

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

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held November 1, 2012, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

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

Absent: Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst

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 Eb Hogervorst had excused absences.

ITEM 5: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)

Ms. Mansolf announced the County is considering having an ordinance for converting existing billboards in the unincorporated area to LED digital billboards. A meeting will be held in the near future to get input from community planning and sponsor groups.

ITEM 6: FORMATION OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Brean requested to bring the Roe Recycling Minor Use permit to the Consent Calendar. CUDA reviewed the project and felt the proposal was suitable for the area.

Mr. Hickman said there were no issues from the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee.

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 12-E-1, THE ROE RECYCLING MINOR USE PERMIT, TO THE CONSENT AGENDA, AND TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Upon motion made by Chad Anderson and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-2**, with Angus Tobiason abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA – *No Motion Brought Forward*

ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 10-4-12 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2012.

Upon motion made by Paul Stykel and seconded by Richard Tomlinson, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-3**, with Chris Anderson abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized) – None

ITEM 10: Stephanie Gaines, Update on Clean Water Requirements – Presentation on NPDES Stormwater Reissuance Process and Total Maximum Daily Load Plan for Bacteria (Discussion and Possible Action)

Ms. Gaines, of the County DPW Watershed Protection Program, made a presentation to the RCPG in January, 2009, to let us know of upcoming changes in water regulations. At that time the new additions to the law included a Low Impact Development (LID) approach to development that helps controls stormwater and protects watersheds. New changes are again being proposed to water regulations at the Federal level. These regulations filter down to State and County governments and become part of the County regulations.

The County feels the new permit, which is a draft to an administrative draft, is a departure from the current permit and adds a lot of modifications. One modification is the Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirement. There is no guarantee targets can be reached, and it would cost billions to implement region wide. The County does not want to see this requirement included in the final permit as they feel it is unreasonable. Another development constraint is hydromodification, or how upstream developments affect development downstream. Pre-development will have to be estimated. A 5-year study is being conducted, and they are in year 2 of the study. There is also liability exposure to third parties should hydromodification be included in the permit.

On September 26, this item was brought before the Board of Supervisors. The Board approved a call to action and the County is making presentations to communities. Comments are due back to the Board on January 11, 2013.

Ms. Anderson asked if this was coming from State or Federal level?

Ms. Gaines said it started at the Federal level, then it goes to the State. It is a regulatory framework. The Regional Board has the power to write the permit.

Mr. Wallace asked who determined we need this level of permit?

Ms. Gaines said only the board who created these regulations could answer that question.

Mr. Sprong asked about the impact of farming?

Ms. Gaines said that the County currently inspects commercial operations. Mostly they educate people on best management practices when they see a problem. If the new laws go into effect, they will have to do enforcement when they see a problem.

MOTION: THE RCPG TO PEN A LETTER IN OPPOSITION OF THE UNREASONABLE REGULATIONS BEING PROPOSED BY THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 13-0-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

ITEM 11: Emergency Evacuation Route Update – Tour To Be 11-1-12, 10:30 a.m., at Montecito Way Just North of El Paso

Speaker: Rick Morgal, Ramona Resident

Mr. Morgal supports the means to evacuate, but he doesn't support the lights being on in the Ramona Grasslands every night. He also is concerned there will be an impact from signs. If switch circuitry is used, lights may stay on. He would like the Ramona Grasslands to be dark at night. Headlights will light the way if there is an evacuation and the route is used at night. There is no guarantee that SDG&E won't turn off the power if there are winds of over 55 mph, so they may not be on during a fire anyway

Speaker: Mischa Dobrotin, Ramona Resident

Mr. Dobrotin said it was commendable to have an alternative route to be used during an evacuation, although it is a circuitous route. Maybe other potential evacuation routes in Ramona can be identified.

Speaker: Jack Brandon, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brandon lives in the San Diego Country Estates. He got caught near the edge of Ramona on Warnock Drive during the 2007 fires. There was a very bright glow on the hillside as the fire moved forward, and traffic wasn't moving. He thought the evacuation route is a good idea.

Speaker: Kit Kesinger, Ramona Resident

Mr. Kesinger said that anything we can do will help in an evacuation. Ramona Patch brought attention to the lighting proposed in the Ramona Grasslands. The route may be used once in a lifetime. It doesn't make sense to have the lights on all the time. He doesn't think lights belong in that part of town. He is in favor of the evacuation route, but not in favor of the lighting.

Speaker: Vivian Osborn, Ramona Resident

Ms. Osborn said she agrees with the statements on lighting. If an evacuation is in effect, she said there should be guardrails on both sides of the road. The headlights will be on, and people will be following other cars with their lights on. Is there a gate at both ends? Who will open the gate? The route is only be 12 feet wide. This is one lane which will be blocked if someone breaks down. A bottleneck will be hit on Archie Moore by Mt. Woodson. Ms. Osborn said we should protect the Ramona people who are here.

Speaker: Regina Wilson, Ramona Resident

Ms. Wilson agrees with the comments already stated.

Speaker: Fred Sproul, Ramona Resident

Mr. Sproul went to look out over Rangeland Road before the meeting, at the area where the emergency evacuation route is proposed. Mr. Sproul advises the Federal government on projects. The area where the route is to go is part of the Ramona Grasslands. He is concerned the lights will create a gauntlet. He has evacuated 4 times. He doesn't think lighting is wise in the Ramona Grasslands. If lighting is to be considered, an Environmental Impact Statement will be required.

Speaker: Carol Angus, Ramona Resident

Ms. Angus said there are 92 parcels in Highland Hills. When she evacuated in 2007, there was not a lot of traffic, but it was very smoky – like fog. It was very hard to see through. She is concerned that the emergency evacuation route comes out at the Highland Hills Estates gate. How will Highland Hills' residents get out if there is a big line there? She asked that there be traffic control at the gate if there is an evacuation and the route is used. She was very prepared in the 2007 fires, but lost her house anyway. They had 2, 6,000 gallon gravity flow tanks, and another 15,000 gallon tank for water. Ahead of the fire, the oxygen is sucked off. Ms. Angus asked people to please evacuate early if there is a fire.

The Chair said the idea of lighting the end of the evacuation route came out of meetings. Maybe it won't be necessary. SDG&E had said they would put 3 low wattage amber lightbulbs, turned down along Rangeland Road going east. One would be at the intersection, one would be halfway down to the evacuation route, and the third would be where the gate connects to the road. There have also been discussions on having delineators and reflectors. All we want is agreement to establish a route. We are down to the final stage. It will be implemented through experts. Nothing will be done to jeopardize the Ramona Grasslands. The Chair asked for the people in the audience who spoke to show up at the RMWD meeting to support the emergency evacuation route. It will be the first new evacuation route established. Lights don't have to be used. Reflectors can be worked out. If the route is not safe, it won't be used.

Mr. Brean wanted to make a motion regarding the lighting, however, the item was not on the agenda as an action item. Mr. Brean requested putting the item on the agenda for the next meeting, December 6, 2012, as an action item.

ITEM 12: Subcommittee Reports

12-A: SOUTH (Hailey)(No Business)

12-B: WEST (Mansolf) (Action Item)

12-B-1: P08-017, Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church, Corner of Hwy 67 and Highland Valley Rd. Four Primary New Structures Proposed for Permanent Campus: Sanctuary (5745 s f); Fellowship Hall (5,500 s f); Administration/Classroom Buildings (3,700 s f); and a Maintenance Building (320 sf). Access to be Along the Vacated Portion of Highland Valley Rd. Future Sewer Service will be at Highland Valley Rd. Danskin, Representative (w/T&T)

Greg Danskin, project architect, was in attendance with some of the project team for the Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church. They started working on the project in 2002. They came to the RCPG in June, 2004, and in June, 2008, received approval of the conceptual plan at that time. The West Subcommittee approved the project at the meeting October 30, 2012, and the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee identified 2 issues at their meeting October 30, 2012 – the pathway and traffic

generated from the project. The general layout of the site is the same as in 2008. Parking has shifted to accommodate a landscape issue.

The Design Review Board (DRB) approved the overall design of the 2008 plan in concept. Originally when the DRB saw the project, they asked the applicant to solve the problem of people jumping to Highway 67 from the Old Highland Valley Road alignment. The old alignment has been vacated since. Landscaping and parking issues have also been solved.

They have worked with the County on their reports. They are adjacent to the Cumming Ranch and were originally going to have sewer. Now sewer is uncertain. There are groundwater issues on the site. A consultant, Barbara Bradley, was hired to design an alternative on-site wastewater treatment system. She designed the wastewater treatment system behind the new Hanson Lane school site on Boundary Avenue. It will all be on a subterranean drip. The grading changed some of the project. A lighting study was done. Additional right of way was purchased.

Ms. Bradley talked about the alternative on-site wastewater treatment system. A rigorous treatment process takes place before the wastewater is released. It will be disinfected and will go into the ground, subsurface to 12 inches. It will go into the native plants. The disposal area is large. There is a large safety factor at the site because of the shallowness of the soil.

Mr. Danskin said the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee wanted to details on the traffic study. There will be 168 weekday trips, with 673 trips on Sunday at the rate of 220 per hour. The subcommittee wanted to know details of the pathway. There will be a separation of split rail fencing between the pathway and the road. The pathway will be dg, 15 feet wide, 8 feet from the road. The applicant either has to build the pathway or provide for it being built. The pathway will connect to the pathway on the Cumming Ranch. If the Cumming Ranch project is ready first, they will build the pathway and do the work on the intersection. If the Cumming Ranch doesn't go in first, the Church will do the work.

Mr. Hickman said the County now wants rope between poles rather than split rail fencing along pathways.

Ms. Anderson asked about EDU's?

Ms. Bradley said that this depends on occupancy. There will be peak flow for Christmas and Easter. The wastewater treatment system can handle 1800 gallons per day (GPD). If the discharge goes over 1800 GPD, it will be stored.

Ms. Anderson said the Ramona Community Plan, LU 5.1.8, says package treatment plants are discouraged. This is the location to do a package treatment plant. What is being proposed is state of the art and works effectively.

Ms. Bradley said San Diego has strict rules for alternative on-site wastewater treatment systems. They are permitted by the State Water Resources Control Board and not through the County. There are a number of reasons there are strict septic regulations. San Diego is slowly catching up.

Speaker: Vivian Osborn, Ramona Resident

Ms. Osborn said the area is a wetland and won't perc. She is concerned with water saturation, sound and lighting. She asked that the project be reduced. She requested that the elevations be

RCPG Minutes 11-1-12

changed so that the mountains can be seen behind the Church. She asked if there would be a school with the project?

Pastor Dan Erlenbusch said there was not going to be a school or preschool as part of the project.

There was some discussion on the ballfield.

Ms. Bradley said the perc rate at the front of the project will be best – not on the ballfield. The polytube will be 12 inches down. It will save on water.

Mr. Danskin said the ballfield will be natural. There will be turf in the center.

Ms. Bradley said there would be native landscape in the front of the project.

Mr. Hickman said low traffic volumes do not require a full blown traffic analysis.

Mr. Danskin said the project will be contributing to the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program. Twice on Sunday there will be a surge of traffic.

Mr. Hickman asked what the TIF contribution would be for the project?

Mr. Danskin said he doesn't know the exact figure yet.

Mr. Ken Brazell said the TIF has been reduced, and it should drop from about \$8 thousand to \$5 thousand.

Mr. Ensign asked how long the tubing of the package treatment would last?

Ms. Bradley said the tubing is supposed to last for 20 years. It will not have septic water going through it. Parts will be maintained. An operations manual will be prepared. Permits can be revoked. There are areas that cannot be walked on. She recommends signage to identify these areas.

Mr. Tomlinson asked when services would be?

Pastor Erlenbusch said services are at 8:15 and 9:45 a.m.

Mr. Sprong asked if the Church is constructed before the Cumming Ranch – what more is required?

Mr. Danskin said the County needs to accept their studies and write conditions.

Mr. Snipes, civil engineer for the project, asked Mr. Brazell about final conditions?

Mr. Brazell said each project mitigates impacts. He is not familiar with the final conditions for the project. Which ever project goes first, Cumming Ranch or the Church will make the improvements.

Mr. Anderson said he would like to approve the project.

Ms. Anderson said the DRB did not review the project after the preliminary review. They did not go over signage or see the final plan. She can't imagine the project moving forward without the

approval of the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee or the DRB. The DRB had asked the applicant to come back with final plans. She asked the applicant to go back before the DRB?

MOTION TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Chad Anderson and seconded by Angus Tobiason, the motion **failed 7-5-1-0-2**, with Chris Anderson, Scotty Ensign, Carl Hickman, Kristi Mansolf and Paul Stykel voting no, Kevin Wallace abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

MOTION: THE PROPONENT COME BACK NEXT MONTH (DECEMBER 6, 2012) AFTER GOING TO THE TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE RAMONA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD; AND LIMIT DISCUSSION TO THESE 2 ITEMS ONLY.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Paul Stykel, the motion **passed 12-0-1-0-2**, with Kevin Wallace abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

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

12-D: PARKS (Tomlinson)(No Business)

12-E: CUDA (Brean)(Action Item)

12-E-1: ZAP 11-002, Minor Use Permit for Recycling Center, 1230 Olive St. Proposal to Develop Front One-Third of the Parcel with Addition of a Vehicle Scale and 160 s f Scale House. Addition of 5 Sea Cargo Containers, 2 Metal Awnings, a Rest Room (Trailer) and Office Trailer With a Raised Wood Deck and a Motorized Aluminum Can Bailer Ashley, Representative (w/T&T) – *Approved on Consent*

12-F: Transportation/Trails (Action Items)

12-F-1: ZAP 11-002, Minor Use Permit for Recycling Center, 1230 Olive St. Proposal to Develop Front One-Third of the Parcel with Addition of a Vehicle Scale and 160 s f Scale House. Addition of 5 Sea Cargo Containers, 2 Metal Awnings, a Rest Room (Trailer) and Office Trailer With a Raised Wood Deck and a Motorized Aluminum Can Bailer Ashley, Representative (w/CUDA) – *Approved on Consent*

12-F-2: P08-017, Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church, Corner of Hwy 67 and Highland Valley Rd. Four Primary New Structures Proposed for Permanent Campus: Sanctuary (5745 s f); Fellowship Hall (5,500 s f); Administration/Classroom Buildings (3,700 s f); and a Maintenance Building (320 sf). Access to be Along the Vacated Portion of Highland Valley Rd. Future Sewer Service will be at Highland Valley Rd. Danskin, Representative (w/West) – *See discussion under West Subcommittee, Item 12-B-1*

12-F-3: TM 5250R, Montecito Ranch Revised Map. Request to Modify the Conditions of Approval of 6 Road Segments as the Segments are not Needed for Project Mitigation and Will Not Have Level of Service Implications. Chris Brown, Dave Davis, Representatives

Ken Brazell, Project Manager of the DPW Land Use Development Division presented the proposal. The Montecito Ranch project was approved. After it was approved, it was discovered that there were discrepancies between the Executive Summary and the Traffic Impact Study. The Summary states that there would be direct traffic impacts to Montecito Way, Ash Street and Montecito Road and improvements would be required. The Traffic Impact Study states that there are no direct traffic impacts to these roads, so no mitigation is required. The developer was going above and beyond what was required to put in lavish improvements that would enhance the development. These are not required, and the developer is trying to make the project viable due to the current economic conditions. They are asking to delete some improvements. They still have to put in the critical intersection improvements.

Mr. Hickman brought up the traffic analysis. The counts for the project are from 2004. Montecito Road had 3,500 trips per day and Montecito Way had 600 trips per day. Forty three percent of the project is projected to use Montecito Way and thirty percent of the project is projected to use Ash Street. If left alone, by 2030, Montecito Way will be at 7,500 trips per day, Montecito Road will be at 7,800 trips per day, and Ash Street will be at 7,400 trips per day. He has gone on site and driven all the roads. He doesn't feel Montecito Way will be able to accommodate 7,500 cars in 2030 if left alone. He understands there are concerns from the residents with the County taking the right of way. He doesn't think they are cognizant there will be 2,500 trips per day on Montecito Way with the project. He thinks the number will be higher as more people will use Montecito Way to Montecito Road than Ash Street. If the developer doesn't make the road improvements, no other developer will be making the road improvements in the future.

Mr. Sprong asked Mr. Hickman how he concluded there would be 7,500 trips per day in 2030 if there will be 2,500 trips per day after the project?

Mr. Hickman said that the 2,500 figure is what is existing plus the project. There are approximately 10 ADT's per home in Ramona. The higher figure in 2030 is based on SANDAG models.

Mr. Brean said a lot of people are upset over the big subdivisions. If there will be a lot of traffic and no road improvements, the town will have more traffic problems.

Mr. Brown said what was proposed and approved was over what the County required.

Mr. Brazell said 2 firms said there are no direct impacts to some of the roads. Staff agrees with these conclusions. There are already some negative impacts to Montecito Way and Montecito Road and they thought it would be a good idea to improve them, but it is not required.

Mr. Brown said the project hasn't changed, and neither have the amenities. The intersection improvements are staying as approved. He has been out to the site and talked to people who would be affected by the roads getting wider because they have built into the right of way. It happens all of the time. One lady said to take the right of way from a neighbor.

Mr. Hickman said if the roads aren't widened, people won't be able to walk their dogs along the street or ride their bikes. They won't be able to get out of their driveways.

Mr. Brazell said experts accepted and approved the traffic studies. The General Plan has downzoned areas in the backcountry. There will be less density and fewer homes which will result in less traffic.

The Chair thanked Mr. Brazell for attending the meeting to explain the project changes to the RCPG. To recap – the developer was going above the project requirements. Now he is doing what he is required to do.

Mr. Hickman doesn't agree with the conclusions. He thinks it is possible they were made using models. This needs to be gone over road by road. He disagrees with the changes to Montecito Way.

Mr. Stykel said there is one property owner from El Paso to Montecito Road on Montecito Way. Sixty feet of right of way would be a condemnation for the property owner.

Mr. Brazell said that interim road standards could be used to put in the road and then it can be adjusted later. Interim improvements can be considered.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE LETTER FROM THE DEVELOPER AND PROPONENT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MONTECITO WAY. WE WOULD LIKE THEM TO GO WITH THE ORIGINAL VTM FROM THE ORIGINAL REPORT; AND CONSIDER, WITH CONSULTATION, MODIFICATIONS THAT WOULD MINIMIZE RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS.

Upon motion made by Carl Hickman and seconded by Bob Hailey, the motion **passed 9-2-2-0-2**, with Angus Tobiason and Kevin Wallace voting no, Paul Stykel and Richard Tomlinson abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

12-G: DESIGN REVIEW (Chris Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board – *No Report*

12-H: Village Design Committee Meeting Report (Brean, Stykel) – *Addressed under 13-C*

ITEM 13: OTHER BUSINESS (Chair) (Possible Action)

A. Consideration of Appealing Sol Orchard Project (Approved at Planning Commission 10-19-12)

Ms. Mansolf said the RCPG appeal was filed within the 10 day time limit after being approved by the Planning Commission. The project issues in the appeal are those that were discussed and voted on at past RCPG meetings. In order for the appeal to be official, the RCPG needs to vote to uphold the appeal. The Board of Supervisors will then have a new hearing on the project. The Citizens for a Rural Ramona also filed an appeal for the project, as did a Laborer's Union

Ms. Anderson noted that Kathy DaSilva filled out a speaker slip to register her position that she would like the board to file an appeal against the Sol Orchard project, but did not wish to speak.

MOTION: TO UPHOLD THE APPEAL OF THE DECISION TO APPROVE THE SOL ORCHARD MAJOR USE PERMIT, FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OCTOBER 19, 2012, TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 10-0-2-1-2**, with Chris Anderson and Angus Tobiason abstaining, Richard Tomlinson stepping down, and Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

B. Highland Valley/Dye/Hwy 67 Intersection, Request Update from Caltrans for Project Study Report

Mr. Hickman said enough time has passed since Caltrans first began working on the Project Study Report for the intersection for the RCPG to ask for an update.

MOTION: TO HAVE THE CHAIR WRITE A FORMAL LETTER TO CALTRANS ON THE PROJECT STUDY REPORT FOR THE HIGHLAND VALLEY/DYE/HIGHWAY 67 INTERSECTION.

Upon motion made by Carl Hickman and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

C. Consideration of When to Schedule Ramona Village Design Plan Review – Joint Meeting with Design Review Board and Ramona Village Design Committee

There has been discussion with committee chairs on having a joint meeting between the DRB, the Ramona Village Design Committee, and the RCPG at the beginning of the next RCPG meeting, December 6, 2012, to review the Ramona Village Design Plan – the Form Based Code for Ramona. Regular RCPG business would follow.

MOTION: TO HAVE A JOINT MEETING OF THE RCPG, RAMONA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND THE RAMONA VILLAGE DESIGN COMMITTEE ON DECEMBER 6, 2012, TO REVIEW THE RAMONA VILLAGE DESIGN PLAN.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick and Eb Hogervorst absent.

ITEM 14: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)
A. Concerns of Members

Mr. Brean presented a letter that he had written to Supervisor Jacob on behalf of the RCPG, that brings forward the concerns over the proposed solar project. After some discussion, Mr. Brean said he would make some revisions based on the input at the meeting, and have a revised letter at the next meeting. The item will be put on the next agenda.

B. Agenda Requests

Mr. Tomlinson asked that removing the fences along Ramona Street be placed on the next agenda for the December meeting.

ITEM 15: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf