

**County of San Diego
Ramona Community Planning Group
MEETING MINUTES**

June 2, 2022

Meeting was In Person

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

ITEM 1: Call to Order

ITEM 2: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3: ROLL CALL (~~Maxson, Chair~~) (Brean, Vice Chair)

In Attendance:	Torry Brean	Scotty Ensign	Debbie Foster
	Lynn Hopewell	Casey Lynch	Kristi Mansolf
	Elio Noyas	Dawn Perfect	Matt Rains
	Michelle Rains	Andrew Simmons	Dan Summers

Members Absent: Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel, Kevin Wallace

As the RCPG Chair, Robin Joy Maxson was absent, Mr. Brean would be chairing the meeting.

ITEM 4: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 5-5-22 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2022, MEETING, AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Elio Noyas, the motion **passed 10-0-2-3**, with Lynn Hopewell and Matt Rains abstaining, and Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 5: PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to Group on any subject matter within the Group’s jurisdiction that is not on posted agenda. (Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes)

Speaker: Bob Romeo, Ramona Resident

Mr. Romeo said he received a notice about the SDG&E Enersmart Battery Facility that is proposed to go in on Creelman Lane. About 40 battery facilities will be placed on the approximately 10 acre parcel. He feels they should pave the road. He has concerns about noise.

Ms. Mansolf said the RCPG recently received the project and did not have enough time to get on the June agenda, so the project will be on the July 7 RCPG meeting agenda. It will also go to a subcommittee prior to the RCPG meeting.

Mr. Romeo left his contact information so he could be notified of the meetings.

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

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

Upon motion made by Dawn Perfect and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 7: Consent Calendar:

7-A: Ratification and Continuance of Teleconferencing Meeting Option Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e).

In order to continue the teleconferencing meeting option, when needed, the following motion was made:

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE RATIFICATION AND CONTINUANCE OF THE TELECONFERENCING MEETING OPTION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e)

Upon motion made by Dawn Perfect and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 8: ACTION ITEMS:

8-A: Update from San Diego County Sheriff's Department - Ramona Substation for the community of Ramona

Lieutenant Vengler said he had no update to share with the RCPG.

Mr. Lynch asked about the status of the new Ramona Sheriff's Substation?

Lieutenant Vengler said, that regarding the new Ramona Sheriff's Substation to be built, if HHSA moves to the RICC, the open lot can be used for the Substation.

**8-B: TPM 21299, 3 Residential/Subdivision Lots Proposed. Scope of work is to subdivide a 4.22 acre lot into 3 parcels. All existing structures will remain and a pad with a driveway will be constructed on Parcel 2. The 2 existing houses will be accessed by 2 proposed separate driveways. 1512 Walnut Street.
Mansolf, West Subcommittee**

Kalani presented the project. They are proposing a lot split at 1512 Walnut Street. One 4 acre parcel will be split into 3 parcels. There will be 3 separate entry ways for each property owner to access their parcel. In the middle of the property is a road/turnaround that can be used for emergency vehicles. Currently there are 2 homes on the property. Each home will be on its own lot. One additional house will be developed and it will also have its own lot.

Mr. Lynch remembers that the flood zone doesn't show on the map, and there is no right of way dedication yet. It will get done to regulations. He doesn't like the idea of 3 driveways.

Ms. Mansolf gave the subcommittee report. The project was not voted on at the subcommittee because there was confusion on the number of access points to Walnut Street for the property.

The vote from the West Subcommittee was to wait until the RCPG meeting to further vet out the project details, and it failed. Then the applicant was unable to attend the May 5 meeting so the project was moved to the June meeting. It sounded like there was going to be the one access point in the middle of the property, or maybe 3 total access points, but after the meeting the County confirmed that there would be 3 access points, one to each house. Walnut Street is a County maintained road. Ms. Mansolf asked if the County had any standards in place about how far road access points can be apart along County maintained roads, and she was told there was no set distance in place.

Speaker: Stefani Reeder-Miller, Ramona Resident

Ms. Reeder-Miller said she does not like having 3 access points along Walnut Street. She also thinks 3 houses in that area will be too much.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Dan Summers, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

8-C: AD 22-009, Speckle Rock Vineyards, 16138 Highland Valley Rd., Escondido, Administrative Permit for 5 acres of clearing/grading to plant grapevines. Mansolf, West Subcommittee

Jason Crow was in attendance representing the project for Greg Perrin, the applicant.

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee meeting report. Mr. Perrin, and Mr. Bennett, the project architect, had attended the West Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Perrin said he had applied for an Administrative Permit for a small winery in 2016 on his 55 acre parcel. There are no structures on the property and no utilities. Currently he has several acres of grapes. Five to 7 acres of vegetation were cleared. The grapes are drip irrigated.

Mr. Perrin has been cited for clearing the vegetation on the property, and this is a new Administrative Permit for the property to remedy the violation. Although Mr. Perrin had applied for the Administrative Permit for the winery, he had not applied for any specific areas to be cleared to grow grapes. He had not been aware he had to do so as the property is in an agricultural area.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT FOR GRADING (AGRICULTURAL).

Upon motion made by Dawn Perfect and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-D: AD 16-023M1, Speckle Rock Vineyards, 16138 Highland Valley Rd., Escondido. Minor Deviation to proposed Hospitality Center. Square footage stays the same, but the 2nd story will be eliminated with square footage from the 2nd story transferring to cellar underground.
Mansolf, West Subcommittee**

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee meeting report. The original Administrative Permit for the property was submitted to the County in 2016 and approved in 2021. Due to COVID, the permit took 5 years to get approved. Everything for the original project will remain unchanged, except for the Hospitality Center. The applicant is requesting a minor deviation to change the building from a 2-story building to a 1-story building, and to put the additional square footage from the second story underground, like a cellar. The building square footage will remain the same. The project is 475 feet from the road and not visible from the road due to the topography.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINOR DEVIATION AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Matt Rains, the motion passed **12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-E: VAC-22-001 proposes the vacation of a 1.25-acre open space easement that was dedicated for the protection of biological resources. The open space easement is at the south end of a 78-acre property operated by the Young Life Oakbridge Camp under Major Use Permit 77-005W1 at 27224 Golden Eagle Road, Ramona, CA 92065 (APN 246-160-39-00). The open space easement has been converted to a vineyard and this action is also the subject of case number PDS2021-ENFGCO-000088 by Planning & Development Services' Codes Compliance Division. Owner/Applicant: Oaks Venture, LLC and Coffey Engineering, Inc.
Hopewell, East Subcommittee**

Robert Hingtgen, County Planner for the project, said that in late April VAC 22-001 came in as a violation case. The previous year some of the property had been converted to a vineyard. He has been looking at the existing Major use Permit (MUP) for the property and the allowed uses described within the MUP. The County also has been looking at previous impacts to the property and options for the future. The County scoping letter has not been done yet. The County needs to evaluate the project and make sure the MUP is current. The new owners acquired the site in 2019, which is 14 years after the Open Space Easement, that was recently disturbed, was placed over the property. It has been brought up that the Open Space Easement was cleared over the years, and the County is going through a process to figure everything out. There will be a new environmental review process, and the project will eventually go to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Hingtgen wanted to be clear that only 1 Open Space Easement is being considered for vacation and not 4.

Mr. Brean asked for the East Subcommittee report on the project.

Ms. Hopewell said the East Subcommittee voted against the Vacation of the Open Space Easement. There were concerns about the habitat that was disturbed.

Mr. Brean called on speakers for the project. Two speakers who had filled out speaker slips wanted to give their time to Essence Oyos. Mr. Brean said that this would be noted in the record, however, Ms. Oyos would still have 3 minutes to speak.

Speaker: Essence Oyos, Secretary of the Board of Directors, Mesa Grande Business Development Corporation, of the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians

Ms. Oyos said that there was a discrepancy in the project in naming the applicant. The property is no longer owned by non-profit Young Life Oakbridge; that is just who the Major Use Permit was granted through. The current owner is for-profit The Oak Ventures, LLC, owned by the proponents. Ms. Oyos is attending the meeting as a representative of the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians, who owns the Golden Eagle Ranch. The Band has great concerns over the impact of the violation of open space easement on biological, environmental, and archaeological resources in the Ballena Valley, on or to neighbors' access to their homes who live down Golden Eagle Road, and also the Golden Eagle Ranch. There are concerns that the other 3 Open Space Easements on the Oak Venture property have been violated, too. The Mesa Grande Band is concerned about those as well for the same biological, environmental and archaeological reasons. They are concerned that runoff from the property will impact and destroy Golden Eagle Road and negatively affect the Golden Eagle Ranch.

Speaker: Jim Quinn, Ramona Resident

Mr. Quinn said his family has property off of Golden Eagle Road. There was a lot of confusion with the information provided by the County on the project when the public notice went out. The neighbors did not know if the project would impact their access. The project at this point sounds like a code violation. If the remedy is to vacate the easement, why is the violation not being mitigated for? He is concerned with how the application is proceeding. He would like to see the current Major Use Permit reviewed if the project is to be changed. The Major Use Permit should be amended to fit the changes that occur. If the currently proposed uses do not conform with the existing Use Permit, then the applicant should reapply for a new Use Permit or an amendment to the existing Use Permit. It is a discretionary process to remedy what has occurred on the property. He thinks the vineyard that is there in the Open Space Easement looks good, but did this project go through the right process?

Speaker: Michelle Rains, Ramona Resident

Ms. Rains grew up and spent 30 years within close proximity to the Oaks Venture (for profit) property. In several areas of the Open Space preserve there were signs placed about 15-20 years

ago when the property was formally owned by the Oakbridge Young life organization (non profit). The signs stated habitat was sensitive and not to disturb or remove any vegetation in the area. The recent grading done by the Oaks raised concern as they removed the signs and started grading and planting in the area. Michelle was concerned also that the grading will have a negative impact and cause eroding and increase the flooding in the neighborhood's easement road. At the East Subcommittee it was stated by the current owners that the areas were always kept clear as required by the fire department. However, there are no structures within 100 feet requiring such clearing. Some comments made by the current owners were flat out false at the meeting such as there were no sensitive habitat signs in the area when they had started the grading. One of the reasons she ran for the RCPG was to see that some areas remain the same and delicate areas are protected and not destroyed.

Mr. Hingtgen said he appreciated the comments. Even though there was a change in ownership, the MUP stays with the property. Uses now are similar to what they were with Younglife Oakbridge. The County is looking at the other Open Space Easements on the property. A cultural expert will review the easements. There will be more time to provide outreach. One option is to vacate the Open Space Easement that has been violated. More options may be considered. The Open Space Easement was put into place for biological resources. Its function was for mitigation for the original MUP. When the project scoping letter is done, he will cc the RCPG. The County will be back for public review with whatever changes to the project are proposed.

Mr. Lynch said it is too early for the RCPG to see the project as we don't have all of the information. The owner is in a tough position. The easement is on the title report. Maybe the new owners did not seek professional advice. It will be hard to remedy what has been done. There is no narrative – we are in the dark and we need information from the County on the project. It is too preliminary to know what action to take. If this project were to come in today, there would be signs on a wire fence notifying people of the limitations of the area.

Mr. Hingtgen said we are in the beginning stages of the current project review.

Mr. Rains asked what is being asked of the RCPG? The land has been disturbed.

Mr. Hingtgen said there was a previous environmental document. The property had a wetland habitat. There will probably be a new environmental document coming out of the review process.

Ms. Mansolf said she would like to make a motion to send comments on the project.

Ms. Perfect asked Ms. Mansolf to read the comments that would be sent to the County.

Ms. Mansolf said there were so many comments. She preferred not to read them at this time, and she asked Mr. Lynch to please read some of her notes.

Mr. Lynch read a couple of the notes and Ms. Perfect asked what was different here than just having the information in the meeting minutes?

Ms. Mansolf said it provided the County with more focused documentation.

Ms. Hopewell said she would like the County to come back with all of the information.

Mr. Lynch said he would like the modified MUP to come back to us.

Ms. Rains said she has photos of the property from a long time ago if anyone should want to see them.

Mr. Noyas said that nothing would substantiate the work that has been done from the prior EIR.

Mr. Lynch said it is important to continue to hear from the public as the project moves forward.

MOTION: TO TABLE UNTIL WE HAVE ALL OF THE DOCUMENTATION.

Upon motion made by Lynn Hopewell and seconded by Matt Rains, the motion **failed 3-9-0-0-3**, with Torry Brean, Scotty Ensign, Debbie Foster, Casey Lynch, Kristi Mansolf, Elio Noyas, Dawn Perfect, Andrew Simmons and Dan Summers voting no, and Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS TO AID THE COUNTY AS THEY MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PROJECT.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the motion **passed 11-1-0-0-3**, with Dawn Perfect voting no, and Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

8-F: Discussion on Question and Answer Session with Ernie Bartley from the county about median closure at San Vicente Rd and Arena Dr, and potential plan B discussion based on previous community feedback Rains, Transportation/Trails Subcommittee

Mr. Rains said that they talked to Murali Pasumarthi at the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Pasumarthi took back the information to the County from the discussion. Something needs to be done at the San Vicente Road and Arena Drive intersection. Closure may not be a good solution. There used to be 300 vehicle trips in the morning, and now the traffic pattern has changed and there is less. This item will be back in the future. No action was taken.

Ms. Perfect said she felt this item should have been under other business as it was not an action item.

8-G: Review the Proposed Ordinance of the County of San Diego, California Adding Chapter 4 (Cannabis Business Tax) to Title 2, Division 2, of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances Establishing a Tax on Cannabis Business Activities within the County and Provide Feedback to the RCPG for Submittal to the Supervisors Office. Lynch, Cannabis Ad Hoc Committee

Mr. Lynch said the Sheriff's fee for a cannabis facility was \$49,000 a year. The annual fee for bars, in comparison, was \$900 a year. The tax goes to public services. We had heard the money was going to help with addiction prevention and related social services and now we are hearing the money is going to the General Fund. San Diego cannabis facility owners pay the highest tax rate in the State. They get no Federal deductions. They could also get charged a 15% to 20% tax rate at the County level. The businesses do see a profit of about \$280,000 if there are no additional taxes. Mr. Lynch said there are 4 items that he would like to be brought forward to the Supervisors before they take further action on this issue on June 14.

1. It is recommended the County review how other adult industries are taxed and provide fairness across the board.
2. The tax money received should go toward addiction treatment, or a similar use, as first promised, not to the General Fund.
3. We ask that the Sheriff's Department fee (\$49K) be reviewed for fairness, versus fees charged to bars and other adult industries.
4. Should an applicant/shop owner violate the law, we ask that their permit be revoked.

Mr. Summers said he would like to see a lid put on marijuana businesses in Ramona. Marijuana is a gateway drug. As a firefighter-paramedic for more than 30 years, Mr. Summers had responded to drug overdose emergencies where there was a connection to marijuana. He would like to see these businesses taxed out of business.

Ms. Foster said marijuana was supposed to be medicinal. People had to get a medical card to buy it.

Mr. Lynch said both medical and recreational uses are legal in California

MOTION: TO WRITE A RESPONSE TO SUPERVISOR ANDERSON WITH THE COMMENTS GENERATED TONIGHT.

Upon motion made by Casey Lynch and seconded by Michelle Rains, the motion **passed 10-2-0-0-3**, with Debbie Foster and Dan Summers voting no, and Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-H: Monthly update from Caltrans on status of State Route projects.
1. Progress on EIR report**

Mr. Summers gave the RSRS report. He said the EIR on the San Vicente Corridor Project is proceeding in a timely manner. Notices went out from Caltrans that comments from the public were due on the project at the end of June. He would like to see the public comment period extended to the end of July, as June 30 may not allow for enough time for people to review the information and comment on it.

MOTION: TO ASK FOR CALTRANS TO CONSIDER EXTENDING THE JUNE 30 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD DEADLINE FOR ANOTHER 30 DAYS.

Upon motion made by Dan Summers and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

2. Progress on repaving SR 67

The repaving SR 67 project from Lakeside to Ramona should be starting this month.

3. Progress on Clean California crosswalks and signal enhancements

The raised crosswalks in the business district are scheduled to be installed simultaneously with the repaving project.

4. Progress on “Welcome to Ramona” sign.

The “Welcome to Ramona” sign is working its way through the appropriate agencies.

**5. Progress on Mina De Oro
Summers, RSRS Subcommittee**

The Mina De Oro shoulder project is behind published schedule, but work is progressing.

**8-I: Potential impact of AB 1778
Summers, RSRS Subcommittee**

AB 1778 is working its way through the process. It will cut funding of highways in highly polluted areas and high poverty areas. It may impact the widening of SR 67, although Ramona has neither highly polluted areas or high poverty areas. He has tried to contact Christina Garcia’s office but they haven’t responded.

**8-J: Report on SVC Stakeholders Working Group Meeting on 4/28.
Summers, RSRS Subcommittee**

Mr. Summers and Ms. Maxson attended the meeting. Mr. Summers made it clear that safety and evacuation threats are not effectively addressed in the San Vicente Corridor Multimodal Plan.

He expressed appreciation for the work that has been done and the benefits proposed by the project.

**8-K: Supervisor Anderson requests the Ramona Community Planning Group support in recognition of the exclusion of Ramona youth from the SANDAG Youth Opportunity Pass Program as current bus service is insufficient to provide any program benefits for our community.’
Maxson/Rains**

Mr. Rains had prepared a powerpoint presentation as a handout on SANDAG’s Youth Opportunity Pass Program. SANDAG has a great program for youth, 18 and under, to ride the bus free until June, 2023. There are few bus routes in Ramona, and most of the bus schedule times favor commuters as they run hourly in the morning and late afternoon. This service is provided by NCTD in Ramona. MTS does have one or two bus routes that run once a week and goes through Ramona. NCTD only goes to Escondido from Ramona. If someone wants to go to Poway, they have to go to Escondido and catch a different bus, for MTS, which runs in Poway. We need more bus opportunities in Ramona for youth to be able to utilize the Youth Opportunity Pass Program. Mr. Rains has prepared a letter on this topic to Supervisor Anderson, and he asked the RCPG that this letter be approved to send.

Mr. Lynch said it is nice to have a program for youth.

MOTION: TO SEND THE LETTER, AS AMENDED, TO SUPERVISOR ANDERSON.

Upon motion made by Matt Rains and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

**8-L: Consideration of the RCPG sending a letter to the Board of Supervisors regarding quorums and majority votes (voting structure) of Planning Groups and Subcommittees
Summers**

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

The I-1 voting flaw that I described in my previous paper is a very subtle but has huge implications for the way the County has been doing business.

It is important to understand that it is not how meetings are conducted or how the voting is done, it is a question of interpreting the voting that has taken place.

This 8-vote rule is fine if all RCPG members are present for every meeting. When fewer than 15 show up, all the absentees, recusals, and abstentions become no votes that the proponent must overcome to prevail. There is no opportunity for a yes vote from these people because they are

absent or unwilling to vote. This makes for arbitrary and capricious results. In the example I cited last time, a minority of 2 prevailed over a majority of 7. According to Robert's Rules of Order, a plurality (minority) can never prevail over a majority. Effectively, absent members had their negative votes counted.

This is further compounded by the fact that the threshold becomes greater as more members are absent.

If this 8 vote rule is not in force a simple majority prevails, then my previous example becomes 5 absences and 1 recusal resulting in the majority carrying the day 7 to 2.

Every proponent has a right to expect equal access to each member of the RCPG for both a yes and a no response. Business must be conducted by the will of the majority and not by a unpredictable number of pocket no votes.

Mr. Summers presented a letter he wanted to send to Supervisor Anderson's office regarding voting structure. The Brown Act talks about the establishment of a quorum. In the Brown Act, a majority of a group is of the majority of the voting membership, not of those in attendance.

Mr. Lynch said the proponent has the option to take their item off of the table until 15 members are present. The Brown Act is State law. Mr. Lynch may provide a dissenting opinion.

Ms. Perfect said other legislative bodies operate the same way. The voters are accountable.

Mr. Brean agrees with the letter. We can go to approve the minutes with 8 members present, but if 1 member abstains, the vote fails.

Ms. Perfect said members can still vote to approve the minutes, even if they were absent.

Mr. Summers asked for the RCPG to approve sending his letter to Supervisor Anderson.

MOTION: TO SEND MR. SUMMERS' LETTER TO SUPERVISOR ANDERSON TO SEE IF THERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE WHO FEEL THIS WAY.

Upon motion made by Dan Summers and seconded by Lynn Hopewell, the motion **passed 8-4-0-0-3**, with Scotty Ensign, Casey Lynch, Kristi Mansolf and Dawn Perfect voting no, and Robin Joy Maxson, Paul Stykel and Kevin Wallace absent.

ITEM 9: OTHER BUSINESS (Possible Action)
9-A: Announcements and Correspondence Received

Ms. Mansolf gave an update on the Mt. Woodson Parking Lot project. The County is still in review with Caltrans for the final ICS (Intersection Control Evaluation). Project design is

nearing completion. They anticipate going to Board of Supervisors this Fall to bid the project this winter. The environmental document will be out for review later this year. They don't have a date yet. The County was planning on attending a Mt. Woodson ad hoc meeting on June 23 and the RCPG meeting on July 7. This was planned as far back as late March/early April. Ms. Mansolf has not yet received confirmation on these dates from Emily Hubbard, who replaced Marcus Lubich as project manager, but she hopes to hear from Ms. Hubbard soon.

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

Mr. Ensign said there was no Design Review Board meeting.

9-C: Discussion Items (Possible Action)

1. Concerns from Members

Ms. Perfect said she has concerns about agenda items being noted as action items on the agenda, when they are not action items.

2. Future Agenda Item Requests

Ms. Mansolf said the Ramona Skatepark project was going to be on the July 7, 2022, RCPG agenda for an update.

3. Addition and Confirmation of New/Continuing Subcommittee Members (*None brought forward*)

9-D: Meeting Updates

1. Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and TAC Meetings

Ms. Mansolf said there was going to be a TAC meeting on June 10, 2022, and there were no Ramona items on their agenda.

Mr. Summers said that LAFCO will be meeting to transfer EMS to the County Fire Authority, on the following Monday morning, June 6.

2. Future Group Meeting Dates – Next RCPG Meeting to be 7-7-22, Location/Format to be Determined

ITEM 10: 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.