

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

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held January 15, 2015, at 7:00 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

ITEM 1: ROLL CALL (Piva, Chair)

In Attendance:	Torry Brean	Jim Cooper	Scotty Ensign
	Barbara Jensen	Frank Lucio	Kristi Mansolf
	Donna Myers	Elio Noyas	Jim Piva
	David Ross	Dan Scherer	Paul Stykel
	Rick Terrazas	Richard Tomlinson	

Excused Absence: Eb Hogervorst

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

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: SEATING OF NEWLY ELECTED/APPOINTED RCPG MEMBERS

The Chair welcomed and swore-in all returning and newly elected RCPG members David Ross, Kristi Mansolf, Rick Terrazas, Frank Lucio, Scotty Ensign, Elio Noyas and Dan Scherer.

ITEM 4: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING 12-4-14.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2014, WITH THE CORRECTION BY SCOTTY ENSIGN ON PAGE 6, ITEM 9-C-1, DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REPORT – DARREL LARSEN IS RAMONA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD VICE CHAIR FOR 2015.

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Richard Tomlinson, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1**, with Eb Hogervorst absent.

ITEM 5: Announcements and Correspondence Received

ITEM 6: 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.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers discussed the importance of rotating the RCPG Chair and Vice Chair positions every year. She feels rotation of the Chair and Vice Chair assures equity, allowing more growth for individuals and the group as it expands roles and enhances the ability to exercise team capacity.

She has observed that the earliest speaker seems to exert the most influence and only about 30 percent of the members participate in the discussions. Each member speaks with an independent voice and many are receding into the woodwork. She values the opinion of each member and the

exchange of creative ideas. The RCPG is advisory to the County and we need to be pro-active for the residents of Ramona. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors may not be receptive to our ideas, so we need to speak with a strong voice.

Ms. Myers would like to see broader community representation on the subcommittees, regular meetings of the subcommittees on a monthly basis, and a less restrictive hand by the Chair regarding agendas. She asked that when she make nominations, RCPG members join her in supporting nominations to better serve the community.

Speaker: Mark Baker, Ramona Resident

Mark Baker spoke representing himself and his Ministry. He wants to continue the work he has been doing since the fires of 2007. His church was born from the fire. He has distributed 1.4 million pounds of food to Ramona residents in need. An economic situation has occurred that is straining his ability to feed the homeless in Ramona. He uses his own resources to continue his work when he is unable to get other funding. He is taking care of Veterans. The Ministry is his passion. He used to receive more funding per month to carry on his Ministry's work. Now he is only getting a fraction of what he once received. The County has changed the rules. His is the only church to take in people living on the street. Mr. Baker asked the RCPG to help him continue with his work in the community.

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action)

MOTION: TO SWITCH THE ORDER OF ITEMS 8-D AND 8-F.

Upon motion by Donna Myers and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Eb Hogervorst absent.

(Barbara Jensen left the meeting at 8 p.m.)

ITEM 8: ACTION ITEMS:

- 8-A: (Transportation/Trails Subcommittee Project) MUP 14-013 Major Use Permit for Photo Voltaic (PV) Solar Facility For SDG&E. 1049 Creelman Ln, Project to be on 17.5 acres and Provide 4 MW. Height of PV Modules to Range from 4 feet to 11.4 feet. D2 and Other Scenic Area Designators Apply. Consideration of Road Issues**

Ian Stewart, Regional Public Affairs Manager with SDG&E, said the project will contribute toward the State reaching its 30 percent renewable goal by the year 2020. The property is owned by SDG&E. The project will tie into the distribution lines. The project can't exceed certain funding limits set out by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

The project team has gone to the RCPG meeting twice before, the Design Review Board once, and the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee once. They have tried to incorporate everyone's comments into the current design.

Eric Johnston, Project Manager with Independent Energy Solutions, said they are 13 months into the project. They have met with the County and discussed the project parameters. The initial layout was done in March of 2014, and the County made suggestions regarding landscaping, design and transportation issues. The chief concerns they have heard from the community are project landscaping and road issues. The project area will be 17.5 acres. There will be a 30 percent fuel

modification zone around the perimeter and fence setbacks. Originally there was going to be a 17 foot fence with razor wire on it. Now an 8 foot chain link fence is proposed. Construction traffic will use Ashley. Creelman Lane will be used for maintenance once the project is built. Maintenance visits will be infrequent. They met with the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee who informed them about the flooding on Ashley road. The fence there now catches debris when it floods. The north half of the project is in the flood channel and no building is proposed there. The project was evaluated for glare. The panels will have a non-reflective coating that will have little glare. Originally the landscaping was going to be native. Now, ornamental vegetation has been added and there will be permanent irrigation.

Amy Hoffman, Project Landscape Architect, said many more plants are included in the project landscaping than before. Ornamental berms have been added to raise the height of the plants so they will be taller from the start. Fifty trees are included in the landscaping. Plants will be low water useage plants. There will be a pathway along Creelman. Previously the landscaping was to be monitored for 5 years. Now it will be monitored for 20 to 25 years.

Joe Frani, Project Manager at SDG&E, said originally there were to be 464 plants. Now there will be 1500 plants. The pathway along Creelman has been laid out. It is a green project. A lot of energy is not produced in Ramona, but this energy will be produced and used locally.

Mr. Ensign gave the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee report. The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee approved the project unanimously with conditions that included a pathway along Creelman and Ashley; a road constructed and paved San Vicente to Ashley; prohibit construction deliveries from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. while school is in session; and install appropriate stormwater management systems to preclude water backup on Ashley. A pathway on Creelman is shown, but not on Ashley. The subcommittee wanted a pathway along Ashley, too. Who will maintain the pathway?

Mr. Frani said a pathway is by a road right of way, and is maintained by the County.

Mr. Stewart said the project has a cap on it by the PUC that cannot be exceeded.

Mr. Johnston said SDG&E will enter into a road agreement with the County.

The Chair read an email sent by the County earlier that day:

“SDG&E has agreed to pay their fair-share into the improvement of Creelman lane from their driveway entrance to San Vicente Road. This is not mitigation for the project since their construction trips will be coming from the north and avoiding Creelman Lane altogether. There will only be minimal ongoing trips for occasional maintenance that does not require road improvements, but SDG&E has agreed to pay their fair-share. The Director of Public Works has made the improvement of Creelman Lane a top priority and the improvement is expected within 2 years.”

Speaker: Jim Tate, Ramona Resident

Mr. Tate has lived on Creelman Lane since 1986. He watched SDG&E put in the tie line project. They used Creelman Lane constantly and produced a lot of dust. Big trucks drive down Creelman. Paving from the driveway to San Vicente Road is not a fair share contribution. They have agreed to put in trees. He doesn't feel SDG&E is doing enough to offset project impacts.

RCPG Minutes 1-15-15

Speaker: Bob Romeo, Ramona Resident

Mr. Romeo is not against solar, but SDG&E needs to step up and minimize project impacts including excess dust and visual impacts. This is a proposal to put a solar plant in an agricultural area next to homes. It will devalue the neighbors' property by having a power plant there. When SDG&E put in the tie lines, they stirred up dust for 3 months. He wants the road paved before they start construction. Their trucks are going through private property. Their subcontractors use Creelman. The scoping letter said there will be less than 1 vehicle per day – Mr. Romeo feels this is not accurate.

Mr. Cooper asked about a stormwater management system?

Mr. Johnston said the plans for the stormwater management system are not yet completed. They intend to remove the fence that sits in the flooded area when it rains. But they have to have security. People can't be trespassing.

Amanda Gonzales, Project Biologist, said there will be no grading in the floodplain.

Mr. Cooper said there is already natural drainage on the site. The fence clogs with debris on Ashley. Water backs up on to people's properties. There needs to be a good stormwater management system in place.

Mr. Johnston said the landscaping will be sparse in this part of the project. They may have to look at more options.

Mr. Tomlinson asked about the watering requirements for 1500 plants?

Mr. Johnston said they will be using a small amount of water on the landscaping and there will be no impacts on groundwater. After 2 years there will be enough growth that irrigation will be light.

Ms. Hoffman said the ornamental plants are low water plants.

Mr. Johnston said they will build the pathway and turn it over to the County for maintenance.

Mr. Tomlinson said that the pathway along Warnock is full of weeds. There are trail standards for pathways, and he would like to see the pathway have DG and be built to County standards for a trail.

Mr. Ensign said there has been a great improvement on the landscaping. For homes on the north side of the project – how will they be screened?

Mr. Johnston said there would be a 30 foot fire perimeter and an 8 foot screen chain link fence. As far as the road, they will match funding and will pave San Vicente to the entrance of the SDG&E facility.

Mr. Brean asked when they will pave the road?

Mr. Johnson said it will be paid for when they get their building permit – all fees are assessed.

Mr. Brean asked them to put in a pathway along Ashley.

Mr. Johnston said Ashley is not directly adjacent to the project.

Mr. Ross asked about how the landscaping will be maintained?

Mr. Johnston said plants that die will be replaced at a 1 to 1 ratio. SDG&E will contract out the landscape plan.

Mr. Ross added a landscaping condition to the 4 Transportation/Trails conditions that included landscape maintenance.

The Chair said a lot of plants that were part of the landscaping for the Warnock solar facility died.

Mr. Johnston said the project will be owned and operated by SDG&E for the life of the project – 20 to 25 years, unlike the Warnock solar facility, which has had many owners.

Ms. Mansolf asked what will happen after 20 to 25 years? Ms. Mansolf asked if any of the project team was aware of the status of the County Solar Ordinance?

Mr. Stewart said they would assess the project in 20 or 25 years and upgrade it. As far as the development of the County Solar Ordinance – there have been 2 meetings, so progress is being made.

Ms. Myers asked if the environmental document was ready for public review yet? She asked about cleaning of the panels?

Mr. Johnston said the Mitigated Negative Declaration is not ready to review yet. Panels will be cleaned every 2 weeks. They are staying out of the floodplain by building on the highest ground on the property site.

The Chair complimented the project team for the addition of berms. No one is against solar – it is all about location. Creelman Lane will be paved in 2 years. The project belongs to SDG&E and they have been on that site for a long time. The project has come a long way.

MOTION: PROJECT BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. A PATHWAY BE CONSTRUCTED TO COUNTY TRAIL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS ALONG CREELMAN AND ASHLEY, ALONG THE ENTIRE PROJECT BOUNDARY.**
- 2. APPROPRIATE ROAD CONSTRUCTED AND PAVED ACCORDING TO COUNTY STANDARDS FROM SAN VICENTE TO ASHLEY.**
- 3. PROHIBIT CONSTRUCTION DELIVERIES BETWEEN 6 AND 8 A.M. AND 2 TO 4 P.M. WHEN SCHOOL IS IN OPERATION.**
- 4. INSTALL APPROPRIATE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TO PRECLUDE WATER BACKUP ONTO ASHLEY.**
- 5. THAT THE LANDSCAPING PLAN DETAILS A MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE FOR LANDSCAPE AND IDENTIFIES RESPONSIBLE PARTIES FOR MAINTENANCE AND ENSURING DEAD PLANTS ARE REPLACED AT A 1:1 RATIO**

Upon motion made by Richard Tomlinson and seconded by Paul Stykel, the motion passed **10-3-0-0-2**, with Donna Myers, Elio Noyas and Dan Scherer voting no, and Eb Hogervorst and Barbara Jensen absent.

8-B: (West Subcommittee Project) MUP 14-036, Proposal for a 40 ft high Faux Water Tank, Verizon Telecommunications Facility, with 12 Antennas and 1 Microwave Dish Inside. Custom Concrete Block Equipment Shelter and a Concrete Block Enclosure for an Emergency Generator. Located at 1808 Cedar St by Summer Glen Rd and Olive St.

Ms. Goodman presented the project. The cell site design is for a 40 foot faux water tower with 12 antennas and a microwave dish. The facility will be metal but painted to look like wood. The equipment enclosure will be CMU block as required by the Fire Department. Noise from the project will be in compliance with County requirements. The tower is 50 feet from the property line. Originally the project was proposed to be more west of where it is now. That design did not comply with County requirements for setbacks.

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. There were some neighbors at the meeting, plus she had received phone calls and emails from other neighbors who were unable to make the meeting. The neighbors were adamantly opposed to the project, and a motion was made to not approve the project due to neighborhood opposition in this location. The neighbors did not want it in the neighborhood and felt it should be relocated.

Speaker: Stan Dvorak, Ramona Resident

Mr. Dvorak is opposed to the cell phone tower going in where it is currently proposed. The neighbors were not consulted in determining the project location and he wants to know why a vacant hill behind his house is being considered? He will see it every time he walks out of his house. His view will be spoiled. It will be several feet from his property line and back door. As far as health risks – they haven't been proven, but they haven't been disproven either. Lastly he is concerned with the effect this cell tower will have on his property values.

Speaker: Chris Camaratta, Ramona Resident

Mr. Camaratta supports the issues brought up by Mr. Dvorak, and is opposed to the cell tower in the proposed location.

Speaker: Bob Hunsbergen, Ramona Resident

Mr. Hunsberger lives directly across the street from the proposed cell site. He is concerned with the project for health reasons. The site will be 750 feet from his home. European standards prefer ½ mile of separation between cell towers and residences. He found 3 health studies related to the radiation the cell towers emit. One study was from Brazil, 1 was from France and 1 was from Germany. After 10 years more cases of cancer were discovered than before. There is nothing conclusive to show there are no health impacts from cell towers aimed at a home. If he goes to sell his property, he will have to disclose the cell site and his property value will go down.

Speaker: Sharron Camaratta, Ramona Resident

Ms. Camaratta asked why her neighborhood was chosen for the cell site? She pulled up information to show that cell phone coverage was adequate in the area, so the project is not needed. There are no gaps here. She thought it would be better to piggyback onto another existing site and keep this one out of the neighborhood.

Speaker: Charles Foth, Ramona Resident

Mr. Foth agrees with the concerns over the health issues that have been brought up. He has lived on his property 40 years. The cell towers are working all of the time. It is a commercial activity in a residential neighborhood. It doesn't belong in a residential neighborhood.

Speaker: Carl Graner, Ramona Resident

Mr. Graner's property is right next to the facility. His head will be about 100 feet from the tower. He moved to Ramona to get away from the city. There have been studies that show the result of a 200 percent increase in leukemia in children whose homes and residences were next to a cell tower. When he sells his home he will have to disclose it and he will lose 20 percent of the equity in his home.

Speaker: Richard Martin, Ramona Resident

Mr. Martin brought his son to the meeting. He is 11 years old. Mr. Martin's property is right next to the property for which the cell tower is proposed, and about 100 feet from his son's bedroom. Ramona is a great place to raise kids. The cell tower should be farther away from residences.

Speaker: Richard Wright, Ramona Resident

Mr. Wright bought his property 1 to 2 years ago. He is also next to the proposed cell tower. He thinks it will be an eyesore.

Mr. Scherer asked Ms. Goodman about health issues?

Ms. Goodman said the project meets the guidelines for licensing.

Mr. Brean said numerous cell sites have been approved where there were no issues with the neighbors. He feels the applicant putting up the cell tower should do more PR with the neighbors. He doesn't recommend focusing on health issues alone to oppose the project.

Ms. Mansolf said the deciding authority for the project will be the Planning Commission. She encouraged neighbors to familiarize themselves with the section of the Zoning Ordinance that talks about cell site regulations and siting requirements on individual properties. This is the criteria the Planning Commission will use to evaluate the project. The findings for use permits, Section 7358 of the Zoning Ordinance, must be met to approve the project. The RCPG and the Planning Commission sometimes don't agree on projected impacts. Health concerns are not part of the criteria. A stronger argument will be made if comments are tailored to the evaluation criteria and the use permit findings.

MOTION: TO NOT APPROVE MUP 14-036 DUE TO NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION IN THIS LOCATION.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Jim Cooper, the motion **passed 13-0-0-2**, with Eb Hogervorst and Barbara Jensen absent.

8-C: (CUDA Subcommittee Project) TPM 20741R, 815 14th St. Project Approved Previously with Structure on Site with Potential Historic Value. After Research, It Was Determined there Was no Historic Value and Structure has been Removed. Purpose of Review is to Remove Historic Easement on Site

Sharon Quisenberry presented the project. She had a minor subdivision approved several years ago and one lot had a house on it that had the possibility of being an historic structure, so an historic easement was put over the lot. Over the years it was determined that the structure was not historic, and the house was removed. In order to develop the lot, the historic easement needs to be removed from the property.

Mr. Stykel said the CUDA Subcommittee voted to remove the historic easement.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND REMOVAL OF THE HISTORIC EASEMENT.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Jim Cooper, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Eb Hogervorst and Barbara Jensen absent.

8-F: Presentation by the County Capital Improvement Projects Staff on the County Process to Create and Complete Projects – *Taken out of Order*

Mike Aguilar made a presentation on County Capital Improvement (CIP) projects and how the RCPG could contribute to the process. First background was provided. A CIP project has 3 separate processes in its development. First, a Draft General Plan is created by County PDS with input from the community provided by the CPG and other sources. As the Draft General Plan moves forward, a Mobility Element Road Map is developed for each community. If roads are not built to the standards of the road classification as defined in the General Plan, they are given a higher priority so they can be improved to meet the necessary standards. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors approve the General Plan, and the next phase of the process occurs – the Capital Improvement Plan Process.

Public Works, Project Management, develops a Capital Improvement Long Range Plan with input from the community and other County departments. The plan incorporates the direction of the General Plan, Road Network Operational Requirements and County Strategic Priorities with funding sources that are available and have their own restrictions. The CPG's develop a top 10 priority list. Public Works considers the top 10 list and also considers individual requests outside of the list. Project Management ranks projects across the County based on operational evaluation factors such as accident history, congestion relief, maintenance, etc., so projects may change in priority. The primary funding mechanism for CIP projects is through the voter approved TransNet sales tax initiative that provides about \$13 million per year to the County. The final step in funding roadway improvement projects is Project Management brings the 5-year TransNet spending program recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for their approval every 2 years.

The third step is the Individual Project Design Process. Public Works Engineering obtains funding from a variety of sources through SANDAG, Federal Funds, State Funds, Gas Tax, Sales Tax and other Regional funding sources for projects that are included in the Long Range Plan and possibly other projects that are not in the plan but will help public safety or Road Network Operational requirements. Once Preliminary Engineering has been completed and funds are secure for the period of design, projects are moved into a formal design phase that includes the creation of a Construction Contract with periodic updates to the CPG and input from surrounding property owners and those that may be directly involved with the project being on their property.

CPG's can influence the priority of projects on the County's list and introduce new projects. Projects are always competing with other projects County wide.

Projects currently active in Ramona include the San Vicente Road Improvement Project, 10th and H Street intersection Improvement, 13th Street Bridge Project. The County is also contributing to Caltrans plans for the SR-67/Dye/HVR Intersection Improvement Project. The Dye Road Extension Project and the Ramona Street Extension Project will then be worked on.

8-E: (Transportation/Trails and CUDA Subcommittee Project) STP 14-034 Multi-Family Project Proposal on 16th St. Presentation, by Casey Malone of Lansing Companies. Project in Form Based Code Area Approximately 62 units on 2.87 Acres, Zoned RM-V5, General Plan Designation VR-24

Casey Malone presented the project. There have been concerns mentioned over vernal pools being on the property. Mr. Malone brought copies of a biological study on the vernal pools that had been done about 5 years ago that showed there were no vernal pool indicator species on the site, such as fairy shrimp. There is a large concrete drainage channel that empties onto the site and flows onto the property. A 10 foot drainage easement lies over the south side of the property to allow for drainage. A traffic analysis is being done. There will be 96 parking spaces within the project, and designated guest parking. They are only required to have 1 parking space per unit as per the Form Based Code. There will also be 8 guest spaces along 16th Street. There will be no pedestrian traffic on the site and no path through the property.

The Project Architect said the project is on property with a RM V-5 zoning designation. They could ask for 24 dwelling units per acre, but instead are asking for 21 dwelling units per acre. There is a 3 foot rear yard setback. No stormwater runoff will leave the site. They chose Monterey architecture as they felt it fit Ramona best.

Mr. Stykel said the CUDA Subcommittee approved the project as presented.

Mr. Ensign gave the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee report. There were concerns about impacts to 16th Street. The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee motion was: To table this project with the intent to receive additional information regarding traffic impacts, onsite parking, fire department analysis, pedestrian access, results of vernal pool report. Mr. Ensign said the project could trigger the need for a stoplight on 16th Street

Mr. Tomlinson said he read the biology report and vernal pools are not an issue.

MOTION: TO SEND THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS:

- 1. INCREASE IN ADT'S AND IMPACTS TO 16TH STREET AND MAIN ARE A CONCERN. WE LOOK FORWARD TO REVIEWING THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT.**
- 2. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT NOW TO SIGNIFICANT STORMWATER RUNOFF WHEN IT RAINS, AND STREETS AND PROPERTIES FLOOD IN THAT AREA AND DOWNSTREAM.**
- 3. NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES ONSITE AND GUEST PARKING MAY NOT BE ADEQUATE. PARKING AT APARTMENTS IN RAMONA HISTORICALLY HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATE.**
- 4. WHEN BUILT, THE PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES PARTICIPATE IN THE CRIME FREE MULTI HOUSING PROGRAM.**

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Donna Myers, the motion **passed 13-0-0-0-2**, with Eb Hogervorst and Barbara Jensen absent.

8-D: (Transportation/Trails Subcommittee Project) Traffic Congestion on Main St. at 13th St. by Starbucks – Taken out of Order

Stephanie Haas made a presentation on the challenges of the intersection at 13th Street by Starbucks due to traffic congestion. Cars leaving the library want to make a u-turn at the center divider if they are going east as there is no left turn onto Main Street from 13th Street heading south. Traffic backs up at the traffic signal on 14th Street and motorists are waiting to turn north into the Starbucks drive through restaurant, and also to access the library. There is foot traffic and apartments in the area and no crosswalk for kids to use to cross Main Street. The DO NOT BLOCK sign painted on Main Street in front of 13th Street has helped, but traffic congestion is still a problem. Ms. Haas would like the issue studied further to see if there are any more opportunities for improving the 13th Street and Main Street intersection on the north side..

Mr. Ensign gave the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee report. The committee thought that removing the center divider in the intersection could help improve traffic congestion.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND CALTRANS RE-VISIT THIS INTERSECTION ISSUE REGARDING TRAFFIC AT 13TH STREET AND MAIN STREET.

Upon motion made by Scotty Ensign and seconded by Dan Scherer, the motion **passed 11-2-0-0-2**, with Torry Brean and Jim Cooper voting no, and Eb Hogervorst and Barbara Jensen absent.

ITEM 9: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)

9-A: Election of Officers for 2015: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

The Chair opened nominations for Chair for 2015.

Mr. Stykel nominated Jim Piva and Mr. Ensign seconded the nomination.

Ms. Myers nominated Jim Cooper and Mr. Cooper seconded the nomination.

The Chair closed nominations.

Vote:

Torry Brean:	Jim Piva
Jim Cooper:	Jim Cooper
Scotty Ensign:	Jim Piva
Eb Hogervorst:	Absent
Barbara Jensen:	Absent
Frank Lucio:	Jim Piva
Kristi Mansolf:	Jim Piva
Donna Myers:	Jim Cooper
Elio Noyas:	Jim Piva
Jim Piva:	Jim Piva
David Ross:	Jim Piva
Dan Scherer:	Jim Piva
Paul Stykel:	Jim Piva
Rick Terrazas:	Jim Piva
Richard Tomlinson:	Jim Cooper

RCPG Minutes 1-15-15

Jim Piva: 10 votes – Chair for 2015
Jim Cooper: 3 votes

The Chair opened nominations for Vice Chair for 2015.

Mr. Scherer nominated Scotty Ensign for Vice Chair, with the nomination seconded by Ms. Mansolf.

Ms. Myers asked Mr. Cooper if he would run for Vice Chair and he declined. There were no more nominations for Vice Chair. Nominations were closed. The vote would confirm Mr. Ensign as Vice Chair for 2015.

Vote:

Torry Brean:	Yes
Jim Cooper:	Yes
Scotty Ensign:	Yes
Eb Hogervorst:	Absent
Barbara Jensen:	Absent
Frank Lucio:	Yes
Kristi Mansolf:	Yes
Donna Myers:	Yes
Elio Noyas:	Yes
Jim Piva::	Yes
David Ross:	Yes
Dan Scherer:	Yes
Paul Stykel:	Yes
Rick Terrazas:	Yes
Richard Tomlinson:	Yes

The Chair opened nominations for Secretary.

Mr. Scherer nominated Kristi Mansolf for secretary, with the nomination seconded by Rick Terrazas.

There were no more nominations. Nominations were closed. The vote would confirm Ms. Mansolf as secretary for 2015.

Vote:

Torry Brean:	Yes
Jim Cooper:	Yes
Scotty Ensign:	Yes
Eb Hogervorst:	Absent
Barbara Jensen:	Absent
Frank Lucio:	Yes
Kristi Mansolf:	Yes
Donna Myers:	Yes
Elio Noyas:	Yes
Jim Piva::	Yes
David Ross:	Yes
Dan Scherer:	Yes
Paul Stykel:	Yes

Rick Terrazas: Yes
Richard Tomlinson: Yes

9-B: Santa Maria Creek Cleanup Update

The Chair said 20 tons of trash, filling 5 large dumpsters was cleaned out of the Santa Maria Creek on January 10, 2015. The Ramona Sheriff's Advisory Group organized the event. Well over 100 volunteers came to do the work. The trash was located just north of the apartments on Montecito Road. Steps were taken so there would be no ground disturbance. The cleanup was done in less time than anticipated and that portion of the Creek looks great.

Ms. Mansolf said the 4 wildlife agencies with jurisdiction over waterways were notified of the plan to remove trash in that area, and the methods to be used. They were asked if there were any concerns. Three responded with things to be aware of and possible impacts to avoid. All 4 wildlife agencies were notified after work was completed.

9-C: Airport Issues

Ms. Mansolf said she contacted County Airports and asked some questions relating to the Ramona Airport and whether or not it had a Federal status classification and received FAA grants. She received a lot of good information which will help focus the RCPG letter on this issue from the December meeting.

Mr. Terrazas suggested the RCPG have a presentation on the issue from someone in his office who is very knowledgeable about transportation and airport issues at the Federal level. If interested, he will try to arrange for the presentation at the February RCPG meeting.

The Chair asked Mr. Terrazas to please arrange for the meeting.

9-D: Committee Reports (Possible Action)

9-D-1: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Ensign) – Update on Projects Reviewed

Mr. Ensign reported that the Design Review Board approved further plans for the Mountain View Community Church, and also changes to Dunkin' Donuts/Baskin-Robbins. Starbucks presented changes to signage, which were approved with minor changes. There was discussion on landscape code violations, and the item was then tabled until the next meeting.

9-E: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

Ms. Mansolf passed out the RCPG Standing Rules in the packets of information the RCPG members received. She said that some changes had been made in the recent past, and the RCPG Standing Rules were sent to the County to see if the County would accept them. Ms. Mansolf had followed up with the County but had not heard back. She wanted RCPG members to have them as new terms started, but with the understanding the County may ask for revisions before they will accept them.

9-E-1: Concerns from Members – None

9-E-2: Future Agenda Item Requests

Mr. Ensign asked that the 13th Street bridge project be on the next agenda for consideration of trails and pathways in the project area. Also someone on the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee asked to have the Creelman Lane paving on the next agenda.

Mr. Cooper asked that the follow up with the County on the status of the RCPG Standing Rules be placed on the next agenda. He also asked that consideration of having the San Diego County Estates have its own RCPG subcommittee be placed on the agenda, as well as the CUDA Subcommittee taking on the Form Based Code.

Speaker: Joe Minervini, Ramona Resident

Mr. Minervini asked the RCPG to put writing a letter of support for Mark Baker and his Ministry on the next agenda.

9-E-3: Addition and Confirmation of New Subcommittee Members – None

9-F: Meeting Updates – None

9-F-1: Planning Group Member Training Dates: 1-10-15, 1-31-15.

The Chair reminded RCPG members that the annual training by PDS for Planning and Sponsor Group members will be held on January 31, 2015. Should members not be able to attend, they could take the training online. Annual Form 700's also need to be completed and submitted to the County Registrar of Voters at sometime in March. Ethics training also needs to be completed every other year. This can be done online at the Fair Political Practices Commission website.

Ms. Mansolf said she would be happy to send members' Form 700's to the County once completed.

9-F-2: Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Meetings – None Reported

9-F-3: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 2-5-15 at the Ramona Community Library, 7 p.m.

ITEM 10: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf

The RCPG is advisory only to the County of San Diego. Community issues not related to planning and land use are not within the purview of this group. Item #5: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the RCPG on any subject within the group's jurisdiction that does not appear as an item on this agenda. The RCPG cannot discuss these matters except to place them on a future agenda, refer them to a subcommittee, or to County staff. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes. Please fill out a speaker request form located at the rear of the room and present to Vice Chairperson.

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.