

County of San Diego
Ramona Community Planning Group
MEETING MINUTES
March 4, 2021
ZOOM MEETING
(DETAILS)

~~7:00 PM @ the Ramona Community Library, 1275 Main Street, Ramona~~

Meeting shall be a Zoom Meeting held at 7:00 P.M

<https://zoom.us/j/94978756309?pwd=eTxbnY0UmFTWXU1QTRsc0Y0ZTg3QT09>

Dial In Numbers: +16699006833, (San Jose), +13462487799, (Houston)

Meeting ID: 949 7875 6309

Passcode: 169070

A Temporary email address has been created to request agenda item information via email.

Please send an email to: rcpgcovid19meetinginfo@gmail.com to request documents for each item to follow along with during the teleconference.

Requests for documents will be responded to before and during the meeting as possible to accommodate any member of the public wishing to participate during the meeting.

Members of the public are requested to make a speaker request via email prior to the meeting as well. This request is to ensure everyone is heard and has an equal opportunity to speak during the meeting as well as providing the RCPG a chance to organize our speakers ahead of the meeting to ensure we have ample time for each item. Please indicate if you are speaking as PUBLIC COMMUNICATION or as an AGENDA ITEM and note the agenda item you wish to respond to and please limit your written response to 3 minutes or less.

Written comments to be read into the record will also be accepted via email prior to the meeting. Please indicate the item number you wish to respond to and please limit your written response to 3 minutes or less.

ITEM 1: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 2: ROLL CALL (Maxson, Chair)

In Attendance:	Torry Brean	Scotty Ensign	Debbie Foster
	Lynn Hopewell	Casey Lynch	Kristi Mansolf
	Robin Joy Maxson	Elio Noyas	Dawn Perfect
	Matt Rains	Michelle Rains	Andrew Simmons <i>(late)</i>
	Paul Stykel	Dan Summers	Kevin Wallace

Robin Joy Maxson, RCPG Chair, acted as Chair of the meeting, Torry Brean, RCPG Vice Chair, acted as Vice Chair of the meeting, and Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 2-4-21 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2021, MEETING AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Dan Summers and seconded by Scotty Ensign, the motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Andrew Simmons absent.

ITEM 4: Announcements and Correspondence Received

The Chair announced the Organic Materials Ordinance was going to the Board of Supervisors on March 11 and March 23, 2021. There are webinar updates on this issue that were sent out to the RCPG. Supervisor Anderson is eager to engage the community and seeking feedback from us on various issues, such as the Needle Exchange Program and the Cannabis Ordinance, and others. Other supervisors are also reaching out to their communities for feedback. Seventh Street Bridge over Santa Maria Creek will undergo maintenance at the beginning summer (no specific date). The County will reach out to us with more information as they move closer to the project.

Dan Summers announced about the SR67 pavement project timeline that will impact traffic .

Ms. Mansolf said the Mt. Woodson parking lot issue will be on the agenda on April 1. CAL FIRE asked the County to address some issues.

Ms. Perfect said she followed up on the athletic field lighting. No PLDO projects will be approved through the County until after July 1. The County will be doing preliminary project work until then.

ITEM 5: 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: Janet Kling, Representing the Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church Project

Ms. Kling said the Spirit of Joy project on the corner of Highland Valley/Dye and Highway 67 has been in the construction process for many years and still isn’t built. A lot of grading has been done and parking lots and access roads have been built. Contractors have fallen through with the work to be done and millions have been spent.

The Ramona Community Planning Group has previously reviewed and approved the Spirit of Joy plans for a Sanctuary and Fellowship Hall on the property at the corner of Highway 67 and Highland Valley Road behind the Welcome to Ramona sign. They would like to make some minor modifications to their plans and are requesting RCPG approval. The modifications are all cost driven. The pandemic has been difficult, but they want to move to the property. The scope of the Fellowship Hall building has been reduced from a cross footprint to a rectangle and shifted from stick construction to a steel building. Plans for the Sanctuary are unchanged but will be built in a later phase. She believes the campus is an invaluable asset to the Ramona community, offering meeting spaces, recreational sports fields, an evacuation site and much more. The County is anxious for our feedback.

The Chair said this item would be referred to the West Subcommittee for review and then be seen by the whole RCPG.

Mr. Stykel said they should go to the County and the County will refer the project to us.

Ms. Kling said they have been to the County and the County asked them to go to the RCPG for feedback on the modifications.

Mr. Stykel said this is not the process we follow.

(Joann Kling filled out a speaker slip on the Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church non-agenda item issue but did not speak.)

CALL FOR ANY ADDITIONAL SPEAKERS

VICE-CHAIR SHALL ANNOUNCE EACH SPEAKER REQUEST BY NAME, THE SPEAKER SHALL STATE THEY ARE ON THE CALL AND BEGIN. THE TIME LIMIT IS 3 MINUTES AND THE CHAIR SHALL CALL TIME AT THE END OF 3 MINUTES AND THE SPEAKER WILL STOP ON THE CALL.

ITEM 6: APPROVAL OF ORDER OF THE AGENDA (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion by Torry Brean and seconded by Kevin Wallace, the motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

ITEM 7: ACTION ITEMS:

- 7-A: MUP 21-002, Proposal to change the existing monopole, at 19591 Horizon View Dr, into a stealth tree design, with the addition of about 10-feet to accommodate branches. The top of the branches of the proposed monoecalyptus tree would be at about 67-feet after the improvement. This proposal was heard and approved by the Ramona Community Planning Group on 6/30/2020**

Nicole Comach presented the project. They are proposing to change a monopole on Horizon View Drive into a monoecalyptus, stealthed tree design. The monopole is currently about 60 feet. The addition of branches to the top of the tree will add about 7 feet in height, so the monoecalyptus will be about 67 feet tall. The County asked them to bring site plans to the RCPG for review. The monoecalyptus will be in the same lease area. They brought some photo simulations that show the different vantage points the tree will be seen from.

Mr. Ensign asked how far the current monopole was from where the monoecalyptus will be? Do they intend to continue using the monopole while the monoecalyptus is being constructed? Will the faux tree have a full branch count?

Ms. Comanch said they do intend to use the monopole during construction of the monoecalyptus. The faux tree will not be far from where the monopole is located and it will have a full branch count.

Ms. Mansolf said the applicants came to the June 4, 2020, RCPG meeting and presented different designs. The motion from the RCPG meeting was to give feedback on the designs. Several members said a faux tree would fit best into the area. The West Subcommittee approved the current project design at the meeting February 22, 2021.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE FAUX TREE DESIGN AS PRESENTED

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1-0**, with Casey Lynch stepping down.

7-B: Scenic Waiver Request/Site Plan Permit Exemption at 19329 Susie Way, for a 21 foot tall, 4,740 square foot metal storage building approximately 500 feet from Highway 67

Mr. Salmeri presented the project. He lives in a newly constructed house at the top of the hill on the left on Susie Way. There is a property in front of his, also on the left. The property in front of his also includes land on the right of Susie Way, and there is a barn and a house on the right of Susie Way.

He would like to put up a workshop, storage building, 50 feet by 95 feet on his property. Previously a chicken ranch was on the property. There is a flat area on the property where there was a chicken coop. He plans to put the workshop on the flat area. The neighboring property owner (to the front of his property) planted trees to shield the property and buildings from Highway 67. His storage building will be over 500 feet from Highway 67. He would also like to plant trees/shrubs to help shield the property. The 50 foot side of the building will be what is facing Highway 67. His property is at the top of Susie Way. It is hard to see the property from Highway 67 as it is up on a hill.

Mr. Ensign asked if Highway 67 is visible from where Mr. Salmeri wants to put the storage building?

Mr. Salmeri said Highway 67 is not very visible from the spot where the workshop will be built. The building will be about 19 feet tall.

Mr. Ensign said the project is out of the Form Based Code Area

Ms. Mansolf said the building will be tan with a red roof, matching another nearby building on another property in the area. The building will not have outside lighting. The West Subcommittee approved the scenic waiver request.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SCENIC WAIVER AS REQUESTED.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Casey Lynch, the motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0**.

7-C: Reds Whites and Brews, 629 Main St, Site Plan Exemption to widen an exterior door on the building by about 6 inches (from 30 inches to 36 inches) so there is an accessible entry/exit. D5 Special Area Regulation applies

Ms. Wylie presented the project. The project is to upgrade the access on an existing historic building. The Zoning Manager at the County came up with the idea of adjusting the side door by widening it by 6 inches to improve access to the building. Right now the building is not wheel chair accessible. The project had been reviewed by the County and they are waiting for the

Design Review Board and the RCPG to give their opinion. The new door will look like the current historic door that will be replaced.

Mr. Simmons gave the CUDA report. The project is pretty simple and CUDA approved the waiver request.

Ms. Rains asked if the building is historic? She likes the way the style of the doors.

Ms. Wylie said the front of the building is not changing.

Mr. Ensign said he applauded Mr. Bidegain and Ms. Wylie. They got Main Street parking and the building is ADA accessible. The access will accommodate emergency vehicles. The project passed at the Design Review Board.

Ms. Wylie said they will be fixing the floor level change in the building, too.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE D5 WAIVER.

Upon motion made by Andrew Simmons and seconded by Torry Brean, the motion **passed 14-0-0-1-0**, with Casey Lynch stepping down.

- 7-D: Discussion of new Cannabis and Social Equity Programs from Board of Supervisors on 1-27-21, feedback and Planning Group role requested by Supervisor Anderson and Planning & Development Services as updates to zoning ordinances and implementation details are developed. Original Medical Marijuana Ordinance will sunset. Presentations by Donald Chase, County of San Diego, Advance Planning Land Use/Environmental Planning Manager; Martha Gonzalez, Ramona Sheriff's Substation, Crime Prevention Specialist and Ramona Cannabis businesses.**

The Chair said the presentation order would be as follows: Donald Chase, County Land Use/Environmental Planning Manager, Martha Gonzalez, Crime Prevention Specialist for the Sheriff's Department and the Ramona cannabis business owners.

Mr. Chase said the County is working on a new cannabis ordinance, effective January 27, 2021, when the Board of Supervisors approved doing so. County staff will return in 90 days in June, and again in September to present their work to the Board of Supervisors. In 1996, voters passed Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 that allowed the use of medical cannabis. Outreach is a goal and they want to get the input of a full spectrum of people. Up for discussion is cultivation and sales, different types of uses, and then coordination with Zoning. The current ordinance will sunset in April of 2022. There is oversight on these types of facilities. Governor Newsom is creating a single department starting in July of 2021 that will roll 3 agencies into one for cannabis oversight. Social equity is another important consideration of this issue.

Martha Gonzalez spoke next. Ms. Gonzalez said one question to consider with the cannabis issue is the crime rate. How does the change to the cannabis ordinance relate to crime? There is no evidence of increased crime with the cannabis industry in operation. Efforts will be made to deter criminal activity that may come along in the future. An environmental study based on crime prevention is completed before putting together a plan. Some considerations are surveillance and territorial enforcement access. Sheriff's Crime Prevention will discuss security features and advise on what they think is best for a location. Brighter lighting deters crime. Where the camera

is pointing, how long it points at a location, and the size of the pixels all help to make settings safer. There has been an 80 percent reduction in crime when the Sheriff's work with a facility for crime prevention through an environmental design study. This is an important consideration when getting new businesses in

Don Bowen, representing a Ramona cannabis shop in Ramona, said he has been in business for 5 years. They have had no crime issues. They have security lighting and have adhered to County regulations. Their products provide medical relief to individuals, of which the average age is about 45 years old. Their products help people with cancer and epilepsy. They follow strict guidelines and use track and trace which allows for no illegal activity. They have a no nonsense policy for cannabis and minors. Regulating the marketplace helps. Their products are well tested. The RCPG assisted in drafting the ordinance that is currently in use which restricts/limits cannabis in commercial store fronts. They worked together in the past on the ordinance and they would like to work with the RCPG on the new ordinance and grow the cannabis industry in a responsible way. They know there are families that concerned with cannabis getting into the hands of minors. Right now there are pop up shops that pop up illegally where the products are not tested. They get closed only to pop up again. These pop up shops are not regulated at all.

Ren Bodin, representing a cannabis shop in Ramona said he appreciates all the information that has been presented. The Crime Prevention aspect is great. At his location, they use all of the elements Ms. Gonzalez spoke of for security. In the future, they want to be good community members. The California Ordinance is robust and there are good rules and regulations in place. Track and trace is very important. They make sure the products get into the right hands. The focus on the new ordinance fits in with the County plan to allow communities to designate where these types of facilities go, and they are in M54 industrial currently. In the future they can be on Main and in commercial areas. Cultivation can maybe occur on agricultural land in Ramona in the future. Open agriculture may be a concern. Right now they are using greenhouses. No pests get in or out. There is no odor going out and no unfiltered air coming in to pollute the plants. There are 3 outlets in Ramona currently to serve the community. He looks forward to continuing the good relationship in the future.

Speaker: Mark Hutton, Ramona Resident

I agree with the Board of Supervisors that cannabis should be available to people who live in the unincorporated areas and I applaud them for their focus on social justice. But when we draft the new regulations that would affect Ramona, I ask that we also take the following into consideration:

- 1) Cannabis is legal and should be available to residents of the unincorporated areas of the County, both for medical, and recreational use. But we need to make a distinction between doing that and turning Ramona into a recreational inebriation destination. It's not equitable to compromise public safety and degrade the quality of life in our town in order to benefit a relatively few people.
- 2) Ramona has limited groundwater, expensive imported water and our region regularly experiences drought cycles.
- 3) Creating a recreation destination for cannabis that people would be driving to may not align with the County's Climate Action goals and would appear to conflict with the intent of Prop 63, Section 3(P). Combining retail sales and consumption would lead to more people operating motor vehicles in an altered state.

4) In Northern California cannabis cultivation is part of the social fabric. That's not the case in Ramona, so the Microbusiness model isn't a good fit for our town from a cultural perspective. Also, the intent of A-70 and A-72 zoning isn't commercial use.

5) The Microbusiness model would impact rural residential neighborhoods in our bedroom community by allowing commercial use, something that would significantly increase non-resident traffic. And if the Tiered Winery Ordinance is used as a template, we could see public access on private roads under a by-right permit, and not only will the planning group not be able to comment on projects, but neighbors won't even be notified.

Given the above, I recommend the following:

- 1) Allow a limited number of cannabis retail outlets to operate in Ramona.
- 2) Severely limit the number of cultivation permits, and site them in commercial and industrial zones. I ask that you also consider the impacts on public safety, neighborhood and community character, traffic, pollution, loss of biological resources, and the depletion of groundwater resources. All permits should be discretionary.
- 3) Prohibit cannabis consumption, cannabis sales and public access at cannabis cultivation sites.
- 4) Prohibit cannabis consumption in cannabis retail outlets and other public places.

Speaker: Peggy Walker, Ramona Resident

Ms. Walker says the ordinance takes away local control. By putting social equity into the discussion, this discussion on cannabis is being framed as moral. She appreciates the County working with the public. This topic also appears to be minority designed.

Speaker: Barbara Gordon, Public Health Educator, San Diego Alliance

There are many concerns with marijuana businesses coming to Ramona. Land use responsibility needs to be a priority. If marijuana businesses expand, the community should not be negatively affected with smell and excess ground water usage that are associated with cultivation. Traffic and crime are also a consideration with expanded marijuana businesses. I work with young people and see how marijuana has negatively impacted their lives. These businesses make marijuana seem normal for young people. Marijuana is often the first drug youth try and often not the last. We need to let the BOS know our concerns to protect the community. Public safety and health need to be our priority and not promoting more marijuana businesses. Prop 64 was about personal possession and personal cultivation and not a mandate to allow marijuana businesses.

Deanna Blair, Ramona Resident, was not in attendance, so Mr. Brean read her comments into the record:

I strongly oppose anyone being able to buy and ingest cannabis on site and then drive their vehicle afterwards. That is a recipe for car accidents, where someone could be killed or maimed.

Perhaps patrons could be required to have a designated driver or be required to pay for transportation if they are going to ingest before they get home. If they must drive themselves, perhaps they could be required to sign some sort of legal document before they leave stating they will drive home before they ingest.

For those who ingest on site, there could be some sort of sobriety check before they get their car from a type of required valet parking, with no walk up clients allowed who could just park down

the road. Anyone who can afford to pay to use cannabis for recreation can afford to pay the extra cost to keep everyone else safe. That would provide jobs for parking valets and sobriety check security guards.

The cannabis businesses could be held liable for not doing all in their power to keep the community safe.

I sure do wish the supervisors had never approved this.

Speaker: Carol Green, Ramona Resident

Ms. Green said she knows of someone in Santa Barbara who gets odor impacts from an outdoor marijuana cultivation site, and if there is outdoor cultivation, she hopes odor will be addressed and mitigated. Ms. Green said she has kids and she has seen THC trigger psychosis. Her own son smoked marijuana for anxiety. Normalizing marijuana use tells kids it is okay. It is not safe as it can trigger psychosis, and this has been backed up by psychiatrists. She asked the RCPG to please consider this information and learn more about marijuana before opening the use of it so much more in the community.

Speaker: Dallin Young, CEO of Blue Water Government Affairs

Mr. Young said communities need more safe shops and the pop up shops need to be closed. There is an illicit market and this is one of the things a new ordinance on this topic is trying to address.

Mr. Lynch said he would like to see a community ad hoc to gather comments on this issue. The current ordinance was to provide medical marijuana for 5 years and now it is going to sunset. The County is creating a war chest. He would like to see the process slowed down and a determination made of what areas the new types of businesses could go in. We need to be on top of this. We can't stop it. There is one of these businesses currently down the street from his house. Mr. Lynch will be happy to head up an ad hoc committee if it is decided there is a need to create one.

Mr. Summers said is not happy. He was a paramedic for 30 plus years and he has seen the negative impacts of marijuana on youths. He would like to see these types of businesses kept out of the community. Pro cannabis representatives emphasis mitigation solutions. The program can be heavy regulated but criminals don't follow programs.

Mr. Stykel disagrees with Mr. Summers. He supports the policies as a way to reduce the influence of a black market on the community. He feels the cannabis facilities will deter criminal activity. He hasn't seen people smoke in the parking lots of these facilities. People don't smoke and leave but buy and leave. Marijuana businesses follow the business model created 4 to 5 years ago. They helped to create the laws.

Ms. Hopewell said she is not excited about more dispensaries. She is concerned this will open the door to more of them and possibly put them on Main Street.

Mr. Ensign said he was on a task force with Jim Piva when the RCPG looked at this issue 5 years go. There have been no problems with the cannabis facilities for 5 years. They use hydroponic growing grounds and recycled water. They are good businesses to work with.

Mr. Brean asked if there is any explanation regarding on site consumption? Will this be a lounge scenario?

Mr. Chase said it may be like a coffeeshop environment. They may be sobriety checks. It may be similar to a microbusiness like a winery. There can be different potencies of products on site.

Mr. Brean said he thinks on site consumption is too much, too fast. He is not ready for this in the community.

Mr. Stykel said he agrees with Mr. Brean and doesn't think Ramona is ready for onsite consumption.

Ms. Foster said she doesn't agree with onsite consumption. People are already smoking in places. She can't imagine going to the rodeo and smelling marijuana. She has concerns with companies coming in and growing 50 acres of marijuana at a time and the smell from that. She is not a fan of the smell. Plants will be pungent for the neighbors.

Mr. Chase said the new ordinance will address cultivation and retail sales. Cultivation may be done on a large scale. Hemp doesn't use THC, but it can be used for CBD.

Mr. Wallace lives close to the 3 businesses that are located in the M54 industrial areas. He feels caution should be exercised when expanding an industry.

Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Chase if he was aware of a hemp farm on Duraznitos Road?

Mr. Chase said he was not aware of one but he will check on it.

The Chair read the measure, which is open ended. Every option is on the table now. An ad hoc will gather ongoing feedback. There are more options and opportunities for the future.

7-E: Reconsideration of motion to approve Mahogany Mountain Winery, AD 20-020, at 12-17-20 RCPG meeting. Motion was, "To approve the project as presented," and it passed 12-0-0-3, with 3 members absent (Jim Cooper, Donna Myers, Kevin Wallace). The reconsideration request is from Mark Hutton who feels that the South Subcommittee and RCPG voted without complete information when considering the project. The motion for reconsideration needs to be made from someone who voted "yes" on the original motion. Should the motion for reconsideration pass, the project will be reviewed again by the South Subcommittee and the RCPG.

The Chair invited Mr. Hutton to make his presentation on why he feels the Mahogany Mountain Winery vote of approval should be reconsidered.

Speaker: Mark Hutton, Ramona Resident

I am a Mussey Grade resident and a member of the South subcommittee. I'm here tonight to ask you to request the County to return the Mahogany Mountain Winery project to us for reconsideration. The reason I'm asking for this is that the information we were given was incomplete and incorrect. Our project package mentioned a Code Violation Citation, but gave no details. I called Code Compliance twice in the first 2 weeks of December but my calls were not returned so I wasn't able to speak with anyone before the South meeting on December 15th. Ms.

Mansolf was able to find out that it had to do with a metal storage building that was converted into a wine production and wine tasting room without permits, but that's all we knew.

At the meeting the applicant, Mike Hargett, told us that the code enforcement violation had been taken care of a long time ago, and that he's been operating as a Boutique winery. After I listened to Mr. Hargett's presentation, I felt it wouldn't be fair to he and his family not to vote for approval in a case where they had done everything right according to the existing regulations in the Tiered Winery Ordinance. So based on the information available to us at the time, I made the motion to recommend that the RCPG recommend approval of the project.

But in January when I heard back from Planning and Development Services and Code Compliance, I got a completely different story. The code violation for operating without the proper permits had not been resolved. And so (as it was explained to me) the winery never met the requirements which would allow it to legally operate as a Boutique winery under the Tiered Winery Ordinance because the owners never got a building permit for a wine production area, or a tasting room.

I want to thank Tabina Tonekaboni, Brad Hernandez and Denise Russell for explaining what is required for a Boutique winery, and what permits the winery needed, but didn't have. PDS has agreed to return the project to us for review once the scoping letter is finished, but since the planning group already voted to recommend approval of the project, they need for you to request it. I ask that you vote to request that the Mahogany Mountain winery application for a Small Winery permit be returned to us so that the South subcommittee and the planning group can review it again. Thank you.

Denise Russell from Planning and Development Services said Board of Supervisors Policy I-1 governs planning groups. Reconsideration of a previous vote is permitted if pertinent new information is brought to the groups attention that had not been known at the time of the vote. If the thought was the code violation was part of the presentation when the project was voted on, then a revote of the project would be up to the discretion of the group.

Mr. Lynch said approval of the Final Administrative Permit was contingent on the resolution of the code violation. The code violation will be resolved when the Final Administrative Permit is approved.

Mr. Brean said he did not feel the code violation issue was new information. He was aware of the code violation at the time we looked at it. It was shown on the permit. He feels reconsiderations should be used carefully. He didn't want to see a County bureaucratic mess with the issue going back and forth.

Mr. Stykel said he feels this is a simple issue to resolve, and it will get resolved as part of the permit process. He gets the impression that there is a little of, "not in my backyard" going down on Mussey Grade.

Mr. Summers said when the project was voted on, the project was misrepresented. The foundation of the motion was to approve the project, but it was known the code violation issue would be resolved before final approval, so he feels the issue is mute.

MOTION: TO RECONSIDER THE MOTION MADE AT THE 12-17-20 MEETING REGARDING AD 20-020, MAHOGANY MOUNTAIN WINERY: “TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.”

Upon motion made by Dan Summers and seconded by Debbie Foster, the motion **failed 0-14-0-0-0-1**, with Dawn Perfect absent.

The Chair said that the RCPG was able to discuss the reconsideration issue. The proponent gave the information they felt justified a reconsideration of the previous approval. The motion to reconsider the project failed.

7-F: Discussion on road safety and traffic calming measures on the roads in the San Diego County Estates, to include discussion on enforcement, signage, speed bumps, sidewalks and other tools to make the roads safer for pedestrians and non-motorized traffic and to slow drivers down.

Mr. Lynch said Murali Pasumarthi from County Traffic Engineering will talk to the people from the SDCE contingency. He has talked to Mr. Pasumarthi and he will work with the SDCE people to let them know what things are allowable for traffic calming. He plans to keep this item on the agenda. They are reaching out to the SDCE HOA and other community groups.

Mr. Stykel said speed bumps divert water and there is water flow at SDCE. On Arena there was a devastating speed bump. Speed bumps have to be carefully considered before they are installed.

Mr. Lynch said speed bumps are often the first thing to be considered, but other things such as signage and paint can be better solutions.

7-G: Discussion on Kelly Avenue paving carried over from the 11-5-20 meeting, to include discussion on enforcement, signage, speed bumps and consideration of possible additional options for improving the current situation on Kelly Avenue

Mr. Lynch said no one came to the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee on the Kelly Avenue issue.

Speaker: Vicky Winter, Ramona Resident

Ms. Winter said the Kelly Avenue people need more time to organize their efforts. She likes what SDCE is doing for traffic calming. She doesn't want to carry the item on the agenda. She asked the item please be tabled for now. She is working a lot now and she needs to distribute information to the neighbors to help get things organized.

Mr. Lynch said he will always put the item back on the agenda when she is ready.

7-H: Discussion of an additional route, Equestrian Trail, to connect Hanson Lane to Warnock to alleviate traffic congestion in the vicinity of Hanson Lane. Consideration of again requesting the County to do a GPA so that a feasibility study can be done in the future (originally requested 8-2-18)

Mr. Lynch said this item has been on past agendas. A letter was written and sent by the RCPG to the County on this issue in August of 2018. Mr. Brennecke asked him to put this item back on

the agenda. Mr. Lynch is following up with the County and he will know more once he has the information from the County.

7-I: Update on invitations to SANDAG voting members

Mr. Summers said letters were sent to SANDAG voting members to request talking to them about SR 67 improvements. The letters were sent during the election, and after the election people were setting up their new offices, so there have been only 3 responses. RSRS voted at their last meeting to recontact them to discuss the SR 67 improvement project.

7-J: Add RSRS as a stakeholder on the development of entryway from SR 67 to the Mt. Woodson parking lot.

Mr. Summers said RSRS discussed that the entryway to the Mt. Woodson parking lot off of SR 67 is of interest to the RSRS Subcommittee and they should be stakeholders. They were surprised to learn that a plot plan and a traffic plan are already in place. Mr. Summers wants discussion on this issue in the future.

7-K: Discuss progress on SR 67 scoping process

Mr. Summer reported that Mr. Canton said there have been a variety of responses received during the SR 67 scoping process. Those comments are being taken into the record. Mr. Canton gave an update on SR 67 paving. The project will be from Maplevue to Ramona. Caltrans is willing to come and give us an update.

L. Discussion of Board of Supervisors consideration of a proposal on 1-26-21 to develop a Needle Exchange Program, reversing a 23 year old ban. Supervisor Anderson requests Community Planning Group recommendations and official stance on proposal.

The Chair said the Board of Supervisors wants community feedback on having Needle Exchange Programs (NEP) in the County. An NEP is a tool to help with substance abuse. We are land use – how do we want this to be done if it were in our community? Would we want this in a store front? What parameters would we want? County staff is developing the Ordinance for a Needle Exchange Program and any feedback will be helpful. An NEP will reduce cases of HIV and Hepatitis C. Supervisor Anderson would like a letter from the RCPG on this issue by tomorrow (March 5, 2021)

Mr. Stykel said he felt things like an NEP should stay in Los Angeles and San Francisco and not be in Ramona.

Mr. Summers said Supervisor Anderson sent out documentation from Nathan Fletcher, and the information sounded good. It showed the statistics for safe point client visits. Between 2017 and 2018, there were over 2,000 more visits. Programs like this act like a magnet and bring in more drug use.

Mr. Lynch said he had a family member who had some problems with substance abuse. Some people can exercise control over our bodies, but not everyone. Entities like an NEP can provide access and get people who need it coached into treatment. It is a resolution. We would not want it on Main Street. These programs are tied to treatment programs, such as Health and Human

Services, that can help with the problem. People won't drive here for this program, but it gives people safe access to a level of health care for this issue.

Mr. Stykel has been in Ramona since the 70's and he knows people under the bridge. Twenty percent of the needles are not brought back for these programs. This program endangers people. He doesn't agree with an NEP in Ramona.

Mr. Ensign asked if an NEP could go into a medical facility? People can get counseling in a medical facility. We can't turn our backs on this. Will it be on banners? What are the parameters?

Mr. Brean said that Supervisor Anderson has concerns that there will be a disproportionate number of these facilities in his district. He feels they should be equally distributed throughout the County. This use is not residential but industrial. It would need to be in the right place and not on Main Street, or in a commercial area.

Ms. Rains said medical equipment should be used at a medical facility.

Mr. Noyas is concerned with putting an NEP in a rural area. Three or 4 years ago, Ramona became a marijuana gateway. Now we are talking about an NEP.

Ms. Foster said she doesn't know of a place in Ramona where people can get rid of needles. She has a dog that requires medication administered with a needle.

Mr. Stykel said he worked on a job near an encampment, and the people in the encampment put needles sticking out of the ground to stick people coming into the encampment.

Mr. Rains said he agrees with NEP's being done at a medical facility, as a medical program.

Mr. Stykel made a motion:

MOTION: TO NOT ALLOW AN NEP IN RAMONA IN ANY FORM, MEDICAL OR RECREATIONAL; BY A SCHOOL, RESIDENTIAL AND/OR COMMERCIAL AREA. THERE ARE ISSUES ATTACHED TO AN NEP THAT WE DON'T WANT TO IMPORT TO RAMONA.

(Discussion on the motion)

Mr. Summers said he dealt with the drug abuse lifestyle for 32 years in his career. The lifestyle is not compatible with a job but with burglary and assault. He doesn't want to see this imported to Ramona.

Mr. Lynch called a point of order and said the agenda item does not fit the motion. The County is looking for feedback on the program.

The Chair said the County wants feedback.

Mr. Lynch feels that the County is asking if we support a program or do not support a program.

Mr. Noyas said this use should be at a medical facility. Some people use needles because they are diabetic. Where can they dispose of the needles they use?

Mr. Stykel said the program is specific to heroin.

Mr. Summers said he doesn't think we are that far out of line. We don't want this in our community. We are being asked what we think about NEP issues.

Ms. Foster looked up the SS Mobile Unit Detox and they exchange one needle for one needle.

Mr. Stykel said 20 percent don't get turned in. He has been on jobs with extensive grading. Sometimes needles have to be removed from the ground if working by something like a clinic.

(Voting on the motion)

Upon motion made by Paul Stykel and seconded by Dan Summers, the motion **failed 1-14-0-0-0**, with Torry Brean, Scotty Ensign, Debbie Foster, Lynn Hopewell, Casey Lynch, Kristi Mansolf, Robin Joy Maxson, Elio Noyas, Dawn Perfect, Matt Rains, Michelle Rains, Andrew Simmons, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace voting no.

Mr. Lynch asked that the motion be included in the RCPG's letter to Supervisor Anderson. The timeline is short on input for this program. He wishes we had more information and time on this issue.

7-M: Discussion of General Plan Update to 3 Elements: Housing, Safety and new element Environmental Justice, feedback requested by Planning & Development Services. Item was a "Workshop" item at the Board of Supervisors meeting on 2-10-21 to provide direction to County staff at an early stage before staff return with the items for consideration by the Board in summer 2021.

Ms. Maxson announced there would be 3 separate webinars on each of the 3 elements, Housing, Safety and Environmental Justice. She asked Ms. Mansolf to send the information on the webinars out to the RCPG members. The information was just sent out on March 4 from the County.

ITEM 8: GROUP BUSINESS (Possible Action)

8-A: Annual County Training for Planning Group Members, and Biennial Ethics Training – Reminder

The Chair reminded everyone to complete their trainings and their Form 700's. The deadline for filing Form 700 is April 1.

8-B: DESIGN REVIEW REPORT (Ensign) – Update on Projects Reviewed

Mr. Ensign gave the Design Review report. For the Ramona Town Hall, there will be an ADA cleanup of the building. New screening, ramps and stairs will be installed. The ramps and stairs were approved, but the applicant will be coming back to discuss the screening. There will be a new boutique uptown, called Uptown Boutique. They attended the DRB meeting for the color change to the building and the signs. They will be repainting the building to match the building next door. Their proposal for the signs and color were approved. Reds, Whites and Brews also

came to the DRB. Mr. Ensign reminded the RCPG members that there are still 2 open seats on the DRB.

8-C: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

8-C-1: Concerns from Members

Mr. Lynch said representatives were selected from the RMWD for working with the various community groups around town, and Jim Piva is the representative between the RMWD and the RCPG. Mr. Piva would like to work with the RCPG on finally getting the emergency evacuation route through the Ramona Grasslands.

Mr. Lynch would like to see a cannabis ad hoc. He would be happy to lead it.

Ms. Maxson said they can form an ad hoc for the cannabis issue. She would appoint Casey Lynch as chair of the ad hoc. She asked for interested RCPG members to serve on the committee and Michelle Rains and Lynn Hopewell volunteered.

8-C-2: Future Agenda Item Requests

Ms. Mansolf said the Spirit of Joy Lutheran Church will be on the next agenda.

**8-C-3: Addition and Confirmation of New/Continuing Subcommittee Members –
*None brought forward***

8-D: Meeting Updates

8-D-1: Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and TAC Meetings

The Chair said the RCPG received the TAC agenda, and there are no Ramona items on it.

No additional information was brought forward on Board of Supervisors or Planning Commission meetings.

8-D-2: Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 4-1-21, Format to be Determined

ITEM 9: 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.