



Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting Minutes

September 3, 2014

Attendees: Jon Becker, Thom Clark, Bill Dumka, Stephen Egbert, Steve Gore, John Keating, Ruth Loucks, Darren Parker, Jeanine Politte, Keith Rhodes, Ramesses Surban, Melinda Vasquez (12)
Brian Reschke & Brooke Whalen (appointed and seated for remainder of meeting) (+2)

Absent: Bill Diehl, Mike Shoecraft, Rod Simmons; Appointed 9/3/14: Jack McGuire

Community Members & Guests (Voluntary Sign-in): Julie Islitzer, Laura Cutchall, Juanita Hawkins, Teddy Luszoz, Carole DeBruin, Ellen Vasquez, Dana Gibson, Pam Blackwill, Dale Politte, Ronson Kung, David Ozeck, Dan Christensen, David & Maxine Graves, Jon & Sarah Garro, Katie Juronski, Khalil Hindi, Todd Derbique, Katy McClelland, Geoff Patrick

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm at the Doubletree Golf Resort located at 14455 Peñasquitos Drive, San Diego, California 92129. A Quorum was present.
2. Agenda Modifications:
Clark said, Robin Madaffer (Kilroy's representative) requested that the Torrey Meadows Bridge update be removed from the agenda; they would like a rep from Caltrans present for the presentation. Clark has tentatively scheduled the item for October or November agendas.
Motion: To remove the Torrey Meadows Bridge Update (information item) from the agenda. M/S/C – Clark/Surban/Approved, 11 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 25, 2014
Motion: To approve the July 25, 2014 Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting minutes as corrected. M/S/C - Politte/Loucks/Approved, 6 in favor – 0 against – 5 abstentions (Vasquez, Parker, Dumka, Clark, Politte).
4. Public Safety Agencies: not present
5. Public Forum:
 - a. Morri Chowaike, Torrey Santa Fe HOA President, concerned that the property next to Intuit will be used for staging by SDG&E, a 2 year project to install the new Sycamore-Peñasquitos 230-kV Transmission Line. He prefers that the Torrey Meadows Bridge be completed so the residents have another way out of their neighborhood.
 - Politte inquired if there were any problems with the recent SDG&E staging at the site? Chowaike noted, that the other project was for approximately 6 months and most of the traffic was during the day, but there was evening activity at the site.
 - Keating noted that this location is convenient to SR-56 and that SDG&E won't wait until the bridge is completed. If there is no other location to stage the project, what impacts will be most concerning to the Torrey Santa Fe residents? Chowaike noted that traffic during peak commuting periods, AM and PM; 1600 people (residents and Intuit employees) will be going in and out on one road.
 - Clark noted, the SDG&E project will include road closures, detours, 5 staging areas in Rancho Peñasquitos, and the use of a helicopter. He plans to report on the recent scoping meeting during his Chair's report, adding that he would like the project to

come to RPPB for review and a recommendation.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION ITEMS:

- a. San Diego City Development Services Dept. Report – Michael Prinz, not present
- b. San Diego City Council Member Mark Kersey, District 5 Report – Garrett Hager
 - Council will be back in session the week after next.
 - Sidewalk assessments are more than half way complete; preliminary results will be available on Sept. 16, 2014.
 - Ribbon cutting ceremony for the Ted Williams Pedestrian Bridge at Shoal Creek is Sept. 4, 2014.
 - Free Rancho Peñasquitos Community Clean Up event is scheduled for Saturday, September 27th from 8am – 1pm at 9410 Fairgrove Lane (YMCA); for all things that can't be thrown away in your trash. More information will be emailed out shortly.
 - Wildfires – SDFD is looking for volunteers to go door-to-door to give out Wildfire safety and brush management information. Training will be at the Scripps Ranch Rec Center.
 - Becker asked if the information would go out to the Fire Safe Councils because they have large distribution lists? Hager said, yes.
 - Politte recommended that Volunteers have name tags that identify them as an SDFD & community representative.
- c. San Diego City Council Member Lorie Zapf, District 6 Report – Conrad Wear, not present
- d. San Diego County Supervisor Dave Roberts, District 3 Report – Tighe Jaffe, not present
- e. 77th Assembly District, Member Brian Maienschein's Office Report – Michael Lieberman
 - Assembly Member Maienschein will be at the Pedestrian Bridge ribbon cutting ceremony tomorrow.
 - Legislative Session just ended. Assembly Member Maienschein has 4 bills that have been signed by the Governor and more are awaiting his signature.
 - Del Mar Mesa Preserve meetings – there are still some significant concerns. Assembly Member Maienschein and Senator Marty Block are sending a joint letter to the Director of CA Fish and Wildlife to get his buy in on the plan being proposed.
 - Becker thanked Lieberman for spearheading the meeting(s) and noted the connections for mountain biking community. Hopefully the connection will tie in to Merge 56 project. It was suggested that residents contact Lieberman with concerns about trails/connections from the Del Mar Mesa Preserve into the community.
- f. 52nd District, U.S. Congressman Scott Peters' Office Report – Hugo Carmona, not present

7. BUSINESS.

- a. **Board Member Appointments** – Thom Clark/RPPB (Action Item)
 - Clark reported that he has 4 appointments to make tonight, but no applications have been received for Rancho Peñasquitos District 8.
 - 1) **BMR #2** – Clark nominated McGuire for the BMR #2 seat, application was received. Clark added that McGuire was present during the LUC meeting tonight, but had to leave due to a family emergency. Brief discussion about voting on the appointment in his absence.
 - It was noted that our bylaws do not restrict us from approving an appointment if

applicant is absent.

- Politte noted that she was comfortable voting on the appointment in his absence because he had previously attended and spoke on BMR issues at an RPPB meeting. He is involved in his HOA and is very knowledgeable.

Motion: To approve the appointment of Jack McGuire to the BMR seat #2 for the remainder of the 2014-2016 term. M/S/C – Clark/Politte/Approved, 11 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- 2) **Renter-At-Large** – Clark nominated Brian Reschke to fill the Renter-At-Large vacancy; application was received.

Motion: To approve the appointment of Brian Reschke to the Renter-At-Large seat for the remainder of the 2014-2016 term. M/S/C – Clark/Vasquez/Discussion.

- Politte asked that the vote be postponed so an additional applicant, who expressed interest in the seat and is presently on vacation, could submit her application. There are potentially 2 candidates who should be given an opportunity to tell us why they want to be on the board so we can make a decision based on their reasons.
- Vasquez said she was in agreement with motion noting that Reschke told her back in May that he was interested in the seat, he has submitted his application and is in attendance. She added, that she strongly recommends that we approve the motion and fill the seat tonight.
- Surban asked if the applicants have met the attendance requirement?
 - Politte noted that there is no attendance requirement for an appointment or to fill a vacancy; an eligible candidate for election must attend 3 meetings in the year prior to the election.
 - Reschke noted that this was his first meeting.
 - Politte was unsure if other applicant has ever attended a meeting.
- Vasquez said that it would be different if the other applicant had actually applied and submitted an application.
 - Politte restated that the applicant has been on vacation and she was trying to give the applicant the benefit of the doubt.
 - Vasquez stated that she thought she had the floor, adding that it would be different if the other applicant had already submitted an application to express her interest and provided an explanation for her absence. We have a viable candidate and the appointment should go to the one who is in attendance.
- Surban asked if there was an urgency?
- Rhodes asked if Clark wanted to change his motion?
 - Clark said he was not changing his motion, he appointed Reschke and wants it to go to a vote.
- Becker concurred that there is no sense of urgency and called for the vote.
- Egbert requested to hear from Reschke, why he is interested in being on the board.
- Reschke noted that he has lived in Rancho Peñasquitos all but 3 years of his life. He attended Canyon View and Sunset Hills Elementary Schools, Black Mtn. Middle School, Mt. Carmel High School and is an SDSU Alum. He has been a real estate broker since 2004. He is interested in PQ and making sure that what is moving forward with our planning is in the interest of what he thinks his clients

- and others he deals with would want, a safe and clean community.
- Rhodes asked Reschke if he was opposed to any particular project before RPPB at this time?
 - Reschke replied that he hasn't heard any arguments for or against any project yet. For those arguments against a project, he thinks there should be better solutions to the projects that people have objections to. He noted, he has a personal opinion on the projects, and is not opposed to any specific project. In regards to the Doubletree, there should be negotiation on what is proposed.
- Rhodes asked, is there an urgency to fill the seat this month?
- Egbert inquired, where Reschke lives; in District 1 (The Glens).
- Surban asked if Reschke would be active and participate on board committees?
 - Reschke noted his interest in participation.
- With no further discussion, Clark called for a vote on the motion.

Motion: To approve the appointment of Brian Reschke to the Renter-At-Large seat for the remainder of the 2014-2016 term. M/S/C – Clark/Vasquez/Approved, 7 in favor – 4 against (Politte, Becker, Rhodes, Surban) – 0 abstentions.

- Politte noted that she was not against the appointment of Reschke. She only wanted to give both interested parties an opportunity to be appointed. The others who voted against the motion agreed.
 - Clark invited Reschke to take his seat.
- 3) **Town Council Rep**, Appointed by the Organization – Clark noted that he had received a letter from Melinda Vasquez, President of the Town Council appointing Kate Glenn to fill the vacant seat. Glenn was not present and Vasquez said that she had not been informed of the absence and apologized. Clark did not know why she wasn't present either and chose not to make a motion to accept the appointment.
- 4) **TH #2** – Clark nominated Brooke Whalen to fill the vacant TH seat; application was received.

Motion: To approve the appointment of Brooke Whalen to the TH #2 seat for the remainder of the 2014-2016 term. M/S/C – Clark/Surban/Discussion.

- Clark invited Whalen to tell us why she wanted to be on the board.
- Whalen said that she recently moved to the Torrey Highlands community. She would like to sit on the board because she has great interest in creating pedestrian, bike, and open space areas for people to gather. She knows there are a lot of new projects going into the Torrey Highlands area and wants to help shape them. She is a landscape architect.
- Becker asked if she would be interested in participating on RPPB committees?
 - Whalen said, yes.
- Keating noted that there have been members who were interested in just one project and once the project was no longer before the board, they resigned. He asked, what was motivating her to join the board?
 - Whalen said, she wanted to learn more about the process. Her experience is working on the planning side in an office and wants to truly understand the whole process; no specific project was of concern, she wants to help create a great community.
- With no further discussion, Clark called for the vote.

Motion: To approve the appointment of Brooke Whalen to the TH #2 seat for the remainder of the 2014-2016 term. M/S/C – Clark/Surban/Approved, 12 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- Clark invited Whalen to take her seat and welcomed the new members to the board.
- Clark said we received a copy of Rod Simmons' eCOW completion. He noted that each appointee would need to take the eCOW training in the next 60 days to be indemnified per Council Policy 600-24. Politte will email the information.
- b. **Doubletree Resort Update** – Damon Gascon, Lewis Operating Corporation (Information Item)
 - Gascon reported that the Lewis Operating Corp has been working with the Doubletree hotel owners and golf course owners on repurposing the golf course. They have been doing their due diligence over the last 45 days or so. Golfers will have noticed the backhoes and drilling rigs over the last couple of weeks. They have been taking soil samples and should have the analysis back in the next couple weeks. With the analysis in hand, they should have a better idea of any issues they may face with the land after 40+ years as a golf course.

He noted, the RPPB Ad-Hoc Committee will be confirmed and members appointed tonight. He added, the committee will hold monthly meetings to look at repurposing the golf course land, the opportunities and constraints, narrowing down a concept they can bring before RPPB for approval to move on to the next step {Community Plan Amendment Initiation}.

The 1st meeting of the committee will be on September 16th and the meetings will be open to the public. Gascon said, they look forward to working with the committee and all community members on a solution.

Gascon noted, they should have an update on the Golf Course Closure Plan at the October RPPB meeting.
 - Becker noted Gascon's comments about the soil analysis and studies, asking for his observations on other analysis that will be done.
 - Gascon replied, studies would include environmental, archeological, utilities, and traffic. They are looking at all impacts that could be created by repurposing the golf course. They found a couple of surprises, new opportunities, for future development.
 - Rhodes noted that the previous owner had ingress/egress issues with their proposal and asked if they are looking at other options.
 - Gascon said they will explore all opportunities and study the issues fresh.
 - Vasquez asked what alternative uses are being explored?
 - Gascon replied, they will look at all viable uses and remove those that won't work from the list. With community input, they hope to come up with a solution and possibly some ideas they have not explored yet. He would not offer his opinions or ideas at this time.
 - Becker asked if they are collaborating with the hotel to provide a viable ingress/egress solution?
 - Gascon said they will potentially look at all options. He said that the hotel ownership and the golf course ownership are working together, adding that the hotel has a vested interest in a solution.

- Loucks inquired when the Ad-Hoc Committee would meet and where?
 - Gascon noted the 1st meeting would be on Tues. Sept. 16th at 7:00pm at the Doubletree. A room would be assigned shortly and would change dependent on the anticipated size of community members participating.
 - Politte confirmed that the meetings would be the 3rd Tuesday of each month. All email addresses on RPPB's distribution list will receive the meeting announcements/agendas. Community members can forward the emails message and people not on our list can request to be added.
- Clark asked for an update on the renovations.
 - Gascon said there is a delay and they aren't starting in September as planned; new date is unknown. They have discovered issues related to ADA access. The City is requiring they upgrade for their permits. There are additional expenses associated with the ADA improvements that they had not planned on and should have more info by the next RPPB meeting.
- Keith Nyberg asked if they had found any surprises during their testing?
 - Gascon noted that they found a second storm drain they were unaware of.
- Touraj Momeni asked what is the limiting factor that would keep them from changing the use?
 - Gascon replied, an example would be finding environmental hazardous waste on the site that would be costly to mitigate, but he doesn't believe they'll find anything that severe. Nothing has been identified as of yet. There are two projects: 1) The hotel is applying for renovation permits and 2) The golf course owners will eventually request the approval of a Community Plan Amendment Initiation from RPPB to repurpose and develop the golf course land.
- Pam Logemann inquired about the golf course closure plan and what is preventing them from having the plan in place? Additionally, will the course still close per their June 25th presentation stating 6-12 months which technically could be 4 -10 months from now?
 - Gascon replied, the Lewis Corp. is getting the preliminary steps of studying soils completed, and the closure plan is dependent on the studies?
 - Logemann said, she would like them to present a closure plan.
 - Gascon replied, they are still identifying a portion of the course that would be maintained as part of the hotel, in an irrigated fashion with use agreements, but they haven't finalized those concepts to delineate which areas would be used and maintained by the hotel.
 - Logemann asked if setting up the ad-hoc committee might be jumping the gun before they know what portions might be developed?
 - Gascon said that the 6-12 month range stated in June will not change, they just don't have a specific date right now; potentially at the next RPPB meeting.
- Clark asked if there is be a linkage between the closure plan and concepts of future development. What comes out of the committee work and the initiation, could affect the closure plan?
 - Gascon said that the golf course ownership could deed portions of the course to the hotel; specific area they are looking at is the level, grassy area with the water feature behind the hotel could be deeded to the hotel and used for events.
- Melanie Rodriguez shared her concern that during this lengthy process from the closure until development begins, would the grass/landscaping be allowed to die?

- Gascon said that specific maintenance issues of the course would be a part of their plan.
- Joe Pierzia requested clarification that the portion of the course nearest the hotel would probably be irrigated and maintained, but the other areas would not be maintained?
 - Gascon said, that was correct.
- Vasquez asked, what ideas do the owners have for the land?
 - Gascon said he has some ideas and he added that the owners of the golf course are different than the owners of the hotel. There is a relationship between the two. The owners of the golf course are going to close the course, what they are trying to do is determine a use for the land. He clarified that the hotel owners are interested in a specific area of the golf course land for the hotel's use; nothing has been finalized.
- Touraj Momeni noted the visibility and affordability of the Oaks North Golf Course in Rancho Bernardo, there are 3-9 hole golf courses, suggesting that they should consider maintaining the course as a good, affordable golf course.
 - Gascon, said the course will be closed.
 - Momeni asked if the golf course is grandfathered?
 - Becker clarified, that the Community Plan does make recommendations for the golf course land. What they are hoping to do is come up with a concept that would be acceptable and then request to initiate an amendment to the Community Plan that would change the use of the golf course land.
- Janis Marcello expressed concern that if not maintained, the golf course could become a fire hazard. Additionally, the previous owners had proposed housing on the golf course land; is that a possibility?
 - Gascon noted that remedies related to fire hazard and maintenance will be integrated into the closure plan.
 - Marcello said that no one is maintaining the existing trees on the golf course near the townhomes which are already dead.
 - Gascon added that apartments could be a possible use and the committee will discuss all potential uses.
 - Marcello noted that the neighbors didn't want homes (residential uses) when the previous owners tried to change the use of the golf course; traffic is an issue.
- Freada Hindi said her neighbors and community homeowners are concerned with what will happen in their backyard referencing the lack of irrigation, dead grass, etc.
 - Gascon said the course is currently being irrigated with potable water which is expensive. Would development increase water use? Gascon noted that would be part of the analysis. Would it limit the amount of development? City and State requirements could constrain the development or not.
- Geoff Patrick asked for clarification of the defined responsibilities in the golf course closure plan?
 - Gascon said that the Laurus Corp. and Lewis Corp. are defining the responsibilities in the closure plan, City requirements and code enforcement will define some of the closure plan elements such as but not limited to illegal dumping, brush management and fire safety.
- Clark closed the discussion due to time and invited everyone to attend the Ad-Hoc Committee Meetings.

- Clark asked one last question, if the owners of the golf course are different than the owners of the hotel as two separate business entities?
 - Gascon replied, yes.
- Vasquez asked Clark to restate the date, time, and location of the Ad-Hoc committee meeting.
 - Clark said that the information is on the back of tonight's agenda; Tuesday, Sept. 16, 2014 at 7:00pm. The meeting room at the Doubletree will be announced in the email sent out with the agenda.
- c. **Verizon WCF Emergency Generator, NDP and NUP Applications at 10985 Avenida Maria, PTS#370408** – Kerrigan Diehl/PlanCom Inc. (Action Item)
 - Parker reported on the Telecomm Committee meeting presentation. The location is at the water tower and the project is adding a 10Kw emergency backup generator and a 55 gallon fuel tank to an existing fenced in wireless facility; no new antennas or other equipment are being added. The nearest homes are approximately 300-500' away. The existing fence is 6' high. The generator is 8' high and the committee has recommended the Verizon fence be increased in height to 8' to fully enclose it. Note: the Verizon equipment enclosure is inside the water tower's enclosure which has a 6' high fence with barbed wire on the top.
 - Kerrigan Diehl added, the project will also install a 61 sq. ft concrete pad for the generator/fuel tank. The wireless facility installation went through a substantial conformance review last year for some technology upgrades and the site is owned by the City, leased to the carrier. She said that she doesn't have an issue with the higher chain link fencing proposed by the committee, it would match the height of the water tower fencing. She added, the top of the water tower fencing is barbed fencing. She reviewed previous power outages causing service outages, a reason for the added investment in existing facilities.
 - Clark asked if the generator would be tested?
 - K. Diehl said that the test cycles for 15 minutes every week during business hours. No one is on site to test.
 - Becker asked if the fuel would be diesel and stored on site? Noting the hillside location and adjacency to open space, he asked if fire safety issues have been reviewed/certified by SDFD that it is totally insulated in case of fire? Will the 8' fencing be acceptable per City code?
 - K. Diehl said, health and fire safety is addressed in their business plan and approved by SDFD. They install all shapes and sizes of fencing, adding that the requested 8' high fencing would technically be the same height as the perimeter fencing around the water tower inferring that it shouldn't be an issue in City review. She added, that she wasn't sure it should be around their full enclosure though but didn't mind doing so.
 - Clark asked if the water utilities fencing is 6' high chain link fence with angled, barbed wire section on the top?
 - K. Diehl said, yes.
 - Becker asked if there were any visual impacts to the public?
 - K. Diehl said, there are no visual impacts. The wireless facility is on the backside of the water tower.
 - Keating asked, what is the rationale for the 8' fence around their equipment?
 - Parker replied, prevention of vandalism or theft.

- Politte noted her concern due to a previous fire that ran up the hillside a few years ago. She said she was in favor of the 8' high fence recommendation.
 - K. Diehl said the fuel tank is double walled.
- Clark noted that it would be fire proof cabinet with a retention basin.
- Egbert asked if there would be any monitoring for leakage or the amount of fuel in the tank. Would they know if there was a problem?
 - K. Diehl said that technicians do visit the site regularly (once every 4-6 weeks). She does believe they have remote access to know if there is an issue.
- Reschke inquired if they had considered solar to power the generator?
 - K. Diehl said there would be enough fuel to power the generator for 3-4 days and solar is cost prohibitive on this site.
 - Reschke asked if they had done a noise study?
 - K. Diehl noted the closest home was approximately 400 feet away so a study was not required by the City.
- Ronson Kung asked if there was a containment slab to contain any leaks?
 - K. Diehl replied, yes.

Motion: To approve the Verizon WCF Emergency Generator, NDP and NUP Applications at 10985 Avenida Maria, PTS#370408 as presented with the following condition: the fence surrounding the Verizon equipment be increased to 8' in height. M/S/C – Parker/Surban/Approved, 13 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- d. **Verizon Santa Luz Sector Split MTX-54, Project No. 325857 (Evergreen Nursery) –** Monica Moretta, Swing/Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc. (Action Item)
- Parker reported for the Telecomm Committee. The project modifies an existing 60' mono-palm with 12 antennas, removing old antennas and replacing with new 4' and 6' antennas, adding some equipment, changing the chain link fencing to a wooden fence and increasing the height to 8' adjacent to the residential to mitigate noise. The committee is recommending that the applicant paint the antenna green, adding that a previous approval recommended the painting and it was not done. The committee also recommends that all broken or damaged fronds be replaced.
 - Monica Moretta said, the original installation was approved in 2004. The project is a modification, to replace 6 of the 12 antennas (2 per sector) to improve capacity. 3 antennas are 4' and 3 are 6' plus auxiliary equipment remote units in a prefab shelter. No accessibility or visual impacts. The applicant has notified neighbors and not received comments from staff or members of the public.
 - Loucks noted that Moretta mentioned a noise issue requirement, asking for clarification.
 - Moretta said that due to the of residential nearby, the City required a noise study be completed. It was recommended that they change to wooden fencing to lower noise impacts?
 - Politte noted her concern for the proximity of the 'residence' on site in the plans, adding that we called this out on a previous project and the plans were supposedly changed. It was her understanding that it was not being used as housing.
 - Moretta said, they asked the owner what the adjacent buildings were being used for and the owner told them it is used as a residence.
 - Politte said she would vote against the project due to the distance between the wireless and the housing. She added, the only reason she previously voted in

favor of the wireless projects (at Evergreen Nursery) was because we were told there were no residences on the site.

- Clark added, there is 53' between them.
- Clark inquired about the 8' high wooden fence.
 - Parker clarified, that only one area, facing the residence, is 8' and the rest is 6'.
 - Moretta said the wood is painted to match the
 - Clark noted that it would need repainting and could warp, wood fencing requires regular maintenance.
 - Moretta agreed.
- Surban asked if RF exposure studies were done and within acceptable tolerances?
 - Moretta said the City approved; it was studied and within requirements.
- Becker asked why the transformer isn't inside the enclosure; why is it not all enclosed within the fence?
 - Moretta said the meters are on the outside; equipment and cabinets that are accessed by Verizon technicians is on the inside of enclosure.
- Becker asked if they can install socks on antennas?
 - Moretta said they do not put socks on palms, only pines and broadleaf trees; antennas can be painted to match the fronds.
 - Becker noted that the committee recommends replacing the tattered or broken fronds, asking if they will replace any that get broken during installation?
 - Parker said that they don't usually replace broken or tattered fronds which is the reason for the committee's condition recommendation.
- Becker, noting the location inside the nursery, suggested they plant additional trees to screen the facility.
 - Moretta noted that the City required the existing trees for the original permit, which are alive and maintained.
 - Becker said he would like the applicant to add a couple more trees.
- Rhodes asked if the owner of the nursery can sell the live trees that are part of their approval by the City?
 - Moretta said the live trees are a condition on the applicant and the property owner; they can't be changed, altered or removed, and must be maintained.

Motion: To approve the Verizon Santa Luz Sector Split MTX-54, Project No. 325857 (Evergreen Nursery) as presented with the following condition: to paint the antennas green like they were originally suppose to. M/S/C – Parker/Vasquez/Discussion.

- Becker offered an amendment to the motion, to add 3-24" boxed Mexican Fan Palms. The amendment was accepted by Parker and Vasquez.
- With no further discussion, Clark called for a vote on the motion as amended.

Motion: To approve the Verizon Santa Luz Sector Split MTX-54, Project No. 325857 (Evergreen Nursery) as presented with the following conditions: to paint the antennas green like they were originally suppose to and add 3-24" boxed Mexican Fan Palms. M/S/C – Parker/Vasquez/Approved, 12 in favor – 1 against (Politte) – 0 abstentions.

- Moretta noted, the condition of the additional trees would be subject to approval by City planning; Becker confirmed, adding that they would need to go on the outside of the enclosure.

e. **RPPB Ad-Hoc Committees Formation, Approval of Guidelines (template and Doubletree), Member Appointments** – Thom Clark/RPPB (Action Item)

- Clark reported that he, Becker and Politte had previously met to review the ad-hoc committees and came up with some ideas to bring them into conformance with the CP 600-24 guidelines. Draft guidelines were prepared and emailed to everyone. Some of the issues pertained to the number of ad-hoc committees, need for members on each committee and the number cannot be a quorum of the full board. Attendance requirements would be the same as the RPPB bylaws and City staff would not participate on the committee but would be invited to attend and assist as needed.
- Politte noted that Ad-Hoc and Standing Committees are suppose to follow the Brown Act and CP 600-24; meetings are to be open to the public, be publicly noticed and provide agendas, ADA accessible. Initially, we sent a rough draft to Michael Prinz and he replied that we needed to follow CP 600-24 for those committees. Politte reported that when she and Clark met with Maureen Cohen and Damon Gascon over the summer, they thought the ad-hoc committee was their committee. So as we created the draft, we needed to be sure that the committee represented the community through RPPB, not the developer. We presently have four active ad-hoc committees with CPAI projects in the pipeline. We felt that the LUC had its hands full fitting them all onto the agenda and allowing enough time for discussions especially if they all needed to be on the same agenda due to deadlines. So we drafted the guidelines for the Doubletree Ad-Hoc Committee to take on the role of the LUC for this project only because they have not initiated a plan amendment yet. During the creation of ad-hoc committees, the chair would consider if there is a project ready to present, the number of projects in the pipeline, available board members to sit on the committee so that we are doing justice for the community and the community plan.
- Rhodes noted that if the committee has more than a quorum, then it becomes the full board. For clarification - We have to provide public notice of all meetings (full board, standing and ad-hoc committees)?
 - Clark said yes, 72 hours notice .
- Discussion of whether the RPPB members reviewing the PFFP must follow those requirements, if they could teleconference and whether they would need to take minutes.
 - Becker noted that PFFP probably didn't need to be listed as an Ad-Hoc Committee, it could be listed under Liaison Reports.
 - Clark said the PFFP review could be discussed via teleconference and would be listed under Liaison Reports.
- Politte said that Standing Committees (Land Use and Telecomm) must take and keep minutes of the meetings making them available upon request. Ad-Hoc Committees are not required to take minutes; Clark agreed. Politte added that she was planning to take minutes/notes of the Doubletree Ad-Hoc committee meetings because of the amount of community interest.
- Surban asked if he needed to provide the Secretary with his minutes?
 - Politte said he should keep them and make them available to anyone requesting copies.
- Clark said the CPC is currently working on the revision to the Administrative Guidelines for CP 600-24. We are trying to bring our committees into compliance;

noticing of meetings, set meeting location and Ad-Hoc committees are temporary, etc.

- Clark said, in regards to the Doubletree Ad-Hoc committee, Maureen Cohen and Damon Gascon had different timelines (between 6 and 12 months), so our draft guidelines list 11 months or initiation of a community plan amendment (whichever comes first) and the committee will end. It was clarified that they have not initiated yet. Then it will go to the LUC for review of a project.
- Rhodes noted that a committee like Merge 56 will last longer than 12 month.
- Politte read CP 600-24, under Ad-Hoc Committees (current version) as follows:
“Ad hoc subcommittee meetings are established for a finite period of time to review more focused issue areas and are disbanded following their review. While the Brown Act does not impose requirements upon ad hoc subcommittees when made up entirely of members of the planning group and constituting less than a quorum of the planning group (Brown Act section 54952), this Policy requires all subcommittee meetings be noticed and open to the public by inclusion of the meeting announcement on a regular meeting agenda by an electronic notice, or by announcement at a regular planning group meeting.”
- Clark noted that we went with 11 months or an initiation for the Doubletree Ad-Hoc Committee; Rhodes said that it will take 2 years from now before Rhodes Crossing is ready for an approval. Clark said that we needed to put a time on it. It was suggested that an Ad-Hoc committee could be extended by a vote of the full board.
- Clark said that there are 6 Ad-Hoc Committees that we could set up with a timeline (project dependent) and appoint members. He noted that he only received a couple responses to his email asking the board members which committee they wanted to sit on. He reviewed all the listed Ad-Hoc Committees adding that Santa Fe Summit II & III, Santa Fe Summit IV could come off the list. There is no activity on SFS II & III and Robin Madaffer informed him that Kilroy has pulled out of the Diocese Property (SFS IV). That leaves Merge 56, Rhodes Crossing, Black Mtn. Rd Reclassification and the Doubletree. Discussion on the number of committee members and the number of meetings to attend; some may not need more than a few members.
- Keating asked why we would set up a committee for the Doubletree when they haven't initiated? Politte said that the Doubletree wants to use the committee forum to explore potential uses with community participation; what the previous owners did with focus groups. Look at what works, doesn't work and narrow down their options. The committee would do the work of the land use committee as the Doubletree comes forward with an idea.
- Rhodes said that in 30 years, we have never done it this way. All projects have gone through the LUC for review.
- Gore said it seems like this would take up more time if the Ad-Hoc committees are meeting once a month. Politte said that each committee would be different; the Doubletree wanted to meet twice a month and we said no, one time per month.
- Egbert asked who was running the committee meetings; us, the community or the developer? Clark said the committees will be made up of RPPB members only, up to less than a quorum of the full board and they are our committees. Politte added that the Doubletree can meet on their own with the community beyond the committee's meetings; they want to use a large group for community input. The committee represents RPPB.

- Clark said that is not intended to generate more meetings for all of us. Last month, LUC started at 6:00pm with a full agenda and that could become an issue of time available for discussion on a specific project. The start time could fluctuate from month to month. We could go into next month with only the Doubletree on the agenda as an Ad-Hoc committee and all the others disbanded and just heard under LUC.
- Vasquez asked how many members want to sit on the Merge 56 committee; Becker, Shoecraft, Simmons, Gore.
- Surban asked if the role of LUC would shift to the ad-hoc committees for all the projects? Clark said that it could on specific projects, if needed. He added that Telecomm projects still go to the Telecomm committee before going before the full board.
- Rhodes said that he felt this would be too much, the LUC could meet longer or twice a month to accommodate all the projects. This gets away from what the LUC is suppose to do, this is the wrong direction and uncontrollable. One committee (LUC) creates more access for the public and less notification from us. He doesn't want to have to go to 6 separate meetings.
- Politte said that you wouldn't need to go to that many meetings. If we have that many projects coming before us at once, and LUC will need to have longer meetings or multiple meetings. We can't push the developers back 3 or 4 months if our agenda is so full and what if smaller projects come forward, we need to be able to accommodate all of them and allow for their presentation, discussion and community participation. The same board members attend the LUC meetings every month, we're just trying to divvy up some of this committee work.
- Rhodes said that when there is more interest in a specific project, more board members attend the LUC meetings and that's been okay. Politte agreed that it has never been a problem.
- Clark said that Rhodes made a good point but our Ad-hoc committees are not legit, so next month they will not exist. The projects will continue to go before LUC following Council Policy, but expect that the meetings may begin at 5:00pm or we could potentially schedule a second meeting to accommodate all the projects and the community's participation in the review process.
- Keating said that he somewhat agreed with Rhodes. We can remove the SFS II, II & IV projects from the list. Black Mtn. Rd. Reclassification is being forwarded by BMR per our request and will come to LUC when ready for a recommendation. That leaves two projects that should be on the agenda every month right now, Merge 56 and Rhodes Crossing. It seems like the Ad-Hoc Committee would be a good avenue for the Doubletree seeing there is a lot of community interest and they haven't initiated an amendment yet. It would be a waste of LUC time; use LUC for real projects.
- Politte said the reason we set up this committee like a LUC is because the committee will hear all the community input and all potential uses discussed during the process. If the developer has to go back to LUC for a recommendation that wastes everyone's time and the committee will be giving a presentation longer than the developer's presentation to get everyone up to speed.
- Keating added that we need to be nimble because the developer doesn't have to wait for us to render a recommendation before going to Planning Commission. We don't want to risk that.

- Becker suggested that a decision be made; one Ad-Hoc Committee for the Doubletree.
- Politte said that it would be nice to have at least 4 members, adding that there were over 300 community members in attendance when the previous ownership presented their plan. Politte said, the other members could attend the meeting and participate from the audience. Meeting will be on the 3rd Tuesday of the month.
- Egbert asked if the Ad-Hoc Committee would report to the LUC or the full board? Clark said they would report to the full board, not LUC.
- Question of whether it could be a Standing Committee; Politte said we would need to amend our Bylaws to add another standing committee. Doubletree is proposed to be an Ad-Hoc Committee.
- Clark noted the committee makeup: Politte (Chair), Shoecraft, Egbert and Politte asked that Diehl be appointed to the committee due to his previous interest in participating. Vasquez offered to be on the committee, but later declined due to another meeting.

Motion: To form the Ad-Hoc Committee for the Doubletree Resort with members Politte (Chair), Shoecraft, Egbert and Diehl for the term of 11 months or a CPA Initiation. M/S/C – Clark/Dumka/Approved, 14 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- Politte asked for a motion to approve the guidelines for the Ad-Hoc Committee? Brief discussion.

Motion: To accept the Doubletree Ad-Hoc Committee Guidelines as drafted. M/S/C – Becker/Surban/Approved, 14 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- Next month there will only be 1 Ad-Hoc Committee. All other previous Ad-Hoc Committees will go through the Land Use Committee (LUC).

NOTE: Politte commented that our earlier vote counts were incorrect. They should have been reported as the number listed in favor +1 (12 members were present until appointees were seated).

8. REPORTS.

a. Chair Report – Thom Clark

- Clark reported that he received letters from the City, notifying RPPB that the speed limit on Paseo Montalban (between Black Mtn. Rd. and Carmel Mtn. Rd.) will be lowered from 40 mph to 35 mph and another change will be on Paseo Montril between La Tortola and Cijon St. which is currently 25 mph, changing to 30 mph.
- He also received the Notices of Right to Appeal the Environmental Determination for Camino del Sur median and Carmel Valley Rd. medians for the Torrey Highlands Monuments; comments should be submitted by 9/2/14.
- SDG&E's Sycamore-Penasquitos 230-kV Transmission Line Project - Clark reported that he attended the Scoping meeting on Aug. 25th. 75% of the pole replacements are in Rancho Peñasquitos. They are finalizing the use of helicopters that will lift the poles into place. Referring to the site near his home, Clark said they are taking out the short 60' poles, replacing them with 100' metal pole structures;. There are 5 staging sites throughout the community. One of the pole sites is on school grounds. This project has significant impacts to our community including road closures/detours, helicopter transport of poles/structures over homes, etc.

- Parker noted that the staging site near Intuit is nowhere near where poles will be replaced.
- Rhodes said that if poles are running down the easement (north-south), they could come in and take out the poles by helicopter without too much trouble.
- Parker thought that Hilltop Park (adjacent dirt lot) would be a good location for staging.
- Rhodes noted they are going underground under Carmel Valley Rd., otherwise all is above ground.
- Clark said that helicopters lifting 100' poles over residences is a huge problem.
- Rhodes said that we had asked SDG&E to underground the lines when Sunrise Power Link was being planned.
- Gore said he found it interesting that the only area being undergrounded is near Santaluz.
- Clark said that this is similar to when RPPB sent a letter to the High Speed Rail Authority. There are similar type issues and impacts. What can we do?
- Politte asked if we made a motion when SDG&E came before us on the pole replacements previously? The group was unsure if we did or if SDG&E just presented to keep us in the loop.
- Clark impacts during a 2 year period of time, street closures, detours, helicopters, transporting equipment and materials.
- It was suggested that RPPB could authorize Clark to write a letter from RPPB on the impacts in our community.

Motion: To authorize the Chair to write a letter from RPPB to CPUC about the Sycamore-Penasquitos 230-kV Transmission Line Project expressing our concerns. M/S/C – Rhodes/Surban/Approved, 14 in favor – 0 against – 0 abstentions.

- Gore said the impact of helicopters, road closings and development are understandable, but would people be as concerned with those impacts if the power lines in their backyards were to be undergrounded? If SDG&E is going to improve the capacity with this effort, then SDG&E should put it underground to alleviate the long term impacts and the need to come back and put them underground later.
- Rhodes suggested the letter use bullet points, quick and sweet, so the comments get submitted during the comment period which ends September 16, 2014.
- Becker noted that there was push back in the inner-city neighborhoods to put the transformers underground. When RPPB wrote the letter on the Sunrise Power Link, we focused on undergrounding under Park Village Rd.
- Keating suggested the letter focus should be on permanent impacts – visual, noise, etc; not the temporary impacts of road closures/detours, helicopters, etc.
- Clark reported that the stop signs and crosswalks have been installed on Via Fiesta.
- CP 600-24 Update – The City could mandate that all CPG's update their bylaws. Those that have deviations from CP 600-24 may be required to bring their bylaws into conformance. Clark said he may be creating an Ad-Hoc committee to review our bylaws as the City approves the policy and administrative guidelines.
 - Politte said that she is keeping a list of possible changes to our bylaws and asked the members to email any suggestions to her to be added.
- Absences – Clark noted that we track attendance. Per our bylaws, if a member misses 3 consecutive or 4 meetings in the year between April and March, they could be

removed from the board by a vote of the members; there are no excused absences. Please notify Clark, Becker or Politte if you will be absent which helps us know if we'll have a quorum.

- Community Clean Up – Clark received a letter addressed to Stephen Egbert, thanking him for his efforts getting the word out on two community cleanups (focused on smaller collection areas/neighborhoods). They collected 14.75 tons of waste during the clean ups on August 7th and 21st.
- BMR Retail Center was approved with changes at the Planning Commission, 4-1.
- Clark noted that a corner of Merge 56 is within the Del Mar Mesa planning area, west of the Camino del Sur center line.

Clark noted that alignment of Camino del Sur has not been adjusted or changed, and is per the FUA plans voted on by the citizens of the City of San Diego in 1996 with the phase shift vote. The road is aligned the same as it was then. Based on that, we are saying that RPPB is the planning group that should hear and be the planning group to make a recommendation on Merge 56. Clark is planning to attend the DMM Planning Group meeting next week and is hoping that their board will be in agreement.

- Rhodes said that we need to address this, noting the usable part of the 20 acres was less because the footprint of road was on the property and needed to be considered; we need to look closely into the real history.
 - Becker said the boundaries are set for the subareas. He feels DMM planning group will support our decision; they want the road (Camino del Sur) to be completed also.
 - Clark noted that Gary Levitt will make a Merge 56 presentation to DMM planning group for information only. Their comments will be limited to the portion that falls within their planning area. The development is under RPPB's purview.
 - Politte noted, the slopes west of Camino del Sur that are in DMM planning area. She added that DMM planning board members have been pushing for trail connections and some groups complaining about the dead walling. Could they, these different groups, come back and say we want changes?
 - Rhodes said the environmental permits were already issued, they just don't toll with the map and they ran out.
 - Politte said that in the Cycle Reviews, the City is asking for adjustments to be made to the slopes down from the road. Will DMM planning group have a say in it?
 - Becker said that DMM planning group will have a say. With Liebermann's coordination, the trail connectivity issues are being addressed/reviewed by all parties (CA Fish & Wildlife, Mtn. Biking Assoc, DMM, RPPB and the federal agencies). The bike trails should be brought up to Camino del Sur's Bike lanes, to be determined, to complete the trail loop. DMM Planning Group members in those discussions are in support of the proposal.
 - Rhodes & Clark noted that RPPB should be the official planning group for the Merge 56 project.
- b. Vice-Chair Report – Jon Becker
- Meetings continue with the DMM planning group and agencies on the East – West Connection through DMM Preserve and a full loop on the mountain biking trails in the Natural Resources Management Plan is being formalized.

c. Secretary Report – Jeanine Politte

- Politte said that she has followed up with the 92127/92129 magazine to update our information and they have not responded.
- Khouli Residences are under construction; thinks there are issues with no full fencing, materials are out in the open, rebar is sticking up and scaffolding is up. Neighbors have had to scare off kids. Will continue talking with code enforcement on whether they are following their permits.
- RCF – No application is pending on the CA State website for the Del Diablo house.

d. Standing Committee Reports:

➤ Land Use (Ramesses Surban)

- Merge 56 - Surban reported on Levitt's presentation tonight during LUC. Levitt reviewed original entitlements and their intent to improve upon those entitlements.

Changes include:

- (i) Spreading out of the residential units, farther away from SR-56.
- (ii) Residential units include 2-3 story townhomes and detached homes, offered for sale.
- (iii) 47 affordable housing units (as rentals) above the fitness center
- (iv) 290,000 sf of office space
- (v) Parking structures to give a more urban feel
- (vi) Vertical height near SR-56 with sound attenuation
- (vii) Plaza element in the heart of the project, separating the single family/townhouse residences from the commercial
- (viii) 120 room hotel (new component)
- (ix) No increase in approved traffic volumes
- (x) Pulling road permits

Concerns:

- (i) School space available – PUSD is aware of the project
- (ii) Construction traffic – not on Sundance. Permit will restrict.
- (iii) Public Transit service – per Patricia, MTS has no plan to provide
- (iv) Camino del Sur (4 lanes) will follow the canyon, not filled.
- (v) Wildlife crossing/connection – hope for tunnel under Camino del Sur
 1. Rhodes said the wildlife will go down to southern portion of Rhodes Crossing near Vista Allegre.
 2. Becker said, he believed that RPPB removed that crossing years ago; will check.
 3. Rhodes added that City Biologist, Keith Greer, made sure that there was one. The Center for Biological Diversity agreed to the southern crossing location.
 4. Keating clarified that it would be located in the southern portion of the road, the area up by the Mobil gas station is closed off.
- (vi) Noise study
- (vii) Pedestrian traffic, students crossing the Carmel Mtn. Rd. bridge over SR-56. Are the sidewalks wide enough?
- (viii) Area just south of SR-56 was vacant and now shows a hotel and drug store. Previous issues with drainage/collection flows are now mitigated.
- (ix) Construction could commence in 2016/2017, completion within a year.

- Telecomm (Darren Parker)
 - Upcoming projects include an update to the Westview High School Verizon facility and the generator at the La Quinta Motel.
- e. Ad Hoc Committee Reports:
 - Doubletree Resort (Jeanine Politte)
 - Ad-Hoc Committee meeting will be Tuesday 9/16/14 at 7:00pm at the Doubletree (room TBD); agenda will be emailed. She would like to get a copy of the existing CUP for the property and reviewed the tentative agenda.
 - Santa Fe Summit II & III (Darren Parker) – no report
 - Santa Fe Summit IV (Thom Clark)
 - Clark said, Kilroy has backed out of their option to purchase the Diocese Property.
 - Rhodes said there is another buyer who may come forward.
 - Merge 56 Development (Jon Becker)
 - Becker reported that Merge 56 reps have agreed to attend an upcoming PV LMAD meeting to discuss re-vegetation of the slopes.
 - Rhodes Crossing (Jon Becker)
 - Rhodes reported, they plan to meet with neighbors before the next LUC meeting; will present some illustrations to show the improvements and distances (from existing residences) that they are proposing.
 - Black Mtn. Rd. Reclassification (John Keating)
 - Becker reported, initial traffic studies show minimal impacts through the corridor based on the SANDAG 2050 projections, but there will be some impacts felt near Twin Trails. The level of service will not be impacted too much. They also looked at cross sections (east-west) illustrating if the road was widened to the 6 lanes; there would be excessive grading, walls, etc. The formal submittal presentation to RPPB will be in October or November.
- f. Liaison and Organization Reports:
 - Black Mountain Open Space Park (Bill Diehl) – not present
 - Community Funds (Bill Diehl) – not present
 - MCAS Miramar Community Leaders Forum (Stephen Egbert) – no report
 - PQ Fire Safe Council (Mike Shoecraft)
 - In Shoecraft's absence, Politte read his report as follows:

We had a meeting 7/17. A little time was spend on Defensible Homes (Berkeley Homeowner Wildfire Assessment tool) and Defensible Space (Brush Management), stressing need for continued maintenance. Most of the meeting was on "Effective Fire Reporting for the WUI (Wildland-Urban Interface)".

Many of us go for walks in our community. Many walk their dogs daily. Either Penasquitos Canyon or Black Mountain are probably in view for part of these walks. While you are out on your walks, please keep in mind that a Wildfire could start at any moment, YOU are our Fire Watchers, our communities' EARLY WARNING SYSTEM. Volunteer Fire Watchers received instructions on the information 911 dispatchers need to save the Fire Department valuable time in responding to a Wildfire 911 call.

We will use our Twitter page, https://twitter.com/RP_FSC , to forward notices and instructions to our Volunteer Fire Watchers.

Next meeting is "Protect Your Home from Wildfires", 6:30 PM, Tues, 9 Sep, RP

Library, in conjunction with PERC. Learn how to assess the potential fire hazards in and around your home in about 15 minutes. Demonstration of the Berkeley Homeowner Wildfire Assessment Toolkit. Other informative free internet sites to help protect your home from wildfires.

- RP Town Council (Vacant)
 - Vasquez reported, the Town Council will co-host a PUSD candidate forum on 9/30/14 at the Ed Brown Center; all 8 candidates have agreed to attend.
 - Town Council may hold candidate forums for City Council District 6 and Congressional District 52; voting to approve the expense at next Town Council meeting.
- PQ Recreation Council (Steve Gore) – no report
- Los Pen Canyon Psv CAC (John Keating) – no report
- Park Village LMAD (Jon Becker)
 - Becker said the LMAD is close to finalizing the recycled water connections.
 - Looking at new projects.
- Peñasquitos East LMAD (Bill Diehl) – not present
- Torrey Highlands LMAD (Darren Parker)
 - Seabreeze (Merge 56) signage is up near the Mobile station on Camino del Sur.
- Transportation Agencies (John Keating)
 - Caltrans barriers are in separating the bike path from vehicle lanes on SR-56; the location is not where 5 cars have run off the road though. Caltrans has a 30 foot rule so those locations do not fit the rule.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanine Politte
RPPB Secretary

Approved 10/1/2014, 11 in favor – 0 against – 3 abstentions (McGuire, Shoecraft, Simmons).