

PALA - PAUMA COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP
P.O. Box 1273
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
Phone: 760-742-0426

REGULAR MEETING, MARCH 6, 2012
FINAL APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 3

Date: March 6, 2012

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

Place: Pauma Valley Community Center
16650 Hwy. 76
Pauma Valley, Ca. 92061

1. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM.** Roll Call and quorum established: Five Group Members present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Bill Winn, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ron Barbanell; and Jim Beezhold. Absent John Ljubenkov.

2. **OPEN FORUM:** Jim Beezhold used this informal time to speak about last month's proceedings where we considered an application for the one open seat that we have (#3) and then took action and voted to approve the applicant. He questioned whether or not we had followed the details of the published "Procedures to fill Planning or Sponsor Group Vacancies" when we took that action. He passed out a copy of the procedures and drew our attention to Item #4 which specifies that first the applicant submits the application to the Planning or Sponsor Group. Then after the voter registration is confirmed (#5), the consideration and selection of applicant is placed on the agenda of the next meeting (#6.) Jim felt that the agenda didn't mention pending approval of a specific person (named) and therefore we board members and the public hadn't been properly noticed and that we may have taken premature action in approving Chairman Robert Smith to the seat. Andy corrected Jim and pointed to the fact that it *was* placed on that agenda and read from it, "Request for applicants to serve as a Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group member to fill one existing vacancy for Seat Number 3. Consideration of applicants, if any, and possible agreement to recommend the appointment of one applicant." Discussions continued and Andy said that it would be placed on the next meeting agenda. Fritz and Jim expressed concern that a questionable application might be approved by the board while we were spending 2 months resolving this issue. Andy emphasized that we couldn't consider anything that was not on this agenda. Jim restated his concerns and asked that we withdraw our recommendation until we could decide if the rules had been followed, Andy said that we could only put it on the agenda for next meeting. Fritz then read again from the Procedures where it states that the "Applicant submits the application to the Planning or Sponsor Group", doesn't mean that he can give it to you...he has to come to the meeting and submit it to the Sponsor Group, which is us. He submits his application, then it's put on the agenda for the next meeting. Andy then said again that it would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. Jim asked what exactly would be put on the agenda, and Andy said, "The reconsideration of the recommendation." Jim said, "Then that would be voted on and that would be open for further involvement by others." Andy again said that we would put it on the agenda...that's all we can do.

Then Lavonne Peck, Chairwoman of the La Jolla Indian Tribe, spoke about the Fee to Trust subcommittee that met Saturday, February 25th to discuss in depth, subjects that we couldn't get to at our meeting. She was very pleased with the good conversation they had and looked forward meeting again to discuss more issues. Andy thanked her and said that we would again place this on the agenda after the meeting with the BIA. Bill, the subcommittee chair, also thanked her and agreed that it had been a good group and meeting.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. The final corrected minutes for February 7, 2012 had been circulated to all members. Bill moved to adopt the minutes, Ron made the second and with no further discussion the minutes were approved 5-0.
- b. Operating expenses for the Quarterly Rent (1st of 2012) were submitted and Fritz mentioned that the county had not responded to any of the previous 4 billings. With this 5th invoice from the Pauma Valley Community Center, the amount owed was \$945. Andy read the invoice, which was for 3 Months rent at \$35/Mo. for a total of \$105. Bill moved to approve payment, Andy seconded and it was approved 5-0.

4. DISCUSSIONS:

- a. The County Specific Property Request for parcel PP30 was discussed. Andy explained that this is an approximate 525 acre parcel that was zoned SR2/SR4 and RL10 for 40 years and is near Rincon. The preliminary GP update proposed RL-40. We made a recommendation in September 2011 to the Board to split the zoning between RL-40 and SR-10, the Staff decided to go for RL-40, and the Board had made its determination to be RL-40. Later Staff recommended a change to 1du to 4 acre on some and SR-10 on the remaining. This January the Board reviewed exception requests and asked that we reconsider our recommendations toward a more equitable outcome for the owner, closer to his original request of SR2, SR4. The owners representative, Randy Coopersmith, gave reasons for their current request for SR-2/SR-4. The Armstrong's have owned this land since the 40's and lived there for 7 decades! He explained that the Northern portion is very flat and buildable at their 1du per 2-4 acre proposal. The southern portion is mainly flood plain and steeper slopes. The adjoining property is zoned SR10 and is exactly the same as this. He said that similarly the adjoining northern property is ¼, ½, 1 acre and commercial. These are both very inconsistent with the new RL-40 GP update. Randy said that it had been zoned for 30 years at 2 to 4 acre in the North and the rest 1du to 10 acre. In August, 2011 the Board changed it to RL-40. It was agreed that the Board had requested Staff to try to come up with a solution that would reduce the request from a Major to Moderate level of impact to the Counties Plans. Andy mentioned Staffs April recommended compromise of RL-20 but the owners rejected it and made this new SR2/SR4 and SR10 proposal. Andy emphasized that the Moderate request still needs to have the appropriate zoning determined to make it a Moderate proposal, and we feel that their current proposal is a Major change. After we discussed the issues again Andy made a motion that we reaffirm our previous proposal of RL-40 and SR10 with any more considered a Major change. Fritz gave a second and after further discussion of previous zoning losses vs. future growth planning, the board voted to pass the motion, 3 in favor, one against, and 1 abstain.
- b. Andy gave a report on the February 27th board meeting which considered the recommendations of the Red Tape Reduction Taskforce. This was the meeting that was properly announced in advance and allowed for public and planning group input. After the previous December meeting they had to rescind the decisions made and schedule this one. After hearing new testimony, they did reach the same conclusions and voted to implement 10 or 15 of the most obvious and noncontroversial recommendations. These were so logical that it begged the question as to why the board had not implemented them 10 years ago! The main focus of testimony given was in favor of not disbanding the local planning groups. 3 of the 5 Board Members spoke favorably of keeping them, so that when the matter is reconsidered on March 28th there is a good chance that the board will vote to not disband the planning groups but will move to consider other actions involving them.
- c. The next item was about the draft Climate Action Plan for S.D. Co. Most of us had not had time to fairly consider the details in this 120 page report. Andy said that one major factor in the plan

concerned Green House Gas emission controls and limits or the GHG plan. This was presented as a draft which might become an ordinance in the future. It talks about the cumulative greenhouse gas emissions having to be reduced by about 35% in 15 years from where it is today. They have set forward some levels of development which they consider that the cumulative effect of these measures would adversely affect greenhouse gasses. Therefore development plans above a threshold limit would have to a Green House Gas Element attached to them. Examples of these proposed limits are 86 single dwelling units; low-rise apartment units, 121 units; mid-rise units 136, high-rise 140 units, condos 120... so roughly anything above about 100 units would require a greenhouse gas analysis in addition to all others. Fritz asked what they could do to control the gases and Andy said they could require things such as insulation requirements, traffic plans and more. The effect of this is a requirement that all of these larger developments would need to create a plan that would reduce the GHG's by a minimum of 16% below the unmitigated levels. Bill then asked if these improvements would make the housing costs prohibitive? It doesn't seem like the values can be anticipated yet but Andy's guess was that they were not too stringent. Ron then spoke about limiting over-development and Freedman's articles about the effects of development and climate change, which he offered to send us. We agreed that we were generally supportive of the Climate Action Plan and Bill moved to have Andy write a letter to the board expressing our tentative support, Fritz gave a second and it was approved 5-0.

- d. Jim presented the Parks Subcommittee report. He has been in touch with Steven Paul of the County Parks Dept. His comment on allowing the use of PLDO funds was that if the county owned the land then there would be no problem, but that with private or other organizations a Joint Powers Agreement is required. The community center has been reluctant to enter into one of these. Fritz said that in the past it appeared to be cost prohibitive in that it was maybe \$30K just for the legal agreement and plans and then you were bound to very official standards that are not in general compatible with our simple, rural park. Examples were required sidewalks, roads, HWY entry standards etc. Jim asked if we could maybe get some of the plans and joint powers paid for out of the funds. Andy asked what the next step would be and Jim said that we need to pursue the Joint Powers. Andy said that meeting with Steven Paul to consider the JPA should be our action item and we would place this issue on the agenda again for next month.
- e. The last Item was discussion of the recent road grading out at Rancho Guejito. Andy had spoken with the Department of Public Works and they said they had visited the site and had issued a Stop Work Order. They said that R.G. had stopped work on the road and they were considering additional requirements to follow. Bill made a motion that we ask that the land be placed back in the condition prior to unauthorized grading and Jim seconded it. We all agreed and it passed 5-0.
- f. There were two informal discussions both requesting that an issue be placed on next month's agenda. Fritz requested that we consider adding our support to the Community Center's request for Community Development/Enhancement Grant funds. Ron requested that we consider conflict of interest details and ways to have the minutes adjusted to add what was heard and the impact that was felt at the time, in addition to the exact recorded words. Andy said that both issues would be added to next month's agenda.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

Andy moved to adjourn, Ron gave a second, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary

(These minutes were approved at the April 3, meeting 5-0 and distributed 4/17/2012)