

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

REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 4, 2012,
APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 3

Date: September 4, 2012

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

Place: Pauma Valley Community Center
16650 Hwy. 76
Pauma Valley, Ca. 92061

1. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM.** Roll Call and quorum established: All Group Members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Bill Winn, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Jim Beezhold; Robert Smith; John Ljubenkov and Ron Barbanell.
2. **OPEN FORUM:** There were no comments from the community at the open forum.
3. **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**
 - a. The minutes of the August 7th meeting had been circulated to all members. Andy had a correction on 4b. with the Highway description and Bill found a typo in 4c which the secretary noted for corrections. Bill then made a motion to accept these minutes as amended, and Jim gave a 2nd. There was no further discussion and they were approved unanimously 7-0.
 - b. There were no operating expenses. Fritz submitted an invoice for rental of the hall for July, August and September at \$35/Month for a total of \$105. Ron asked if there was PA system so that the board and audience could more clearly hear the discussions. Fritz said that he would ask the community center board if they had one and if not would they get one. Andy said that if not the Church had one we could borrow. John moved to accept and submit the bill and Bill gave a second. It was passed 7-0.
4. **DISCUSSIONS:**
 - a. The first item for discussion was the Giro Di San Diego bicycle race scheduled for September 15th and to pass through Pauma Valley up to Palomar and back. They had already changed the route and rest area after suggestions from Andy. It will come down Cole Grade, go up the mountain and then return up Valley Center Road. The rest stop was moved after Andy had detailed the dangers of their initial proposed stop; it will now be at the old vegetable (inactive?) stand on V.C. road and HWY 76. Jim then asked about the permitting process they had to go through to put on a race like this. Andy said that they had to go to the Department of Public Works and get a county permit for use of the course and that this permitting information is available on the DPW website. He thought that they also needed Caltrans permits. Jim stated his concerns involving the non-disclosure of financials for this race. Bill and others agreed that as a "charity" using public roads and resources such as police, they should have to provide a final summary of the costs, expenses and profits. It feels like this is a primarily for profit event with no visible benefits for the local communities. Fritz moved that Andy email the county about our concerns as to traffic flow etc. and consider making the disclosure of profits/donations public as well as our concern that we have time for meaningful input. Ron gave the second and it was approved 7-0.

- b. We then continued discussing our priorities regarding remediation of traffic and other impacts by new developments. Andy had sent us a draft summary of our traffic concerns for discussion. We are to review this summary, add discussion, comments and suggestions, and agree on positions and actions that we may or may not take with the county. Andy's summary is being made Addendum 1 to these minutes. Ron said that this is a brilliant document, but it's enforcing it that will be the problem. Ron feels that we need to take a strong stand on all of these issues, as in the Warner Ranch development which assaults most of these issues directly. He said that there are promises made that are not kept and issues just become so large that they are impossible to fix. Bill countered that most of the problem lies within State, not county jurisdiction. Andy asked Robert Smith if he had had any communications with Caltrans about the signalization of Pauma Reservation Road and State Hwy 76? Robert said no. Andy described this intersection project as an example of just what a mess some projects can become. They started the signalization and road improvement and now say that they made a mistake in design and have to go back and redesign it. They said there is no money and it will be late this year before they can address it.

Andy then asked Nikki Symington, Public Relations representative to the Rincon Tribe what she had heard. She asked if we had read Rincon's responses proposed by them to the mitigation issues. She said that some of our issues now are addressed there and she was hoping to get some response from us. Also, she said that the Chairman was not going to meet with the county until sometime next month and he was aware of our administrative issues over moneys being available when needed. The first things they addressed are the mitigation issues that we have a copy of. We and other planning groups had 3 months ago said that we would write the county and ask for an informal meeting with the County and State traffic people and the Tribes and planning groups. We wanted to informally discuss the issues around funds being available to complete projects on time, instead of "*sometime* the monies will be available to finish the project *someday!*" Andy said that we had nailed down our priorities but that other groups needed more time before they could propose a meeting. Nikki said that Oliver Smith had said that the supervisor was not going to meet with the planning group. Nikki said that their Chairman, Mazzetti, who is on the Caltrans Advisory Board, met with Horns Chief of Staff, Dustin Steiner, and they agreed to meet over their issues with mitigation fees. She feels that the tribes are very willing partners in solving the traffic issues and that they want to find an agreement. She said that Bill Horn's office agreed to meet with the tribes, Caltrans, and several planning groups to discuss these issues. Robert Smith said that it was important to work through the county as the lead agency on road issues with Caltrans (State Highways). Andy asked Robert if he had approached any state legislators about traffic issues, to which Robert said that he hadn't because he relies on the county as the lead agency to deal with them. Nikki commented that the county moved projects forward somewhat like a sort of Ponzi scheme, the next project paying in some way for projects that have gone forth, but financial obligations to complete mitigation projects are often incomplete or inadequate to deal with the even more traffic and other problems generated. Therefore the need arises to approve the next big development for infrastructure. It seems that a couple of developments put in their agreed upon "fair share" and then the state waits until they can get more development moneys because there is not enough in the pot, and the State hasn't committed funds because it is not a priority project. Nikki said that this cycle might be broken by using the legally binding Joint Powers Agreement. She and Robert had said that through meetings and discussions they might find a way to allow financing with bonds or borrowing against the tribe's rights to dedicated additional federal and Caltrans highway transportation funds. Andy asked what we could do to try to promote the JPA's and then offered to write articles about it in the news and directly to Horn's office promoting this possibility. Nikki agreed to help with information on JPAs and said that with a meeting we could more easily identify the traffic issues and then find ways to fund them. Everyone agreed that this was what we should be working on. Bill made a motion that Andy get the needed information on the possible use of JPA's together and distribute it to county, Caltrans and media. John gave the second and it passed 7-0. Ron then

added that we need to be entirely firm in demanding that new developments pay for all needed improvements and in a timely manner. Andy then mentioned the difficulties in dealing with Caltrans about the signalization at Hwy 76 and Pauma Road. Robert offered to contact someone to get more information about the delayed project. Ron brought us back to the problem of ensuring that the infrastructure is fixed before developments are allowed to be built. We discussed that the refusal of people to increase their taxes to fix problems that have accumulated was one of the reasons that the county relies on developers to fund infrastructure projects.

After various other general discussions, Nikki then mentioned that the Rincon responses to the county for their expansion project mitigation proposals are available on the Rincon website. She was hoping to get our comments. The response has been there since August 7th and most of us were just finding out; so we needed until next month to discuss Rincon's proposed solutions to the issues raised.

- c. Our attempt to coordinate communications with other nearby planning groups such as Valley Center, Rainbow and Fallbrook was put on hold until next meeting because there were no other representatives present. We discussed ways to get us out to their meetings. It was agreed that we will circulate their meeting dates and allow us each to attend on our own initiative.

Fritz then mentioned Andy's "Late Hit Policy" letter to Sarah Aghassi, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, SD County. He felt that being informed of projects in our district before they are planned in such detail as to make them difficult to change, was important and should be added to next month's agenda.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

Robert moved to adjourn, John gave a second, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary, PPCSG

These minutes were approved at the October 2nd meeting, 5-0.

Summary of Concerns of Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group regarding traffic volumes on local County Roads and State Highways.

This document is a summary of concerns of the Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group (“PPCSG”) that have been developed in various public meetings regarding traffic volumes on local County Roads and State Highways and expressed in comparable form regarding traffic impacts of developments (each a “Project”), such as the expansion of Harrah’s casino, the potential of a Warner Ranch development, etc., in and proximate to the PPCSG area.

I. Mitigation Finance

PPCSG would like to see each Project, the County, and Caltrans (if appropriate) enter into an agreement (in intergovernmental form if appropriate) that provides for:

- i subscription of all the monies for mitigation by the Project upon inception of construction; and,
- ii impounding of all such subscribed monies to ensure their actual use for the intended purpose(s); and,
- iii an enforceable obligation for timely subscription on the parts of fair share contribution parties other than the Project such that their monies will be immediately available upon demand of the mitigation authority; and,
- iv detailed timelines for each of the mitigation actions for each Project so that Direct Impacts are mitigated no later than the completion of the Project, and ideally coincident with the phase of the Project which creates the requirement for mitigation, and Cumulative Impacts are mitigated so as not to experience a LOS below C.

PPCSG is of the view that, while traffic mitigation in a Project proposal will not result in the same quality of life subsequent to the Project as before the Project, there is no certainty that even the mitigation proposed will be realized in a timely manner, or maybe at all. The achievement of the mitigation depends to a large extent upon agencies and entities, other than the Project, (i) contributing the cost balance not provided by the fair share contribution of the Project and (ii) often carrying out the civil engineering works.

II. SR-76

PPCSG would like to see a plan immediately developed and quickly implemented for SR-76 that, while protecting the desirable effects of its classification as a County Scenic Highway, ensures that SR-76 will not continue to increasingly become a traffic bottleneck with a high accident rate, thereby practically impeding safe development and growth. That plan should recognize that:

- i the acceptance of LOS E/F as set forth in the County General Plan Update will ensure that this State Highway will not safely and conveniently meet the needs of present and future residents and visitors using it as the only east to west route serving a large geography; and,
- ii operating improvements, such as extended sight lines, adequate bidirectional passing lanes, increased radii of horizontal and vertical curves, etc., and continuous enforcement of the Vehicle Code, are therefore necessary now, let alone to serve future growth, and should be accorded the highest priority; and,
- iii the condition of SR-76 must be developed so that the prohibition of Over-length Bus & Motorhome vehicles in excess of 40’ on SR-76 west of its intersection with Pala Mission

Road (west junction) can be safely removed so that the industry standard 45' buses continuously serving the existing and expanded casino clients can use SR-76, and are not forced to use the Pala Temecula Road which because of its gradients and small radius curves is unsafe for such traffic; and,

- iv the present guidelines for determining traffic significance of developments causing additional traffic for LOS E/F roadways are inadequate; that there should be a zero threshold of significance regarding such developments (as otherwise the continuing addition of below significance threshold traffic will result in a downward spiral of quality of life and level of safety for then residents of and visitors to such areas.); and,
- v the use of a traffic circle (roundabout) at the intersection of SR-76 and Valley Center Road could be a preferred solution at present and for increasing traffic, thereby avoiding the disruption of signalization and generally speeding the flow of through and right-turning traffic; and,
- vi for concerns of road safety, the signalization of the SR-76 and Pauma Reservation Road intersection should be immediately completed, the signalization of SR-76 and Cole Grade Road intersection (including turn lanes) should be given priority, and a left turn lane for westbound traffic should be provided at the SR-76 and Pauma Valley Drive intersection, and the mitigation on Valley Center Road should be completed.

III. Development Access

Much of the recent traffic growth in the area of PPCSG has been, and with casino expansions will be, the transport from afar of casino patrons. Of particular concern to PPCSG is the traffic load at the entrances to and exits from Casino and other Project entrances and parking areas. In that regard PPCSG would see that a safety and convenience benefit to casino operators and patrons, and local residents, could result from:

- i there being only one signalized entrance/exit to a casino or Project unless the signals are more than 250 yards separated (in which case the signals should be synchronized) and all cases the cycle length should be day and time dependant based upon simulations to minimize impact on through traffic while maintaining a reasonable level of service for entering/exiting traffic); and
- ii a one-way system of traffic within the casino or Project grounds coupled with deceleration/acceleration lanes at entrances/exits so that only traffic entering/exiting across the through traffic has to use the signalized entrance/exit.

IV. Natural Disaster Evacuation

Wild fires have been and will continue to be a feature of the PPCSG and proximate areas. Emergency evacuation in the event of such natural disasters has often to be accomplished with little notice and less than ideal conditions. For that reason PPCSG, would like to see the County and other governmental and intergovernmental agencies cooperate in the drafting and publication of a Disaster Evacuation Plan that can be routinely implemented upon such a need.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

Charles Mathews,

Chair, Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group

August 18, 2012