

Minutes: Oct.17th, 2012 meeting of the  
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

**Agenda Item 1: - Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement**

Farrell called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm. Farrell read the advisory role statement. Present: Sandra Farrell (Chair), Gil Jemmott (Co-Vice Chair), Karen Binns (Co-Vice chair), Tom Kumura.

**Agenda Item 2: - Review of Minutes for Sept 19<sup>th</sup>**: Binns noted a misspelling of Mr. Hunsaker's name. Farrell said she would correct the error and moved for approval with Jemmott second. Motion passes 4-0-0

**Agenda Item 3: Public Forum:** No members of the public spoke.

**Agenda Item 4: Design Review Checklist Process (POD 11-005)** Farrell reported that she had talked to Marcus Lubich and he said there is no plan to include North County Metro as a community with design guidelines. Binns noted that Bonsall had design guidelines and they were part of North County Metro. Farrell wondered if because so much of the Twin Oaks community was in other cities sphere of influence if the County felt each City would determine the design of the areas in the Sphere of Influence. Farrell expressed concern that there is nothing in place to ensure designs are appropriate. She gave examples such as the mushroom farm that is a massive multi story building in a residential neighborhood. Also, Casa de Ampero with the long white wall that is an attractive to taggers and vandals. Susan Wait, a resident, said she felt design guidelines were needed and should be put in place before it was too late. She recommended seeing guidelines from other communities as examples. Mike Hunsaker, a resident, felt design guidelines could be oppressive for a small homeowner and felt there needed to be balance. Farrell said she would send Bonsall's Design Guidelines Checklist to Mike and Susan and asked Gil to talk to Margarete Morgan and get input. No Action taken.

**Agenda Item 5: Review Changes to Board Policies I-1 and I-1A:** Farrell asked if anyone had taken a look at the documents she had forwarded from the County. She said gave a brief overview and read off some of the options being considered. Jemmott read the comments submitted by the Boulevard Planning Group and overall the group and members of the public supported comments. Motion made by Farrell to support comments as outlined in the comment letter submitted by the Boulevard Planning Group with emphasis that it is important to allow the sponsor or planning group to comment in the capacity of a planning or sponsor group and not just a member of the public on projects outside their planning area if the project could impact the planning area and/or its residents, or impact an area that is unrepresented by a planning or sponsor group (like Lake San Marcos), or if residents of an unrepresented area of the unincorporated area have requested representation by a planning or sponsor group. Kumura seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0

**Agenda Item 6: Change in County regulations on notification:** Concern was expressed by both members of the Sponsor Group and residents that one notification on a proposed project would be the only notification the public would get. If a number of years have elapsed since the original notification, property owners living adjacent to the project who had recently moved into the area and didn't know of the project, would not have the ability to participate in the public

process and submit comments. Farrell read a comment letter submitted to Director Mark Wardlaw by the Jamul Dulzura planning group. There was strong support for re-notification if more than 24 months have elapsed since the original notice. Jemmott moved to support comments and position taken by the Dulzura planning group. Farrell seconded and motion passed 4-0-0

**Agenda Item 7: Old Business:**

- **Water Treatment Facility update:** Kumura provided an update to the Desalinization treatment plant and its link to the water treatment plant in Twin Oaks that was previously heard a few months ago. He said he had attended the October 10<sup>th</sup> public meeting and they took comments. He said people raised concerns over the cost. Although the water gained through this desal. project would be just 7% of the total water coming in to the area it is priced much higher than other methods such as recycling and conservation. Also of concern was the energy needed for the desal process is very intensive and the costs may not have been fully incorporated. . Mike Hunsaker said they are using an inefficient process, reverse osmosis instead flash evaporation and that 30% of water used for power generation is used for cooling and so the waste heat can be used for flash evaporation type desalination. He felt the system they are using is much less efficient and much more costly to do. He thought a flash evap system and built the plant next to San Onofre where the amount of waste heated water would have been a less costly solution. Kumura said the filters appeared to be the same technology that he saw used over twenty years ago.
- **SA1414 update:** Jemmott hadn't had time to address this item. No Action
- **Getting membership.** Stan Mathes said he was interested in joining the Sponsor Group. Farrell said she would find out what forms or format he would need to submit an application. No Action

**Agenda Item 8: Administration and correspondence:** Binns reported that the school would be closed so the Sponsor Group would not be able to use the room. Farrell asked if people could attend if the meeting was moved up a week because the County wanted to present changes to the Storm Water Ordinance which was an important to the community. Binns said she would check with the school to see if the room could be used on Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>. Due to people being out of town Farrell said they would not be able to have a meeting in December.

Meeting Adjourned. 9:00pm.

**Respectfully Submitted, Sandra Farrell, Acting Secretary**