeting February 9 to discuss the project. He was unsure of meeting location.

ITEM 12: OTHER BUSINESS (Chair) (Possible Action)

A. Hwy 67 Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report

The Chair said he and Mr. Hickman went over the presentation to SANDAG on the Highland Valley/Dye/Hwy 67 intersection with CalTrans for input. The meeting with a representative from SANDAG will be next week. If we request money to get the intersection Project Report started now and the request is approved, the funding may not be available until 2018. The intersection is operation at an LOS F, and with many operational problems. Neither the County nor CalTrans has any money for intersection improvements.

B. Red Tape Reduction Task Force Issue – Update

The Chair said there was a meeting on that day of Planning and Sponsor Group Chairs throughout the County, at a County office, to discuss the Red Tape Reduction Task Force Report. He and Ms. Mansolf attended. The proposed changes were reviewed and discussed. A micro committee has been formed of District 2 Planning and Sponsor Group Chairs. They have made recommendations and presented these to Supervisor Jacobs. Supervisor Jacob will be hosting a meeting on February 3, to discuss further. So far they are recommending that no changes be made, but if changes are necessary, offered for consideration will be members serving 2, 4-year consecutive terms, with a 2 year break before running again; possible reduction of members; and mandatory Brown Act, Form 700 and Policy I-1 training. There will be more on this next month. The Board was threatened with a lawsuit, and they are choosing to vacate actions taken December 7, 2011, and then consider them February 29, 2012.

**C. POD 11-011, County of San Diego Tiered Equine Ordinance Notice of Preparation of Draft EIR. Public Comment Ends 2-17-12. Available at:
<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa/POD11-011.html>**

Ms. Mansolf announced the County Tiered Equine Ordinance Notice of Preparation of Draft EIR is out for public review.

D. GP Update Property Specific Referrals in Ramona from January 9-11 Board of Supervisors Workshop. Comments due to County By 3-15-12

Ms. Mansolf talked to a planner at the County who said that all concerns from Ramona were brought before the Board of Supervisors during the Property Specific Referral Workshop, January 9 through 11, however only 3 were referred back to staff for more study. County staff has asked for input on the 3 requests. One is RM 3, various lots north of the Santa Maria Creek that were previously designated Industrial, but probably are unbuildable due to the proximity of the stream. The County wants to remove the Industrial designation from these properties and change them to be RL 20. The second is RM 15, the approved Teyssier subdivision, which can be processed if it does not expire. If it expires, it will become RL 40. The third is RM 22, a property east of Ramona – the Hawkins property. It is directly south of the RL 40 line and is a 200 acre parcel that is currently RL 80. It was noted that RM 5, a parcel that is almost 900 acres, is directly south of RM 22. RM 5 is also RL 80. Ms. Mansolf told County staff the RCPG voted to not have any parcels greater than 40 acres.

Ms. Anderson thought each property referral should be reviewed by the geographic subcommittee the property was in. She remembers the GP Update Subcommittee tried to do a ground truthing of the parcels north of the stream to reflect what could be accurately done there.

Mr. Tomlinson asked that the RCPG get digital copies of the referrals.

The referrals will be on the March 1, agenda.

ITEM 13: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)

A. Appointment of Subcommittee Chairs for 2012 (Chair)

The Chair made the following appointments for subcommittee chairs:

Carl Hickman, Transportation/Trails

Scotty Ensign, Transportation/Trails Vice-Chair

Bob Hailey, South

Kristi Mansolf, West

Scotty Ensign, East

Richard Tomlinson, Parks

Chris Anderson, Design Review Board Representative

Torry Brean and Paul Stykel, Village Design Committee Representatives

MOTION: TO CONFIRM SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR APPOINTMENTS FOR 2012.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick and Dennis Sprong absent.

B. Distribution of Form 700, Economic Disclosure, to RCPG Members

Form 700's were distributed to all present. The Chair asked that they be returned to Ms. Mansolf to send to the County. Please don't return forms to the FPPC in Sacramento.

C. Criteria for Releasing RCPG Member Information – Establishment of Guidelines (Action)

Ms. Mansolf said the RCPG member information is available on the Registrar of Voters website. Our names are shown on the DPLU website, with no additional information available. If someone contacts the County and asks for RCPG member information, the County will refer them to us. Recently someone contacted Ms. Mansolf and asked for contact information for the RCPG and she gave it to them. She would like guidelines for handing out this information.

The Chair said some planning and sponsor groups put email addresses on their letterhead after the members' names, and he asked if anyone would object to the RCPG doing this. No members objected.

Ms. Anderson said she is concerned that a Brown Act violation may occur if we are all invited to an event by someone and 8 or more attend.

D. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)

Mr. Hailey said he received email notifications that all of his subcommittee members wanted to be on the South Subcommittee in 2012 – George Eastwood, Thomas Levin, Bill White and Bob Krysak.

The Chair asked that he forward the emails to the Secretary. The Chair also asked that all subcommittee chairs get confirmation in writing from members to continue membership and then we will confirm them next month.

E. Concerns of Members

Mr. Hailey announced the West Wing of the Town Hall has been remodeled and there will be a Grand Opening on February 26.

Ms. Mansolf said she received a concern from Mark Hutton that the Hwy 67 Ad Hoc Subcommittee report was always at the end of the agenda. Hwy 67 affects all Ramona, and he would like it to be moved nearer the top of the agenda so more people would be able to hear the report.

F. Agenda Requests

Ms. Mansolf announced that the RCPG received the Single Family Residential Design Guidelines, which pertains to land use aspects of designing and planning development. We received it right about the time the agenda was being finalized. Public review ends February 25, but she will ask if we can have until the meeting March 1 to review it.

The Chair had an announcement on the Ramona Street Extension project. The Chair and Ms. Mansolf met with the Citizens for a Rural Ramona (CFAR) and the County on January 31 so CFAR could make a presentation to the County of their analysis of the design work done to date. Mr. Rayback of the County said the final plan will address most concerns. The County wants to present the plans to the community when they are 100 percent complete. They are 70 percent complete now. When the plans are 100 percent complete, they will give us and CFAR the plans prior to the meeting and present the plans at the RCPG meeting. We will have 30 days to review. The community will have time to analyze the plans. The County will also come up to discuss the plans at the second meeting.

Mr. Cooper was recognized by the Chair from the floor. He asked that CFAR be given equal time to present their analysis. He suggested the plans be presented at the first meeting and handed out. At the second meeting, CFAR could give their analysis. At the third meeting, the RCPG could vote.

ITEM 14: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf