



**MEETING MINUTES
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF MONO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Antelope Valley Community Center, 442 Mule Deer Road, 107885 Hwy 395, Walker, CA 96107

**Special Meeting
November 5, 2015**

6:30 PM Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Fesko

*Supervisors Present: Alpers, Corless, Fesko, Johnston and Stump
Supervisors Absent: None*

Adjourn: 9:23 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance led by Supervisor Corless

Supervisor Fesko introduced other Supervisors and Staff

Ned Welch thanked the Board for coming to Walker and introduced the RPAC members – Mark Lightner, Katie Newell, Judi Curti, Mike Curti, Dan Anthony, Orville Mosby, Bill VanLente, Arden Gerbig, Johnny Vannoy, Bruce Woodworth, Don Morris, Jeff Ulrich from USFS.

1 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD
Mike Curti – Burn Season is open. Must follow regulations and have permit.

CJ Hermas – Represents a group of residents, “Friends of the West Walker”. The issue of a park on the Walker River is very much opposed by this group. Indicated that the AVRPAC is dysfunctional.

Gerry LeFrancois - will distribute local maps to members of the Board.

Claudia Bonnett - Doesn't live on North River Lane, but supports them.

2. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Regional Planning Advisory Committees Workshop

Departments: Clerk of the Board

As a follow up to recent Board inquiries, this workshop will review the purpose, progress and procedures of Mono County RPACS.

Action: None.

Scott Burns – Presented PowerPoint.

- Checking in to see how RPAC is going.
- We've been doing RPACs since the June Lake CAC in 1985.
- Antelope Valley is most active RPAC.
- RPACs advise the Board and Planning on development and related policy issues.
- Want to maintain small town rural atmosphere.
- Also advises County on General Plan.
- Updating General Plan now, goes to Planning Commission Thursday.
- RPACs are established by Board resolution.
- They help the County in numerous ways.
- Not all RPACs are following established rules and procedures.
- RPACs are advisory, not decision making.
- They have no authority independent of the Board of Supervisors.

Gerry LeFrancois

- Powerpoint shows location and status of all planning areas.

Antelope Valley Bylaws

- Revised in 1998
- Subject to Brown Act
- Have Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary
- Normally meet first Thursday of each month
- 15 member maximum
- Open to all residents
- Attendance requirements – must attend 3 meetings before being considered for appointment

Fred Stump

- Swall Meadows has design review committee which can comment, but has no veto powers.

Board Comments:

Supervisor Alpers

- First RPAC he worked with was Chalfant in 1986 or 1987
- Are you happy with bylaws?
- What can we do to help you?

Supervisor Stump

- How widespread is feeling that RPAC is dysfunctional?
- Does lack of term limits keep people off RPAC

- How would Claudia fix problems
- How many are in agreement? Almost entire audience by show of hands.
- Is the process able to adequately deal with issues? No

Public Comments:

CJ Hermas

- Community feels they aren't being represented by RPAC
- Has application to join RPAC
- Understands that certain members will disagree
- Expects to be treated with respect and have opinions properly considered
- Doesn't know about term limit issue
- Feels community was misled by current RPAC about trails issue.
- At last meeting, suggested open space for properties purchased by FEMA after flood. Was told we are going to a committee.

Claudia Bonnett

- Was on RPAC for about 12 years; many members were not on the RPAC at the time
- Was frequently a dissenter
- RPAC is a community forum and clearinghouse; this is lacking here in Antelope Valley
- No attempts at compromise on this RPAC
- Why does membership require a unanimous vote?
- When she worked for government, all employees went to training to learn how to listen, speak to each other and compromise
- What we are being told by RPAC tonight does not square with what they said at last RPAC meeting.

Fred (didn't catch last name)

- Problem is lack of information. If not online, information is not available.

Roger Donahue

- Part of problem is lack of foreknowledge.
- Trails issue just appeared on agenda. People had no advance knowledge. Led to rumors and trust issues.
- Majority of people are online. County needs to have more information on website.
- Other counties will offer FEMA-type properties for lease. Would like to do so.
- Community is constantly threatened by RPAC

Ned Welch

- Will not try to refute very passionate feelings.
- Wants Supervisors to know that biggest opposition effort to

trails was from former RPAC chairman Dan Anthony. Collected 77 signatures and letters regarding trails near Camp Antelope.

- Grant application was dropped for trails near Camp Antelope.
- Feels if you show up, you should stay on RPAC. If you play, you stay.
- Denying spouses might be a first amendment violation.

Katie Newell

- North River plan was taken off the table in June.
- RPAC has 15 member limit to establish quorum
- Term limits won't work here.

Dan Anthony

- Was chairman for 3 years; only had 2 or 3 times with no quorum.

Bill VanLente

- Initially thought trails were a good idea; realized community opposition was substantial and changed mind.

Lou (didn't catch last name)

- Since 1997 flood, FEMA parcels have just been open space. Please leave them as open space.

Judi Curti

- Problem may be that we are revisiting General Plan
- FEMA parcels are not addressed in Plan
- Staff suggested dealing with them in General Plan
- Let's deal with them so we don't have to keep revisiting issue.

Mike White

- Planning keeps saying this is only a "concept".
- Use Topaz Lane parcel instead of Eastside Lane/395

Supervisor Johnston

- Appreciates turnout and trails discussion
- Concerned with how RPACs and "non-RPACs" are set up in County.
- RPACs cost a lot of money. Tonight's meeting is probably costing \$1,500.
- Wants meetings to be productive, for any group.
- For other areas, wants all members to be appointed and follow Brown Act and other rules
- Everyone should have terms
- Not concerned with number of members, but need to change enabling measure to allow a range for each community.
- Committees should not have county employees.
- Spouses should not be on same committee.
- Applicants should not have to be approved by committee.
- Bylaws should be ratified by Board of Supervisors.
- Principles he has laid out are good ones for any public group.
- Will continue to vote the way he does.

Supervisor Corless

- Great to see participation
- RPAC has two functions: Town Hall and Advisory
- Agrees with many of Supervisor Johnston's points
- Does RPAC and community feel changes would help concerns?
- Wants to get rid of unanimous vote requirement.
- Maybe training is a good idea.
- Need both Town Hall and Advisory functions.

Supervisor Fesko

- Was on RPAC for 16 years.
- Not once was a local applicant turned away.
- 3 Meeting rule is to make sure people really want to serve.
- If it's not broke don't fix it.
- Has enjoyed the community involvement over the last 6 months.
- How will term limits in Antelope Valley fix the problems being discussed today?
- The grant was never to build anything: it was to fund the outreach efforts. Based on feedback, you amend the concept. The process broke down here.
- Can do away with unanimous vote, but feels that RPAC vote on applicants shows support.
- Will set up date to sit and have discussion with community about what real concerns are.

Supervisor Stump

- RPAC has to be flexible to meet each community's needs.
- If terms are needed, we should look at them.
- No problem with number of members.
- Wants to get rid of unanimous vote requirement for RPAC membership.
- Community Development should not be on RPAC; no other restrictions on employment.
- Has never heard this level of disagreement in any of his 5 communities.
- Membership should be up to Supervisors, not RPAC. Requirement to show up at meetings to demonstrate interest is fine. You have a dysfunction. If term limits helps solve that, they are a good idea.
- If an applicant is on the agenda, they can speak to the Board when the agenda item comes up.
- Will defer action on this item if people can come to Board meeting next meeting and show that this really is just about one issue.
- What is opinion of RPAC on changes?

- If Supervisor Fesko can't fix problem, will still listen to community on this issue.

Supervisor Alpers

- Thought this would be a short meeting.
- This group is dysfunctional.
- June Lake CAC has terms; process saved the day when the issue of June Mountain's closure was being discussed.
- We need terms here.
- Wants to see applications and resumes of applicants.
- Wants to know that there is consistency among RPACs regarding how they make recommendations to the Board.
- Needs to trust local Supervisor and RPACs to make good recommendations to Board.
- Supports terms.
- Wants the ability to reject applicants if necessary.
- Interviews applicants in his district.
- Dysfunctional might have been a poor choice of words.
- If your Supervisor can work through issues and bring recommendations to Board, he would be very pleased.

Marshall Rudolph

- RPAC members serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Bruce Woodworth

- Disagrees that there is dysfunction.
- This is just over one issue.

Dan Anthony

- Most of the people on the RPAC are not listening to the community.
- If an applicant is rejected by a Supervisor, how can you go around them to the entire Board?

Mike Curti

- This is first time he has heard from community that RPAC is dysfunctional
- RPAC has not discussed way that parcels could be used.
- Feels RPAC should look at all options before making recommendation to Board.

Orville Mosby

- Possible solution: See if the community wants something before we apply for a planning grant.

Don Morris

- What we have is contempt prior to investigation.
- Community used to fight against County, now they fight against RPAC.
- Resigned.

Bill VanLente

- It is wrong to generalize from this one issue that the RPAC is

dysfunctional.

- Can support idea of terms.

Mark (didn't catch last name)

- No problem with terms
- Need consistency

Katie Newell

- It doesn't matter to me.

Ned Welch

- Watched Board meeting about Sheriff's vehicles, they were much more animated on that issue, but it wasn't dysfunctional.
- Leave things as they are.

Judi Curti

- We've only had one fully attended meeting in 2 years. Terms might make that worse.

Mike Curti

- Will follow whatever the Board decides

Dan Anthony

- Can go either way on terms
- Should stay at 15 members
- Board should decide on members, not RPAC

Orville Mosby

- Right now would not reapply

Bill VanLente

- Does have problem with losing unanimous vote
- Conflict is not inherently bad

Arden Gerbig

- Continuity among members is good. Has been on RPAC since beginning.
- RPAC is not broken, could use a couple of little fixes in bylaws.

Johnny Vannoy

- If bylaws aren't broke, don't fix them.
- Term limits won't work.
- Board members should look in their own backyards, before they worry about this RPAC.
- Agrees with Friends of River Road that trails are not needed in that area.
- Thought that issue was dead 3 months ago.
- RPAC is not dysfunctional.

Bruce Woodworth

- Agrees with eliminating "black ball" votes
- Does not see term limits as fixing anything.

/

/

/

/

ADJOURN 9:23 p.m.

ATTEST

TIMOTHY E. FESKO
CHAIRMAN

BOB MUSIL
CLERK OF THE BOARD