

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

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held December 5, 2013, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

ITEM 1: ROLL CALL (Piva, Chair)

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Torry Brean	Jim Cooper
	Matt Deskovick (Arr 7:30)	Scotty Ensign	Carl Hickman
	Eb Hogervorst	Kristi Mansolf	Donna Myers
	Jim Piva	Dennis Sprong	Paul Stykel
	Richard Tomlinson	Kevin Wallace	

Excused Absence: Barbara Jensen

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

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF 11-7-13

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING NOVEMBER 7, 2013.

Upon motion made by Donna Myers and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick and Barbara Jensen absent..

ITEM 4: Announcements and Correspondence Received

Ms. Mansolf announced County Parks (Item 6-F) could not make it and would be on the agenda for January 9.

ITEM 5: PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction that is not on posted agenda.

ITEM 6: ACTION ITEMS:

Mr. Sprong requested for Item 6-E to be heard first, before Item 6-A.

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 6-E TO ABOVE 6-A.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 12-1-0-0-2**, with Donna Myers voting no, and Matt Deskovick and Barbara Jensen absent.

6-E: Requested Zoning Change on Portion of Parcel from S88 Specific Plan Area Zoning to A70 Limited Agriculture Zoning – GP Update Cleanup to Match Zoning of the Area. APN 277-121-10-00, Corner Highland Valley and Rangeland. Request for recommendation from RCPG (Taken out of Order)

Kim Flinn, one of the property owners, said the land was zoned S88 Specific Plan Area, but the Specific Plan was never put into place. The residents in the area want the zoning of their parcels to match the zoning of the area, which is A70 Limited Agriculture Zoning. The County said it is doable due to the surrounding parcels being A70 Limited Agriculture Zoning.

Mr. Tomlinson asked if all affected property owners are in favor of the change?

Ms. Flinn said that through the email chain between the residents and County staff, there is evidence that all affected property owners are aware of and in favor of the change.

Mr. Tomlinson noted that the letter from the County regarding the change request is addressed to all affected property owners.

Ms. Mansolf said the County supports the change to A70 and will process it as a cleanup item since most of the properties in the area are A70.

Speaker: Beth Edwards, Ramona Resident

Ms. Edwards supports 10 acre farms and farms in Ramona. The property owners in the area are currently farming the land.

The Chair said he has been out to this area. Cattle are grazing and crops are growing, including grapes.

Carolyn Harris filled out a speaker slip but did not wish to speak. She supports the proposed change and is available to answer questions.

MOTION: TO APPROVE CHANGING ZONING FROM S88, SPECIFIC PLAN AREA ZONING, TO A70, LIMITED AGRICULTURE ZONING, AS A GP UPDATE CLEANUP ITEM.

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

6-A: Informational Presentation by Caltrans on the Median Barrier Corridor Study SR-67 Proposal, Willow Rd to Shady Oaks. In Community Outreach Stage for EIR. Information available at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/Env_docs/67FeasabilityStudy/index.html

Richard Estrada, Project Manager, presented the project. Johan Pulgarin, Project Engineer, was also in attendance. Mr. Estrada said there are 4 alternatives for the project. For Alternative #1, where the highway is 3 and 4 lanes, 1 lane will be removed and a median barrier will be placed in the lane width and an inside shoulder will be included along the median barrier. Alternative #2 would place a median barrier on the existing center line with no inside shoulder, and Alternative #3 will be similar to Alternative #1, except there will only a painted median barrier separating lanes of traffic. There will be designated openings to allow emergency vehicles access and certain driveways/roadways will have openings. Caltrans is aware of potential delays for emergency responders should a median barrier be installed. Caltrans has meet with emergency responders at CAL FIRE/Ramona Fire Department to get their input. Alternative #4 is a no build alternative.

Caltrans is currently writing the project report and also the project EIR. They realize there will be some challenges for the community and for wildlife should a median barrier be installed. There have been concerns expressed by members of the community that Alternative #1 will reduce road capacity. A concrete barrier and a cable barrier design are being considered. The cable barrier will have some advantages over the concrete barrier. There will be better visibility and drainage flow will not have to be adjusted. It is better from a building perspective, however, there will be more challenges to people who have to maintain the cable barrier. The concrete barrier will be more challenging as drainage will need to be added. Some driveways/private roadways will be closed off from making a left turn onto Highway 67 with either median barrier option. These residents will have to turn right and then make a turn further down the road to go back to their intended direction of travel. They will also have to go further down the highway and turn around to access their driveway/private roadway. Adequate space will be allowed so motorists can see around the barrier.

Mr. Estrada and Mr. Pulgarin will return to the RCPG in the spring with the project report and EIR and look for formal comments. Right now they are doing a traffic study. Highway 67 in Ramona is very unique as it is a state highway with many driveways/private roadways taking access off of it.

Mr. Tomlinson said that cable barriers are used across the country.

Mr. Hogervorst said he feels the concrete barrier along the center line of the road going to Valley Center is the safest design.

Mr. Stykel said he is not in favor of taking out a lane. What happens when a car hits the cable barrier?

Mr. Estrada said there are 2 designs for the cable barrier – 1 is 3 cable and 1 is 4 cable. Cable barriers give and deflect.

Mr. Hickman asked how much of Ramona will be impacted by the project? He has a problem discussing the project without know what our purview is, the goal of the project and a specific project direction.

Mr. Estrada said the goal of the project is to reduce the number and severity of all collisions with the project footprint.

Ms. Mansolf said the project boundary for Ramona starts at the Poway City Limit line, just south of Cloudy Moon Drive.

Mr. Hickman asked what the number of collisions are – what type, where and how many – so we can better make a decision? No data has been presented.

Mr. Cooper said cable barriers have been used successfully in Australia. They are the least costly to repair but they are dangerous for motorcycles to hit.

Mr. Sprong said he was originally behind the median barrier concept for Highway 67 to reduce collisions. After meeting with public safety officials, he learned it is hard to access accidents. Sometimes they have to approach the accident from the other side and close the road. He also learned that accidents increase with the addition of a median barrier. There will be gore points. At the meeting there was also discussion of a new road surfacing material that would make the road less slippery when wet. He would like to see the high friction surface added to each alternative.

Mr. Estrada said Caltrans is considering putting a high friction surface on the highway. People will stop faster when the road is wet and there will be less chance for their brakes to lock.

Mr. Stykel asked Mr. Estrada what Caltrans is looking for from the RCPG on this project? None of the RCPG has the knowledge to fully evaluate the project.

The Chair said Caltrans is educating us on options. One is a no build option. Residents will be affected in the stretch of highway if a median barrier is placed there. More problems can be created with a median barrier. There is a balance here. We have a responsibility to 50,000 residents.

Ms. Mansolf said that everyone in Ramona passes through this stretch of the corridor just as they do the Highland Valley/Dye/Highway 67 intersection. Everyone using this stretch of road could be impacted from a median barrier. She said that until the EIR and project report come out, we can become aware of the access points along the highway, the side friction caused by the access points and consider the potential impacts caused by each alternative if there is an accident and there is the need for emergency response. We can also try to envision impacts to residents whose driveways/private roadways are closed off and how this will impact traffic flow.

Speaker: Angus Tobiason, Ramona Resident

Mr. Tobiason said he is concerned with fire department access and also for drainage. What changes will need to be done so there will be adequate drainage along a median barrier? Why doesn't Caltrans add more lanes to the highway?

Mr. Estrada said that drainage will need to be redone if a concrete median barrier is selected. The project is a SHOPP fund safety project. The capacity of the road cannot be increased with the use of SHOPP funds.

Mr. Estrada said Caltrans is trying to connect with communities along the highway to learn and discuss residents' concerns. There was a recent meeting with the Rockhouse Road community regarding the project.

Ms. Mansolf said over 20 people attended the meeting. She said the current project document cannot be accessed on the Caltrans website and could they send the RCPG a hard copy to circulate among the group?

Mr. Pulgarin will look into sending out a copy of the current project document. The RCPG will also be informed when the EIR becomes available for public review.

6-B: Multi-Family Project Proposal on 16th St, Informational Presentation, by Casey Malone of Lansing Companies. Approximately 60 units on 2.5 Acres, Zoned RU, General Plan Designation VR-24

Casey Malone of Lansing Companies presented the project. The site is zoned for 24 dwelling units per acre and they would like to put 60 apartments on the site. Mr. Malone presented exhibits and drawings of the proposal.

The project architect said they would like to create apartments using a California courtyard concept with a recreation area in the center of the project that includes a pool and a tot lot. They want to create separation and also a sense of community within the complex.

Speaker: Chris Anderson, Ramona Resident

Ms. Anderson is against the project. She is on the Design Review Board but is speaking as an individual. The project applicant also gave a presentation to the Design Review Board. The project applicant was unaware the Ramona Community Plan has a 7.3 dwelling unit per acre density cap unless the housing is designated senior housing or affordable housing. There are also vernal pool issues that go with this parcel. At the Design Review Board meeting the applicants said they wanted some of the buildings to be 3 story. To do this they would have to get a Major Use Permit. There is only 1, 3 story building in Ramona and it shouldn't have gone through. The height limit allows 2 story buildings in Ramona.

The architect said 3 story is limited in the project.

Ms. Mansolf has been in contact with the County Zoning Counter about the project, and per RCPG Policy LU 2.1.7, there is a limit for residential development in the Ramona Town Center to 7.3 dwelling units per acre unless it is developed pursuant to the Ramona Village Plan or a deed restricted senior or affordable housing project. He did not know if the parcel was included in the proposed Ramona Village Plan, which has not been adopted yet. Ms. Mansolf asked the Ramona Village Design representatives on the RCPG if they knew if the parcel were included in the Ramona Village Design Plan area?

Both Mr. Brean and Mr. Stykel didn't think the line extended this far from Main Street. Mr. Brean did not think density was a factor of the Village Design Plan. He said that certain parcels are allowed 3 story in the Village Design Plan, but this parcel is not one of them.

Ms. Myers said the project is too dense and too tall. The land on the parcel is damp.

Ms. Mansolf said to her knowledge the fire department does not have the apparatus to access 3 story buildings.

Mr. Brean said he liked some of the project elements.

Mr. Stykel said he had concerns with the density and height of the project.

The Chair said the applicant should be aware of the limitations of the Ramona Community Plan for multi family housing and take this into consideration when redesigning the project.

6-C: Informational Presentation by SDG&E on Proposal that Would Result in the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of a Photovoltaic (PV) Solar Facility on SDG&E Land near an Existing Substation on Creelman. To Be Connected to the Local Electrical Distribution Grid. Overall Production Capacity Expected to Serve Approximately 1000 Households

Ian Stewart, Regional Public Affairs External Relations, of SDG&E, said the utility plans to build a solar facility to tie into the distribution system.

Mr. Stewart introduced Joe, Frani, the project manager, who said they are using local engineering resources for the work. They started with identifying 8 potential projects. Studies were done and sites eliminated. The parcel is 37 acres and the project area is a little over 15 acres. They will be producing 5 MW DC and 4 MW AC. The panels will be poly crystalline that will be set to a fixed tilt.

RCPG Minutes 12-5-13

Linda Miller of Independent Energy Solutions, a firm in Vista will be working on the project. Ms. Miller said her firm has mostly worked in third world countries and she looks forward to working on a project locally.

Jay Miller, project manager at Independent Energy Solutions, said they will submit for the Major Use Permit in January. They will try to mitigate aesthetics with fencing plus landscaping.

Speaker: Pan Ayers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Ayers said the project will be in her front yard. Her house is one of the houses above the project, so she will be looking down on it. She has seen the project on Warnock and feels there will be substantial visual impacts. There is also a dirt road issue. Ashley is 1 lane. Ms. Ayers showed a photo of dust in the area caused by a motorcycle. She said the impacts from dust from the solar project construction will be significant. She wants Creelman paved from San Vicente to the transfer station. The road goes on private property. If a neighbor puts up a fence, she will be landlocked as her road is in the wrong place.

Speaker: Bob Romeo, Ramona Resident

Mr. Romeo said SDG&E did a 64 KV project that involved poles. The project was never completely finished as poles have been stored on Ashley for over 2 years. There were cable/phone issues that were never resolved. The road should have been paved when the substation was put in. The project construction on Warnock generates 50 to 60 vehicle trips per day. The road needs to be paved and maintained.

Speaker: Jim Tate, Ramona Resident

Mr. Tate said that if there were high density development on Creelman, the area would be extremely dusty. Dust is certainly a problem now with low density and minimal traffic, and construction will create constant dust.

Speaker: Vicky Tate, Ramona Resident

Ms. Tate said that since the idea came up to put the solar project on Creelman, property values have gone down in a range from \$1,000 to \$40,000. Horse owners also use the dirt road. If the road is paved, a horse trail should be made next to the road. The drainage of the parcel will be a problem. SDG&E got the property through condemnation in 1969. SDG&E has not been good neighbors. They haven't worked with the homeowners and have gone behind their backs.

Speaker: Michelle Mixon, Ramona Resident

Ms. Mixon said that at 7:01 a.m. she can hear the trucks backing up on Warnock, working on the solar project. She can see the reflection from the Warnock site from her property.

Diane Chapman did not wish to speak but wanted to register opposition to the project.

The Chair said there are lessons learned from the Sol Orchard project. The RCPG fought for it not to go in at the Warnock location.

RCPG Minutes 12-5-13

Mr. Deskovick said he felt discussing the project is a waste of time as the County doesn't care what we think.

The Chair said we can talk about mitigation. This is our chance to talk about what we want to see.

Mr. Cooper said the mitigation opportunity should not be lost. The neighbors have a good point regarding the road and dust.

Mr. Anderson said the poles were set before the project proponents came to us. The road is misaligned. He has been here 39 years and doesn't know how it got that way. He thinks the project will be rubber stamped with an approval. We should try to get the road fixed. Panels don't work with dust. San Vicente to Keyes should be paved.

Mr. Ensign and Ms. Mansolf met with SDG&E representatives prior to the RCPG meeting and Mr. Ensign brought up the road. He asked if there is an accident report for the road? With the project a stop sign may need to be put in as visibility may be affected.

Mr. Tomlinson asked about the fixed tilt of the panels – will there be any reflection?

Mr. Frani said the fixed tilt will be 20 percent. There will be 9 percent on some of the solar panels and 4 percent on the lower solar panels.

Ms. Myers asked if there is a comprehensive renewable energy plan in place yet?

Mr. Stewart said the Board of Supervisors discussed coming up with a comprehensive renewable plan and set the wheels in motion. It will be about 12 to 18 months before something will come back to the Board.

Ms. Myers said on the Sol Orchard project on Warnock, the neighbors were told the workers would only be working an 8 hour day – yet they have been working an 11 hour day. They have been working 6 days a week rather than 5. Nothing that was promised has happened. The fencing was done by a company out of Los Angeles, and the cattle got out onto the road. She suggested getting everything in writing.

Mr. Hickman said there is no need to sell technology. He asked SDG&E to be a good neighbor and take care of the residents. Mr. Hickman asked what the benefit is for Ramona?

Mr. Stewart said there is an obvious societal benefit. He is hearing that the project is not wanted in Ramona. He is disturbed to hear that SDG&E is not being a good neighbor. He doesn't know anything about the abandoned poles. Mr. Stewart said the renewable energy goal is 33 percent by 2020. Consideration is being given to raise the percentage in 2014.

Mr. Sprong asked about other solar projects in San Diego County rural areas?

Mr. Stewart said 1 will be proposed for Pala and 1 for Valley Center.

Mr. Wallace asked if the State reaches its 33 percent mandate, will residents get paid back? Will people get cast off?

Mr. Stewart said there is no comparison between industrial and residential solar. Currently there is no longer a cap but there is protection in place for solar customers.

The Chair said the neighbors want mitigation for the project. This will be our second sizeable solar complex in Ramona. How many solar projects are going into other areas? It should be going into Rancho Santa Fe and El Cajon, etc.

Mr. Stewart said a solar project is going in La Jolla on roofs. Carlsbad doesn't have solar but they have the Encina power facility. It will be shut down in 2017 but then something else similar will go in.

The Chair said it is obvious that people don't want solar projects in densely populated areas. He is not happy with Ramona getting all of the solar projects. SDG&E has funds and they can mitigate.

Mr. Stewart said SDG&E is separate from Sempra. If they want to pave the road, they have to ask Sempra. The cost will shift to the ratepayers. The CPUC will say no.

6-D: RCPG to Consider Funding for Highland Valley/Dye Rd/Hwy 67 Intersection. To Be Considered is Delaying Ramona St. Ext. Funding for 4 Years and Dye Rd. Ext. Funding for 1 Year – If These Adjustments are Made, Funding the Intersection will be Possible. Other Funding Options May Be Considered.

Terry Rayback, County CIP Development, Program Manager, said funding is being sought for the Highland Valley/Dye/SR-67 intersection, which is a Caltrans facility. The County needs input on whether or not we want to front the project using TransNet funds now by moving the funds from County road projects. Caltrans will pay back the money in the future. The TransNet funds are administered through the County Board of Supervisors. If front-funded, the County would make sure it gets paid back. This would mean there would be no work done on the Dye Road Extension for 1 year and on the Ramona Street Extension for 4 years. Right now all TransNet funds are allocated, so they are asking for input and feedback on this exchange of funding. Should the RCPG vote to make the change, then the item would go to the Board of Supervisors for a vote. Caltrans and SANDAG would also have to agree to the change.

Speaker: Shelly Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers reminded the RCPG members that they are voted onto the RCPG and are Ramona's community representatives. She asked the RCPG to ask Caltrans and SANDAG to move funds over to improve the highway intersection before working on the Dye Road Extension and the Ramona Street Extension. This intersection is a source of heavy traffic and it is getting worse as each year goes by. Improving the flow of traffic at this intersection would be a huge benefit to the many residents of Ramona as well as to the visitors in our town.

Speaker: Joe Minervini, Ramona Resident

Mr. Minervini said the Dye Road Extension is not needed. This project will cost \$15 million and the intersection improvements will cost \$10 to \$11 million. The intersection improvements will serve everyone and will give more bang for the buck.

Speaker: Patricia Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Ms. Brennecke asked the RCPG to support moving the money from the County Road projects to the intersection improvement project. There are numerous problems identified for the Ramona Street Extension, such as wells impacted and eminent domain. A workable plan within a reasonable

budget has not been produced. This is a great opportunity to move funds that are sitting around for the benefit of a few people in Ramona while awaiting for a workable plan for the proposed Ramona Street Extension. The intersection improvements are needed more urgently and the money will be well utilized.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke said the Citizens for a Rural Ramona (CFARR) has long opposed the proposed Dye Road Extension and the proposed Ramona Street Extension and favors the postponement of these projects to provide funds for the more timely development of relief from the most important choke point in Ramona (affecting everyone) – the Highway 67/Highland Valley/Dye intersection.

Speaker: Diane Chapman, Ramona Resident

Ms. Chapman asked the RCPG to rethink the projects and to shift funds to the intersection improvements.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers said she is recusing herself from the vote on this item. The Ramona Street Extension project is 1/3 of a mile long. It is expensive and serves a small part of the population. For the Dye Road Extension, the Army Corps of Engineer wants 3 new bridges over the floodplain. She encouraged the RCPG to vote to transfer the funds to the intersection improvements to help the residents of Ramona.

Speaker: Angus Tobiason, Ramona Resident

Mr. Tobiason said putting the funds toward the intersection improvements is a good suggestion.

Ray Hood, Michelle Mixon, Carmen LaBelle and Jerry Myers, all Ramona residents, did not wish to speak but wanted to support the change in funding to fund the intersection first before the 2 County road projects.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE DELAY OF FUNDING FOR RAMONA STREET COMPLETION FOR 4 YEARS AND DYE ROAD EXTENSION FOR 1 YEAR WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THOSE FUNDS ARE TO BE UTILIZED FOR PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HIGHLAND VALLEY ROAD/DYE ROAD/SR-67 INTERSECTION. DELAY OF THE 2 REFERENCED PROJECTS COULD BE MINIMIZED IF ALTERNATE FUNDING SOURCES BECOME AVAILABLE.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Barbara Jensen absent.

(Mr. Brean and Mr. Anderson left after the vote.)

6-E: Requested Zoning Change on Portion of Parcel from S88 Specific Plan Area Zoning to A70 Limited Agriculture Zoning – GP Update Cleanup to Match Zoning of the Area. APN 277-121-10-00, Corner Highland Valley and Rangeland. Request for recommendation from RCPG (Taken out of Order after Item 6)

- 6-F: Informational Presentation by Bill Saumier and Sean O’Neill, County Parks And Recreation Department, on 1). Upcoming changes to the Parks and Recreation fee ranges, and 2). Parks and Recreation building and facility naming rights. Item to go before the Board of Supervisors in January or February 2014 – Canceled for December 5, 2013 –Rescheduled for January 9, 2014**

ITEM 7: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)

- 7-A: Santa Maria Creek Cleanup Update (Taken out of Order after Item 7-C-3)**
- 7-B: Scoping Letter from County on Wood Pole to Steel Pole Project TL 637 on Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration**

The scoping letter from the County on the Wood Pole to Steel Pole Project, TL 637 on Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, was sent to all RCPG members via email.

7-C: Subcommittee Reports (Possible Action)

- 7-C-1: Parks and Recreation Subcommittee Meeting Business – Update on Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Priority List Submitted August 2013
*Parks and Recreation Meeting Canceled***

Mr. Cooper said that although there was no Parks and Recreation Subcommittee meeting, projects are still moving forward through the process. Regarding the RHS Softball project, \$50,000 of non-PLDO funds are needed before the project can move forward through the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee and the RCPG and into the County for review, acceptance and action.

7-C-2: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Cooper) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Mr. Cooper reported that there are 2 vacancies of the Design Review Board. People interested in serving on the committee should plan to attend the December 19, 2013, meeting.

Mr. Cooper reported the County responded to the letter of concerns sent to them on the Design Review Checklist. Some additional work will be needed before publication.

7-C-3: VILLAGE DESIGN COMMITTEE REPORT (Brean, Stykel)

A meeting was held, but no one from the RCPG was able to attend. It was reported after the meeting that forward progress is still being made and outstanding issues continue to be worked through. A concern has been raised regarding enforcement. As County standards, they should receive the fullest County attention. Further discussions will be included in the next meeting.

7-A: Santa Maria Creek Cleanup Update (Taken out of Order)

Speaker: Angus Tobiason, Ramona Resident

Mr. Tobiason said he talked to the U. S. Geological survey about the Santa Maria Creek. They gave him maps showing peak flow, stream flow statistics for the 100 year flood for the 7th Street watershed and the 13th Street watershed, which shows the Santa Maria Creek has the potential to have a substantial flow when it rains during a 100 year flood event.

7-C-4: Clarification on Design Review Board Reference in RCPG Standing Rules

In the RCPG Standing Rules the Design Review Board has been shown historically as a subcommittee of the RCPG, although they are a stand alone committee. Mr. Cooper presented the following language to go under Item 2-B-6-e (Agenda Section) of the RCPG Standing Rules in place of the language that is there now:

The Ramona Design Review Board is a separate entity established in 1989 under Article XXII Department of Planning and Development Services, Section 396.10. Community Design Review Boards. Membership shall consist of "...at least one representative of the Community or sponsor group whenever the area of jurisdiction is represented by such group." This representation requirement appears to support the beneficial opportunities of sharing information regarding various projects being developed within the greater Ramona Community. As such, this position requires the nomination of the Chair and approval by a majority of the Planning Group.

MOTION: TO REPLACE ITEM 2-B-6-e OF THE RCPG STANDING RULES WITH THE NEW LANGUAGE AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Jim Cooper and seconded by Richard Tomlinson, the motion **passed 11-0-1-0-3**, with Dennis Sprong abstaining, and Chad Anderson, Torry Brean and Barbara Jensen absent.

7-C-5: Report on Bee Ordinance Meeting 12-4-13

Ms. Mansolf attended the meeting on the Bee Ordinance at the County. The Bee Ordinance will be updated with the intent of the County being more ag friendly. Currently the distances from bee keeping facilities to neighboring residences is far greater in the County than in other jurisdictions who have recently updated their Bee Ordinance, such as the City of San Diego. There are several issues involved with bee keeping that people should be aware of as the ordinance moves forward and the issue of domestic bee keeping should be kept separate from the issue of wild bees. Ms. Mansolf will send out the information she is able to obtain from the Agriculture, Weights and Measures Department to RCPG members as it becomes available.

7-D: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

7-D-1: Concerns from Members – None

7-D-2: Future Agenda Item Requests

Ms. Mansolf asked to put on the next agenda, the addition of “approval of the order of the agenda” as an agenda item. Ms. Mansolf also requested to add discussion of Jeanine Hawkins Property Specific Request for her property to the January agenda. Ms. Hawkins made a presentation on a non-agenda item at the meeting November 7, 2013, on this issue. The RCPG had supported her request for RL 40 but the County did not approve it.

Mr. Cooper said we must check with the County on the “approval of the order of the agenda” item before we start using it on our agendas again.

7-D-3: Addition of New Subcommittee Members

Mr. Hickman said there were 2 openings on the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee to replace Michele Morton and Angus Tobiason. He had a meeting of the subcommittee to give the opportunity to members of the community interested in serving to address the board and share why they wanted to serve on the board. Four candidates gave presentations: Jim Cooper, Bob Hailey, Kevin Wallace and David Stone. The board voted to have Jim Cooper and Bob Hailey fill the 2 vacancies on the subcommittee.

MOTION: TO APPROVE JIM COOPER AND BOB HAILEY AS MEMBERS OF THE TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Donna Myers, the motion **failed 7-1-4-0-3**, with Richard Tomlinson voting no; Jim Cooper, Matt Deskovick, Kristi Mansolf and Kevin Wallace abstaining; and Chad Anderson, Torry Brean and Barbara Jensen absent. Mr. Cooper changed his vote from 'abstaining' to 'yes,' and the motion **passed 8-1-3-0-3**, with Richard Tomlinson voting no; Matt Deskovick, Kristi Mansolf and Kevin Wallace abstaining; and Chad Anderson, Torry Brean and Barbara Jensen absent.

7-E: Meeting Updates

7-E-1: Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Meetings

Ms. Mansolf said the Oak Tree Ranch trailer park, condo conversion project, is going to the Planning Commission December 13, 2013, with a recommendation of denial. They came to the RCPG with the project, and we supported it. The reason for denial is they have not completed the CEQA Initial Study, as required.

7-E-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 1-9-14 at the Ramona Community Center, 7 p.m.

ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf