

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

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held January 5, 2012, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona, California.

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

Excused Absence: Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, and Richard Tomlinson

Jim Piva, RCPG Chair, acted as Chair of the meeting, Bob Hailey, 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

Eb Hogervorst and Richard Tomlinson had excused absences. Chad Anderson expected to be late due to work.

ITEM 5: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair) – *None*

ITEM 6: FORMATION OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Sprong brought forward Items 14-B-1/14-G-1, TPM 21176, Gildred TPM on Highland Valley Road for consent. The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee approved the project with no issues.

Ms. Mansolf said the West Subcommittee also reviewed the project and approved it, with no issues.

MOTION: TO MOVE ITEM 14-B-1/14-G-1, TPM 21176, GILDRED TPM, TO THE CONSENT CALENDAR, AND TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst and Richard Tomlinson absent.

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action) – *No Changes Made*

ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 12-1-11 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF 12-1-11.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 9-0-3-0-3**, with Torry Brean, Matt Deskovick and Scotty Ensign abstaining, and Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst and Richard Tomlinson absent.

ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)

Gordon Maxley of Ramona requested to yield his speaker time to Jim Cooper, who was making a presentation. The Chair said Mr. Cooper would be allowed 5 minutes as per the speaker guide on the speaker form.

Speaker: Jim Cooper, Ramona Resident

Mr. Cooper does not live on Ramona Street, however, he is concerned with the proposed extension of Ramona Street. For 15 months he has asked the question, what problem is this extension solving? He has shared his concerns with Supervisor Jacob at 2 meetings in 2011 and at a number of local community groups, and at the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee meeting in October.

Mr. Cooper said his concerns are with the project plans from November, 2011. There will be a misuse of stop signs in the area. The Boundary Street stop sign will cause an inconvenience so people will be inclined to use other routes. Returning school buses may use other routes to avoid the stop sign. The stop sign at the bottom of the extension will block a driveway. The stop sign for Ramona Street going towards Warnock will cause every SDCE driver to stop, backing traffic up. The property owner's driveways will be impacted. Most have truck long trailers right for horses, and there isn't adequate sight distance shown in the plans. The Boundary/Ramona Street intersection will not meet the 100 foot line of sight requirement for traffic from Creelman. Some driveways will exceed 15 degrees which will require Fire Department approval. One thousand, five hundred average daily trips will be added to the Hanson Lane/Ramona Street intersection, which is already a safety concern, not meeting the criteria.

The project cost has also increased. Almost 500 feet has been added to the extension. Three more property owners are involved. A deeper cut will be required through the hill to bury the aqueduct and the water line, resulting in more property acquisition. The publishing of the new Public Road Standards in 2010 may negate the whole project. Mr. Cooper is also concerned with the increased recommended road width for a Light Collector road in the new Standards as the easement is only 60 feet wide.

Speaker: Carmen La Belle, Ramona Resident

Ms. La Belle is directly affected by the Ramona Street Extension project. She has recently received a copy of the Seismic Line Location Plan which details the evaluation of the density of the underlying rock, showing the potential for blasting in the area. The blasting could be as close as 35 feet from her house. Her well is 100 from the blasting site. She is concerned with the potential for damage from the blasting to her house, well and other structures. She has asked the engineer who prepared the report for more information on the extent of the damage that could occur from the blasting on her property, and he referred her to the County of San Diego. Ms. La Belle said she will require a written guarantee that no damage will be done from the blasting to human, animal or property.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke said the fourth plan for the Ramona Street Extension project is worse than plans presented before. Mr. Cooper's presentation includes several project related issues, but there are more. The

roadbed will be 14 feet below the present grade of his driveway, which means 70 feet will be cut back on his property to connect his driveway to the roadbed. The average resulting slope will be 5 to 1 with a 24 percent slope in the middle. Fire trucks can't negotiate a slope greater than 15 percent. Two gate openings are not being acknowledged for the plan, so that 50 percent of his property will be inaccessible, including a well and the back portion of his property. The traffic noise will be extreme and hasn't been considered. He will lose 75 percent of his irrigation infrastructure with 2 wells at risk due to blasting. His nursery business cannot survive any interruption of power or water. Mr. Brennecke said the project should be abandoned.

ITEM 10: Presentation by Bob Citrano, County DPLU, on Changes to Forest Conservative Initiative (FCI) Lands in Ramona. The Public Will Be Given the Opportunity To Speak on the Changes (Discussion and Possible Action)

Bob Citrano gave a presentation on the Forest Conservation Initiative. In 1992, the FCI was a voter initiative that passed, restricting lot sizes to 40 acres in specific areas close to forest lands. The FCI expired in December, 2010. In August, 2011, the GP Update was adopted. Previous FCI lands are being converted to lot sizes that will be compatible with the areas they are near. The GP Update is based on the Community Development Model where there is a dense core, with less density outside the core, and low density along the periphery of the town. Once the maps are locked down, the project will go out for public review.

There are not many areas affected in Ramona, but there are some FCI lands on the north side of Ramona by the San Pasqual Valley, and also by the SDCE and Barona Mesa. DPLU continued the development pattern that was already proposed for the area with the GP Update. The item was opened up to questions.

Speaker: David Baker, Ramona Resident

Mr. Baker asked what takes precedence now in the area by Barona Mesa – 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres, 1 dwelling unit per 4 acres or 1 dwelling unit per one-half acre? Mr. Baker bought his property in 1994.

Mr. Citrano said the General Plan takes precedence, and so the area by Barona Mesa will be 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres. Previously, the old plan was based on slope for this type of area, and lot sizes were either designated 4, 8 or 20 acres depending on the slope of the property. When the County adopted the General Plan in August, the FCI lands were not included on the maps. With the new maps, the FCI lands are now included with a new density. When Mr. Baker bought his property, it was under the FCI and so was 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres.

Ms. Mansolf asked if there would be some sort of an appeal process for the affected property owners? Can they participate in the GP Update Property Specific Request process?

Mr. Citrano said he did not think they could participate in the Property Specific Request process for FCI lands, and he wasn't sure yet what recourse would be available to them.

Speaker: Russel Skerrett, Solana Beach Resident

Mr. Skerrett owns property in the affected area in Ramona, and he supports the FCI change to 1 unit per 10 acres.

Speaker: Greg Sherman, Ramona Resident

Mr. Sherman didn't get a notice and he owns property in the affected area.

Mr. Citrano said 4,000 notices were sent out. Further notices will be sent out on this issue in the future.

Mr. Sprong asked if properties were evaluated to see if the lots are buildable?

Mr. Citrano said that the changes carried the density of the GP Update. The density allows how many lots you can have.

Ms. Anderson said she thought the changes were incorporated well with the GP Update.

Speaker: Melissa Wilcox, Ramona Resident

Ms. Wilcox is in the FCI area. She bought her property in 1988 when it could be split into 4 acre parcels. She asked what would she be able to do now with the land?

Mr. Citrano said the GP Update limits development away from areas without services. Her property will go to 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres.

Speaker: Paul Novak, Ramona Resident

Mr. Novak received incorrect letters from the County – 1 for each of 2 properties he owns in the FCI area. He asked if anything is going to be done to correct this error? Will a corrected letter go out?

Mr. Citrano said he did not know yet if a corrected letter would be going out.

MOTION:

- **TO SUPPORT THE COUNTY DRAFT LAND USE MAP CHANGES FOR FCI LANDS.**
- **TO REQUEST RENOTIFICATION OF ALL AFFECTED PROPERTY OWNERS WITH CORRECT INFORMATION.**
- **(TO RECOMMEND) THE SAME APPEAL CONSIDERATIONS BE GIVEN TO AFFECTED FCI PROPERTY OWNERS AS IN THE GP UPDATE PROCESS.**

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 11-1-0-0-3**, with Angus Tobiason voting no, and Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst and Richard Tomlinson absent.

ITEM 11: Presentation by Donna Turbyfill, Deputy Director, Department of Public Works on a Proposal to Lease 33.06 Acres (with the Possible Addition of 26.29 Acres) of Ramona Landfill Buffer Property to a Solar Voltaic Company for the Purpose of Generating Power. (Discussion and Possible Action)

Ms. Turbyfill said the County no longer owns or maintains the Ramona Landfill, but they still own the buffer land around it. On one section of the buffer that is 33.06 acres, the County would like to put out to bid for a solar project to get lease revenue for the land. The County doesn't need a Major Use Permit to do this, but they would want the community to be happy with what is done there. She is inviting input and is open to suggestions.

Mr. Hailey asked if there has been or will be any questioning of the neighboring areas?

The Chair said the residents on Burma Road will be looking at the site, as they look down over the property. The Chair recommended sending out visual information to the neighboring residents and others who would be seeing the installation on the property.

Ms. Turbyfill said they will send letters to residents and include photos.

MOTION: WE SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF THE LANDFILL BUFFER AREAS TO BE USED FOR FUTURE SOLAR FARMS, AND TO REQUEST THE COUNTY TO HELP LOCATE OTHER SUITABLE AREAS TO ASSIST IN THE AB 32 CRITERIA THAT DOES NOT TAKE OUR USABLE FARMLAND AREAS.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 9-2-1-0-3**, with Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace voting no, Angus Tobiason abstaining, and Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst and Richard Tomlinson absent.

Mr. Hickman asked that the project go to the Design Review Board and get similar input other applicants with similar projects have been asked to get.

The Chair said standards need to be developed for solar project installations.

Ms. Turbyfill said the buffer land is not good to grow anything on.

ITEM 12: Presentation by Matt Schneider, County DPLU, on the County's Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program

Mr. Schneider said the PACE program is fairly well established throughout the country. The County Board of Supervisors approved PACE as a pilot program for San Diego County. The program was launched in November. Almost 6,000 PACE fact sheets were sent out to property owners the County felt may qualify for the program. There are 3 criteria for participating in the program. The property owner must 1) currently have the property in agriculture, 2) have the ability to subdivide, and 3) have had their density reduced by the GP Update.

The County doesn't know who has their land in agriculture and who doesn't. Not all residents who received the information may be eligible to participate. They have received 200 responses. One hundred people are interested in participating. The application period begins January 16 and ends March 1. After applications are submitted, a determination will be made to see if the applicant is eligible. The County will be evaluating the applications by looking at the agricultural potential of the property, development pressures on the property, and the cost of the easement relative to the program's available funds. Soil rating will also be a consideration. There are only 6 percent prime soils in the County. Developers will use the land for 1:1 mitigation. Prime soils will have to be mitigated with prime soils. Lands can be mitigated for anywhere in the County – there is no requirement that development in Ramona will have to be mitigated in Ramona.

Ms. Anderson said she would like to see where prime soils are located. She asked if a part of the property is sold for PACE, can a second dwelling unit or a barn still be built?

Mr. Schneider said building on the site would be limited to a house, agricultural related outbuildings and employee housing. Building that supports agriculture will be allowed.

Mr. Sprong asked if the Farm Bureau supports the PACE program?

Mr. Schneider said the Farm Bureau participated in shaping the program.

Mr. Brean asked about off site mitigation?

Mr. Schneider said that the LARA model is used, and will be dollar for dollar.

Mr. Stykel asked if a road could be considered in the area of the easement?

Mr. Schneider said this would not be limited. The owner just needs to be having agricultural operations on site. The terms of the easement are specific. The owner will not be able to subdivide the property once the easement is on the property.

The Chair asked if mitigation would occur in Ramona if the solar project is built at Warnock?

Mr. Schneider said that people need to apply. They don't know yet if there will be land in Ramona that will be in the program. If people apply, the LARA model will be used if the land is determined to be eligible for the program. A valuation point system will be used to assess each property to be more fair. County Real Estate Services will subordinate a mortgage if there is one on the property. People will not be penalized if a mortgage is on the property.

There is about \$2 million available for the program. The program is completely voluntary, and the County is anticipating more applications than there will be funds available.

(Mr. Tobiason left at 8:20).

ITEM 13: P11-029, Major Use Permit for Wholesale Distributed Generation Solar Project at 1650 Warnock Dr. Photo Voltaic Solar Farm. Site is 110 Acres. Proposal is for 45.2 Acres to be Developed with Solar Panels that will Be 8 feet to 11.5 feet off the Ground. Production Capacity will be 7.5 MW of Alternating Current. Sol Orchard, Applicant (Action)

The Chair said the applicant had been requested to go to the Design Review Board for suggestions and recommendations to mitigate potential visual impacts caused by the solar panels in the proposed area. The Chair read the motion from the Design Review Board meeting, December 15, 2011, on the solar project: "We recommend 8 foot high for screening fence that is proponents choice of vinyl in black, green or brown and NO barbed wire. The east and south lines can be regular chain link and can have barbed wire. Get with Carol Close re: plant pallet. Plant trees that will grow to 40 to 50 feet high on the north limits of the project (each of the north facing). Trim the close corners (4 corners) to accommodate a 30 to 40 foot high tree (shadows) approximately 60 feet set back along the north west boundary of the project. Lighting to be downward shielded and on motion sensor." The motion was unanimously approved of all present. The Chair opened up the meeting to public comment.

Speaker: Mark Bousema, Ramona Property Owner and Farmer

Mr. Bousema owns the pig farm on the corner of Warnock and Ramona Street where the solar panels would be located. His farm raises pigs for biomedical research. There was a lot of opposition to his pig farm when he first came here. It is expensive to farm here and pay property taxes. Water rates keep going up. He has been raising pigs for 25 years. The solar project is a good lease for him. He has no plans to subdivide. His neighbors are good neighbors who are supportive of his business. He likes the cows and the pastures and thinks the area is beautiful. He plans to farm in Ramona the rest of his life.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

RCPG Minutes 1-5-12

Ms. Myers said she lives in the heart of the last working agricultural area in Ramona. She is a champion for rural Ramona. She has re-read the RCPG members' campaign statements. We all said we want Ramona to remain rural. The project is proposed for the 100 year flood plain. It will permanently alter the area and impose blight on a rural environment. She has heard from an expert that once soil is destroyed, it is permanently disturbed. She asked that the RCPG protect the heritage of the area.

Speaker: Daniel Wise, Ramona Resident

Mr. Wise has worked in the solar industry since the 1970's. He said utilities are allowed to pollute and dodge taxes. There were no good energy alternatives until the 70's and 80's. Misconceptions slow down the advancement of technology. We buy power from SDG&E and they sell us power that is not clean and environmentally friendly. Solar is a better, cleaner energy option.

Speaker: Joe Minervini, Ramona Resident

Mr. Minervini said he is not against solar power, but he is opposed to it being in the proposed area. He doesn't want to see a solar factory. He asked that the solar panels be put where they won't be seen. In response to the gentleman in favor of the project – it seems lately that many power companies are using natural gas – a cleaner, cheaper fuel – produced domestically.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke said the solar plant is an industrial use in an agricultural area. It will be an eyesore in a picturesque environment. The floodplain on the proposed property has been inundated 3 times in the last 20 years. Mr. Brennecke said that if the RCPG approves the project, they will betray everyone who moved here. Anyone who votes for the project is not capable of preserving agriculture.

Speaker: Patricia Brennecke, Ramona Residents

Ms. Brennecke sees no benefits to Ramona from the solar project. Solar panels soon become obsolete due to the advancement of technology. She said it is hard to believe there will be no glare from the project. Ms. Brennecke asked that the RCPG help keep the area beautiful and not approve the project.

Speaker: Kathy Da Silva, Ramona Resident

Ms. Da Silva said the project would be better off at the dump. The lease will be good for 25 years. There is no guarantee that the solar panels will still be viable in 25 years.

Speaker: Shelly Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers commended Sol Orchard for attending the Design Review Board meeting. She doesn't feel the fencing will shield the project. The property owner doesn't live in Ramona. Sol Orchard will sell the power. She wanted to see what the project will look like in the end. Currently agricultural land is being lost at an astonishing rate. Power is a big deal. Ms. Myers said the project doesn't fit Ramona and alternative sites should be considered.

Mr. Wallace said he is against the project. He is offended the company is a northern California company that wants to put solar in the proposed area. Solar should be on roofs.

Mr. Brean said he has nothing against solar, but he is concerned with the location. He really thinks this is the wrong location for the project.

Mr. Stykel went to Mammoth recently and saw a substantial solar farm. He doesn't want to see that in Ramona.

Mr. Deskovick said the land behind the Van Tols can't be farmed. He asked that other locations be considered.

Mr. Pritchard said the location can't be changed. Interested property owners did not get back to them. They would not be able to build the project by the dump. There is too much rock in the area. There are neighbors there, also. They are locked into the site with the agreement.

Mr. Deskovick said people can't afford to grow hay here anymore. Hay has to be brought up the hill. He is not against the project, but it is usable farmland.

Mr. Pritchard said the project will benefit SG&E. This spot is the most economically available. They plan to avoid the drainage and stay out of the 100 year floodplain. A mine is not being proposed. There is no pollution from the site – silicon, steel and silver don't pollute. There will be no glare, morning to afternoon. As far as the obsolescence of technology – solar thermal, etc. – they dried up because there was no power purchase agreement. The panels will hold up well for 25 years. They have worked extensively on visual impacts and will increase the setback to 60 feet from 30 feet for the future alignment. A power plant is considered a civic use. The project will be solar panels, inverters and dirt. The solar ordinance supports solar in any zone except for dense residential.

Mr. Brown said there will be no degradation of the land. Once removed, there will be no impacts. Four times a year ionized water will be used to spray off the panels. The location is what matters to generate and use the power. The owner is willing to have the facility on the property.

Mr. Hickman said when he drives through that area, he looks at the \$1 million view. It boils down to view. He feels this is the wrong area for the solar project.

Mr. Deskovick said the property is agricultural land. He wants to see farming there. Where water has been limited in northern California due to the delta smelt – the farmland has been without water 7 or 8 years. It will never recover. If the water is turned on tomorrow, the land still won't produce right.

Mr. Ensign asked about posts, panels and lights for the project?

Mr. Brown said there will be 1 overhead light on a motion sensor. Mr. Brown has tried to contact Carol Close, the person the Design Review Board suggested he talk to regarding plant types – however he has been unable to reach her.

The Chair said he appreciates the applicant going to the Design Review Board for screening recommendations.

Ms. Anderson said everyone wants solar, but this is not a good spot for it. It is not allowed by right in this location and requires a Major Use Permit. Some projects get their foot in the door with the Major Use Permit and then try to expand later – like the Highland Valley Ranch project. She doesn't believe the project is conducive to the neighborhood. She wants to see the solar on the roof tops and in industrial areas.

MOTION: EVEN THOUGH WE ARE IN FAVOR OF SOLAR FARMS TO ASSIST WITH AB 32 GOALS, WE ARE OPPOSED TO THIS PROJECT ON THIS SITE DUE TO THE

FOLLOWING REASONS: 1) BEING INCOMPATIBLE WITH OUR COMMUNITY CHARACTER; 2) LOSS OF THE USE OF PRIME FARMLAND; 3) BLIGHT TO THE AREA; 4) THE AGRICULTURALLY ZONED LAND NOT BEING USED FOR AGRICULTURE; AND 5) THE BULK AND SCALE OF THE PROJECT, AND LACK OF HARMONY WITH THE AREA.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

ITEM 14. Subcommittee Reports

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

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

14-B-1: TPM 21176, 53.11 acre, 4 Lot Subdivision at the Northeast Corner of Highland Valley Rd. and Highland Trails. Gildred Building Co., Owner; J. Whalen, Applicant (w/T&T) (Approved under the Consent Calendar)

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

14-D: PARKS (Tomlinson)(Action Item) (Item not addressed in Mr. Tomlinson's absence)

14-D-1: Development/Confirmation of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) Project Priority List and Recreation Programming Priority List (Identification of Recreation Program Needs and Priorities) For 2011-2012

14-E: GP Update Plan (Anderson)(No Business)

14-F: CUDA (Brean)(No Business)

14-G: Transportation/Trails (Sprong)(Action Items)

14-G-1: TPM 21176, 53.11 acre, 4 Lot Subdivision at the Northeast Corner of Highland Valley Rd. and Highland Trails. Gildred Building Co., Owner; J. Whalen, Applicant (w/West) (Approved under the Consent Calendar)

14-G-2: POD 11-011, Equine Ordinance, Possible Changes to be Considered For the Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Sprong said Mr. Degenfelder gave an overview of the equine ordinance. There are the same concerns as with the winery ordinance – many believe a lot of people will want to do what's in the equine ordinance – but in reality, only a handful will do it. There are some questions on the number of horses that are allowed on a property. It appears that 10 horses are allowed per usable acre. Odor and insect issues are being addressed.

14-H: DESIGN REVIEW (Chris Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Ms. Anderson said the Bank of Southern California will be splitting off space for a Starbucks to be in their building, and this was approved. A waiver for Bodyworks by Jerry was approved.

14-I: Village Design Committee Meeting Report (Brean, Stykel)(No Report)

ITEM 15: OTHER BUSINESS (Chair) (Possible Action)

- A. **Report on Stakeholder Meeting with US Forest Service on Cedar Creek Falls Trailhead (San Diego River Gorge Trail and Trailhead)(No Report)**
- B. **Report on Emergency Evacuation Easement Status (No Report)**
- C. **Hwy 67 Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report**

The Chair said the Subcommittee met with Supervisor Jacob to go over facts, concepts and ideas for how to fund the project report for the Highland Valley/Dye/Hwy 67 intersection. Supervisor Jacob was very helpful and positive. Supervisor Jacob will meet with us and Gary Gallegos of SANDAG to discuss the project.

D. Red Tape Reduction Task Force Report

The Chair said he and Ms. Mansolf attended a meeting in Supervisor Jacob's office with District 2 CPG Chairs and members. A micro committee was formed of CPG Chairs to come up with possible alternatives that would be workable for the CPG's and the Board of Supervisors should there be a change proposed as to how CPG's operate under the County umbrella. The Chair said the issue came up after the last RCPG meeting, and no one was able to attend the Board hearing December 7.

Ms. Mansolf said the issue came up and no one was able to pull up the item on the Board website because it was down for maintenance the weekend prior to December 7. A letter was written that addressed only the CPG issue – recommended changes, and not the other items brought forward on the Report.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE LETTER SENT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE DECEMBER 7, 2011, MEETING.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

The Chair said he wanted to take some ideas to share to the micro committee meeting, that were approved by the RCPG. After some discussion, the following motion was made:

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND FOR THE CHAIR TO TAKE TO THE MICRO COMMITTEE (PLANNING AND SPONSOR GROUP CHAIRS), TO SUPPORT: 1) TERM LIMITS OF 2 CONSECUTIVE TERMS WITH 2 YEARS OFF (BEFORE FILING AGAIN); 2) 9 MEMBER LIMIT FOR RCPG (FROM 15); AND 3) MANDATORY ANNUAL BROWN ACT, POLICY I-1 AND FORM 700 TRAINING, WITH INTERNET OPTION.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Bob Hailey, the motion **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

- E. **Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration, Zoning Ordinance Update No. 29 and County Code Amendments, available online at: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html Public Review Period ends 1-17-12. Includes Several Issues, Such as Definitions Of Agricultural Tourism and Community Gardens Plus Amendment of Use Regulations for these Categories, and Many Other Topics**

Ms. Mansolf announced that the new Zoning Ordinance Update included definitions and use regulations for the new farming categories of Agricultural Tourism and Community Gardens.

ITEM 16: Administrative Matters (Chair)

A. Election of RCPG Officers for 2012: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary (Action)

Mr. Ensign nominated Mr. Piva for Chair. Mr. Deskovick nominated Mr. Sprong for Chair. Mr. Sprong respectfully declined. Nominations were closed.

Upon nomination by Scotty Ensign, the vote **passed 10-1-0-0-4**, with Matt Deskovick voting no, and Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

Mr. Sprong nominated Mr. Ensign for Vice Chair. Mr. Ensign respectfully declined. Mr. Hickman nominated Chris Anderson for Vice Chair. Nominations were closed.

Upon nomination by Carl Hickman, the vote **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

Mr. Hickman nominated Ms. Mansolf for Secretary. Nominations were closed.

Upon nomination by Carl Hickman, the vote **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

B. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)

Ms. Anderson said the GP Update Subcommittee was supposed to be an ad hoc subcommittee. The GP Update was adopted August, 2011, so there is no longer a need to have the subcommittee.

MOTION: TO REMOVE THE GP UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE FROM THE LIST OF SUBCOMMITTEES ON THE AGENDA, AND TO CHANGE THE STANDING RULES TO REFLECT THE CHANGE.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the motion **passed 11-0-0-0-4**, with Chad Anderson, Eb Hogervorst, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson absent.

C. Concerns of Members

Mr. Brean said he reads Non-Agenda item (Item 9) to mean that ongoing projects will not be heard – they must be agendized. He was surprised the Ramona Street presentation was made as a Non-Agenda item.

There was a concern about members of the public combining time to give to another speaker. There is the 3 minute rule.

Ms. Anderson said the County has it where you need 3 speakers for an organized presentation.

The Chair asked that we see how it is going, and if there is a problem, please call it to his attention.

Mr. Hickman said the back of the speaker slip says the maximum time allowed is 5 minutes.

Mr. Deskovick said he filled out his Form 700 and sent it to Sacramento in 2011 and he was fined \$200 for not submitting it.

The Chair asked Ms. Mansolf to contact the County to see the best course of action to take.

Mr. Hailey said the RCPG voted for a parking prohibition on 7th Street on the north side of Main Street, on the corners. He was surprised to see how small an area of the curb is painted red.

Mr. Hickman said the maximum amount of work was done that could be done without going to the TAC and the Board of Supervisors.

The Chair said he felt it was not professional to ask the solar project applicants to go the Design Review Board for input – he felt it was leading them on, since we did not approve the project.

Ms. Anderson said great ideas came from the Design Review Board, but it wasn't enough to mitigate for the project. She did not make her decision for the project in December. She solicited comments from people over the month.

Mr. Sprong said he made his decision over a period of 3 months.

Mr. Deskovick said we gave them one more opportunity to come back with something that would work.

D. Agenda Requests (*None*)

ITEM 17: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf