

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

**REGULAR MEETING, August 5, 2014**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

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: Four members were present. Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Ben Brooks; and Robert Smith. Three members were absent: Fritz Stumpges, Stephanie Spencer and Ron Barbanell

**2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:**

- Minutes of the July 1, 2014 meeting were circulated during July and the comments received were incorporated. Motion for approval as presented made by Ben Brooks. Seconded by Robert Smith. Unanimously approved.

**3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:**

- None

**4. ACTION ITEMS:**

- a. Modifications to the Bee Keeping Ordinance** – Presentation by Tracy Ellis of the Dept. of Agriculture, Weights and Measures.

She stated that following their presentation to our Group about 6 months ago, their Department made a series of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The Board directed the Department to meet with the San Diego Bee Society and representatives of commercial bee keepers to develop a consensus proposal for less stringent yet appropriate buffer distances for the keeping of various numbers of hives on property within the county. Representatives from the San Diego Bee Keeping Society (Lyle Kafader and Frank Goldbeck) were in attendance as was a representative of commercial beekeepers, David Farmer. Ms. Ellis reported that the Department and the two groups had been able to come to agreement on recommended setback distances for three tiers (based on number of hives) from roads, property lines and dwellings. They were not able to reach agreement on setback distances for two of the tiers from what are termed “Sensitive Sites” such as picnic areas, playgrounds, schools, etc. The Department plans on submitting the consensus proposal to the Board, recommending that the Board concur with the tiers and consensus setback distances and that the Board choose the appropriate setback distance in the case of Sensitive Sites. (The report will show the Bee Society’s recommended setbacks as well as the Department’s).

Ms. Ellis stated that it currently is, and will continue to be mandatory that all beekeepers register their hives with the Department. However she said that most beekeepers have chosen not to register and that there is little or no enforcement of the current ordinance

due to a lack of funding. Charles Mathews asked about how enforcement would be done and funded under the proposed ordinance. Ms Ellis responded that there would be no new fees, just a continuation of the \$10 fee if a beekeeper has more than 10 hives. Funding for education and enforcement would have to be made available by the Board through the General Fund. She estimated that two full time people would be needed to perform these functions if the ordinance is to have an impact. Mr. Goldbeck from the Bee Society said that he was more optimistic about more people registering their hives voluntarily under the ordinance. Mr. Mathews asked the Bee Society representatives if they would consider making County registration a prerequisite for membership in their Society. They responded that they wouldn't because they do not want to exercise regulatory responsibility. In response to a question from Mr. Mathews, member Robert Smith said that while the ordinance would not apply on any of the region's tribal areas, he would welcome information being provided to the tribal areas on Best Management Practices and available resources. Mr. Brooks said he would feel better about supporting the proposal if more information had been presented by either the Department or the industry representatives that the proposed limits were in general conformance with best practices across the industry, nationwide.

Mr. Mathews reminded Ms. Ellis that at the previous meeting, her Department had committed to provide bee keeping and bee safety information pamphlets to the Group so that the Group could distribute them, as possible, in the community. She was informed that we never received them. She apologized and stated that she would see that we received the requested pamphlets.

Motion by Mr. Mathews that the Group support the Department's proposal and recommend to the County the importance of funding, preferably by a license fee, or secondarily, by the General Fund, adequate education and enforcement of the revised ordinance and that further, we recommend that the County seek/require the fullest cooperation of the Bee Keeping Society with the implementation of the Ordinance. Seconded by Brad Smith. Unanimous approval.

- b. **Shadow Run Ranch** - Reconsideration of the prior conditional approval of the proposed 44 residential lot development in light of the non-acceptance of the conditions of the approval.

Mr. Mathews moved, seconded by Mr. Brad Smith, that the Group take this item out order because representatives of Shadow Ranch were present (Ron Deutschendorf and Mark Thompson). Unanimously approved.

Mr. Mathews reminded the Group that at the July meeting we approved the project noting three previous comments that had not been addressed: acceleration/deceleration lanes on State Route 76 at the entrance; requirement for permanent maintenance of groves on individual lots; a new project alternative to include adding the land under the applicant's ownership along Adams Drive between the project and Adams Drive. He informed the group that he had received a response from the Dept of Planning and Development Services that gave reasons why they would not implement any of these recommendations.

It was suggested by Mr. Mathews that we defer any further action on these issues until the final EIR is received for review and comment some time in the future. The group agreed that no further action should be taken at this time.

Mr. Thompson then said that he had some information that might clarify a couple prior issues or update us.

- He stated that, as we had requested, he had looked into having the County accept the park as a public park, rather than it becoming a private park as is planned. He stated that the County wasn't interested in maintaining it because it was too small. Mr. Mathews suggested that they again discuss the park with the Dept of Recreation and Parks but suggest that the park remain privately owned, operated and maintained, yet that public use be allowed. He said that he believed that this might allow local Park fees paid to the County for developments in this area, including from this project, to be used to help fund the capital improvements/equipment in the park "in exchange" for public access and use in this area that has so little public park facilities.
- Mr. Thompson discussed the ongoing misunderstanding regarding the recommendations by the developer at one time regarding the acceleration/deceleration lanes on SR 76. He found an old record from several years ago when the access to the development had been planned to be near the western side of the development onto SR 76. At that time, the developer had suggested these lanes, and Caltrans said they would consider it. Subsequently Caltrans asked them to move the intersection to the east and create a "more robust" intersection and they determined that the lanes were not required because of this much improved intersection.
- Mr. Thompson presented Google Earth photos of various locations in this area showing grove density in residential "rancho type" developments a number of years ago versus the same areas today. All of the images sets showed more grove plantings around the homes today than existed in the past. He said that this tended to support their opinion that the buyers of the residential lots will maintain the groves because they will be a very desirable feature of the development and will be one of the primary reasons why they buy here in the first place.

**c. Negative Declaration and Draft Zoning Ordinance Update No. 30 and County Code Amendments – Proposal from the Dept. of Planning & Development Services**

Motion to approve the recommended Update and Amendments by Brad Smith, seconded by Mr. Mathews. Unanimously approved.

**d. County of San Diego Traffic Guidelines – Proposed Changes from Dept. of Public Works**

Motion to approve the recommended Guidelines by Brad Smith, seconded by Mr. Mathews. Unanimously approved.

**5. ADMINISTRATION:**

- Communications – None
- Operating Expenses – Mr. Mathews sought reimbursement of \$50 from the County for the annual PO Box rental at the Post Office and to order printer paper and a printer cartridge. Motion to approve by Bradley Smith, seconded by Robert Smith. Unanimously approved.
- Request of DPDS to provide an update of their records of the status of Form 700 filing, required DPDS Training and required Ethics Training regarding members of PPCSG – Mr. Mathews reported that Ms. Spencer has completed her training and the fully updated

record of all members being in compliance has been submitted to the Department by Mr. Mathews.

- Date of next meeting September 2, 2014. Coming up at that meeting will be SDGE making a presentation of their landscaping proposal at their planned solar facility which the Group previously reviewed. Also under consideration will be an application for a cell phone tower south of SR 76, east of Rincon.

**6. ADJOURNMENT: 8:10 p.m.**

Minutes by Bradley Smith