

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

REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 6, 2016
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.

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: Four members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; and Bill Jacobs. Stephanie Spencer and Ben Brooks were absent and we have one vacant seat.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes of July 5, 2016 had been previously submitted to all with no corrections received. Brad made a motion to approve as presented, Bill gave the second and they were approved 4-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. This is an informal opportunity for community members to comment on any matters of concern within our area of jurisdiction -- that are not on the agenda already. Jerry Fisher had brought concerns about SDG&E's power line expansion before us at our last meeting on July 5, 2016 was present to hear SDG&E and the County clarify their plans on upgrading the Sunrise Power Northern Link. Andy stated that the County declined to get involved. They maintain that it is not their prerogative, not their issue, and that it is up to PG&E as to what they can and can't do. Therefore, we can't get involved. Andy went further and contacted the director of public affairs at SDG&E to attend this meeting. They had declined to attend. Fritz questioned why the County and SDG&E felt compelled to attend previously but not now; especially when at that meeting the SDG&E's technical expert got lost and couldn't make it and we had to rely on their PR salesman to get their spin and nothing that we could hold them to. Andy stated that they came on the request of the County but once the deal was approved they no longer had any responsibility to follow through. Brad asked Jerry if he had tried contacting any of his State representatives since it is their jurisdiction. Jerry stated that it was his position that it is his property that is being condemned or taken and that SDG&E only have rights from a 1926 easement for the narrow band of land to support a certain small sized line. He questioned our (County's) position of not caring about the added fire, safety, and also ignoring the county's scenic highway designation on this stretch of highway. He stated that since they are wanting to take his land they will have to go to court to do it and he isn't going to pay for the court costs. We got into some of his issues and also mentioned the scenic highway to which he still claims is so designated. He said that he would bring his documentation to our next meeting and email them to Fritz, beforehand, to be entered into record and shared with the group members.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. We then began to consider the county's request that we consider proposed changes to the zoning and related issues of medical marijuana facilities. They requested that we then pick

any number of their predetermined list of 7 restrictive to extremely restrictive alternate proposals. Bill stated that he had a preference for multiple items: he preferred #1, 4, 6, & 7. Fritz stated that he would support any proposal that is applied equally to all other legal medical substances. Brad stated that he also agrees that medical marijuana should be available just as any of the controlled substances in CVS. Bill then refined his position that he thought that it should be controlled in reference to the number of facilities in a certain area but that he wasn't as concerned with the limiting distances and other limitations presented. Brad then mentioned his experience in LA with limiting distances for liquor stores and suggested that this might be a middle position for us. Brad suggested that this wasn't an important topic to him personally, in that it doesn't matter what the laws are; people will get pot some way so why create more prohibition laws. But he does agree with the county's desire to control pot just as they do with alcohol and tobacco zoning laws and he feels that we should mimic the requirements for liquor stores since this has been debated and agreed upon over the last 30-40 years! Fritz then said he agreed and would support that. Andy then expressed his ideas that marijuana is like several other controlled substances such as tobacco and liquor and society has determined that these are detrimental when uncontrolled. It is society's obligation to provide guidance as to their safe usage. He also feels that there is a lot of evidence for improper medical prescription of many controlled substances. He also agrees that liquor store controls are good but they are state controls and we are tasked with county control. Therefore he believes that in regards to planning and land use, control should be similar to liquor stores, except that in pharmacies it should be restricted to ones with Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) licenses. We all then agreed that we would support the same zoning restrictions as currently apply to liquor stores. Andy moved that he be tasked to respond to DPDS as agreed: that the zoning rules be comparable to those of liquor stores; Fritz gave the second. It was approved 4-0. See Attachment A, Andy's response to County.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. We then discussed our efforts to find someone for our vacant seat on the group. So far all discussions with possible applicants have failed. We will continue our efforts.
- b. There were no communications to the group requiring a response.
- c. There were no expenses to approve or submit.
- d. Brad gave an informal presentation of what transpired at the community outreach meeting he attended with other county planning officials and their consultants. This effort was to create a climate action plan that requires specific actions to reduce exhaust emissions from the unincorporated areas of the county. They were trying to get community, expert, business and industry input regarding practical obstacles to this. They will then create an EIR scheduled to go to the BOS next fall. The goal specified was to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 1990 levels.
- e. The next meeting is scheduled for October 4, 2016. The final decision for having a meeting or not comes down to the presence of a key agenda item needing our action.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

- a. Fritz moved to adjourn, Brad seconded it and we adjourned at 8:13 PM.

RE ATTACHMENT A:

ATTACHMENT A,

For inclusion in PPCSG's meeting minutes of September 6, 2016

From: Charles Mathews

Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2016 12:10 PM

To: 'Farace, Joseph'**Subject:** RE: Medical Marijuana Ordinance Options Public Review

Joe:

At its meeting held September 6, 2016, the Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group (PPCSG) upon motion made and carried (4 in favor, 2 absent, 1 vacancy) adopted the following view with regard to proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance section pertaining to the County's Medical Marijuana Collective Facility (MMCF) Ordinance. "PPCSG believes that as a controlled substance the zoning ordinance for MMCFs should be similar to such restrictions for other controlled substances and, specifically, that the ordinance(s) applicable to MMCFs regarding location, parking provision, signage, quantity, density, etc., should be similar to the regulation(s) applicable to liquor stores."

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and please feel free to call if you have any questions in this regard.

Regards,
Charles.

Charles Mathews.

Chairman, Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group

These minutes were approved at the December 6 meeting. Bill made the motion to approved as presented, Brad gave the second and they were approved 5-0.

Fritz Stumpges,

PPCSG Secretary