

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

**REGULAR MEETING, FEBRUARY 5, 2013,**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

Page 1 of 4

Date: February 5, 2013

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

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

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 PM.** Roll Call and quorum established: Five members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ron Barbanell; Ben Brooks and Brad Smith. Bill Winn, Vice Chairman and Stephanie Spencer were absent.
- 2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:** First we needed to elect new Officers for this board with 4 new members, one, Fritz returning for his last 4 year term. Ron moved to nominate Andy (Charles) Mathews continue as Chair, Fritz gave a second and with no further nominations Andy was elected Chairman 5-0. Next Fritz nominated Bill Winn to Vice Chairman with Bill's previous agreement to serve if elected. Brad gave the second and Bill was elected 5-0. Lastly, Andy nominated Fritz to serve again as Secretary and Ben gave the second. The vote was again 5-0 in favor.
- 3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**
  - a.** The minutes of the December 4th meeting had been circulated to all members and corrections incorporated. The minutes were re-circulated prior to the meeting. Brad then made a motion to accept these minutes as amended, and Ron gave a 2<sup>nd</sup>. With no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously 5-0.
- 4. OPEN FORUM:**
  - a.** Sue Stockton informed us that Tuesday, March 19<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 6 PM, in this hall, there will be a meeting with CalTrans for public discussion of the junction of Hwy 76 and S6, Valley Center Road. Andy asked if Department of Public Works would also be there and Murali Pasumarthi from the DPW said that they wouldn't be there formally but only if invited to be present as another commenter. The DPW will be following the development but can only make comments/suggestions since CalTrans has responsibility.
  - b.** Andy then mentioned that Sol Orchards has withdrawn its application for a solar farm on El Sendero road here. They still own the 10 acres of land and may do another development in the future.
- 5. DISCUSSIONS:**
  - a.** Next we had a presentation and discussion on the Proposed new development, Shadow Run Ranch. This is a proposed 44 home development on the NW corner of the intersection of HWY 76 and Adams Drive. The 248 acre development is proposed as consisting of 102 acres for the homes, approximately 47 acres preserved as it is currently in groves and the remaining 91 acres dedicated as RPO Wetland, Impact Neutral, Biological Open Space. Ron Duchendorf is Sheryl Schoepe's representative (Owner) and he told us of their desire to retain as much grove as possible there. Each lot is approximately 2.3 acres and will start with all of the existing grove here intact. The Homeowner's CCR's when completed will encourage maintenance of their

individual trees but allow changes as long as it remains irrigated landscape as required by fire regulations. Mark (?) showed topo and aerial maps with the development and adjacent roads. Brad asked if the CC&Rs would prohibit in-home businesses and what would be the limits if they were allowed? Ben asked if there were any proposed restrictions on minimum size, types and designs? The owner would be required by the county to provide streets, services and drainage. The drainage control will be specified under new hi impact storm water requirements for Hydro Modification Ponds. Ron then asked about visibility from adjacent roads. Mark replied that along Hwy 76 there is a required 100 ft. buffer with trees to maintain the agricultural appearance. It is about 8 ft. higher than the highway and the trees screen the visibility of the homes. Andy reminded them that Hwy 76 is designated a County Scenic Highway. They were asked as to the time limits for building the project and Mark responded that they have not decided as to whether the owner, separate developer, or individual lot owners would build the project. Ron said that his concerns were the increased density and traffic and the general appearance of the valley and then asked the board why we were concerned about what the homes looked like and what were we trying to make better if we could not see them from the roads? Fritz responded that we were just trying to get a feel for what we were asked to approve. After the developer's reps were questioned, they responded that they did not know if it would be a gated community or what the price range might be, though they would be more high end. Andy then asked about the status of the proposed exit sites. Mark responded that they needed two fire exits and that the county has approved of the Adams drive exit as one but CalTrans was still reviewing the details of the Hwy 76 exit which proposes 70% westbound and 30% eastbound flows there. Also the county is still trying to force them to possibly widen Adams from its current approximate 16 feet to the required 24 feet. This is obviously a game killing requirement that must be addressed. Current residents who have paid to maintain Adams drive have enough trouble getting out on the highway than doubling the access load there. Ron then asked how they will monitor the impacts of its new development like storm water. They said that they have to meet many new control regulations like the Hydro Modification requirements. Fritz added that it was by design and not real monitoring that made it compliant. Al Savard added that any grove irrigation runoff is currently punishable by fines. Ron asked if there were new more restrictive rules than the "old grandfathered in anything goes" when it comes to what you can put into the ground. Andy then asked about the plans for Propane Tanks. They had not planned for it yet. Andy then reminded them that they needed to address any requirements from the County Scenic Highway designation in their plans; especially with west bound traffic and the groves there. They then said that both entrances were still having their final alignments determined and that they would be sure to consider this. Andy also mentioned noise requirements being established by a Thursday afternoon survey and that a Sunday evening would be much louder. Andy mentioned that if the traffic was to be moved from Adams to Hwy 76 then the study needs to be modified to reflect any changes from 100% anticipated on Adams Drive. Andy then questioned the certainty that Yuima would be able to sign off on water supply without MWD annexation. Mark then replied that since the property had water that there would be a zero net impact. Andy said that the county has stated that it did not anticipate any new development outside the MWD. Mark then said that this was a desire not a requirement. 3 of 4 should be considered in the plans. Lastly, Andy stated that there was no economic study Andy then questioned their plans for fire flow. Mark then mentioned that the fire departments will continue to use their reservoir for filling helicopters and that they will need to complete the designs for proper water pressure/flow. Next was questioned the timeline schedule for the proposed 30" Northern Pipeline right through their project development. Mark stated that the delayed pipeline, if built, will follow roads through the development. Andy said that the environmental impact would be substantial and justifying the need or benefit of a 44 home development here. In addition there are no economic plans for who would bear the burden of a slowly built or sold project leaving very high fixed costs for the HOA. It is our suggestion that there be such a study done. Brad added that we

would like to see early resolution of the vague CC&R's that will be relied upon substantially for this project. Fritz then questioned the reason for not including the strip of land bordering Adams drive and they responded that it had many restrictions, such as a creek bed, to prohibit any development. The reason it was not included as open space is that this land was acquired long after this development was planned. He also requested that the Agricultural Land within the development revert to Open Space should it fail to be viable. Ben then questioned whether or not they still felt that they would be able to address the many questions and requirements still remaining within a reasonable time period. Mark then said that it was their intention to get thru the entitlement process within 4 months and then have county/public review at the end of year. Then about 1-1/2 years more for a final map. So about 3 years. Sue Stockton then questioned the intersection proposed onto Hwy 76. Mark showed her the proposed moving it east for better sighting. Andy then asked to get a motion to have him compose a reply to the county for comments and for us to either Approve, Approve with Conditions, or Not Approve this plan for its completeness, compatibility of the design with local surroundings, the consistency within the community plan, and any specific concerns we may have. We agreed that we liked the vision of the plan but wanted a conditional approval needing many conditional details just discussed to be supplied, Ron made a motion to continue until such additional information was available and to authorize Andy to summarize the Committees discussions in a report to DPDS, Ben gave a second and it was approved unanimously 5-0. The final Report is Addendum 1, attached.

- b.** Next we heard a presentation on the proposed new traffic signal at Harrahs Rincon Casino. First Ken Jones from the County Department of Public Works, Roads Division gave a presentation on the proposed project. The casino traffic study, where current volumes and turn counts were determined, was considered with projected additions from the current proposed expansion. Rincon Casino is planning to close its central main entrance and rely on the new north road and expanded parking lot there, and continued use of the south entrance with its current intersection and signal. They feel that the traffic volumes would best be served by an additional signal at the north entrance. Ken said that their traffic engineer presented his analysis to their committee and confirmed the needed new signalization of the north entrance. The county traffic advisory committee consists of CHP and Sherriff law enforcement, districts 2, 3, and 5, schools, risk management, AAA, and insurance representatives along with traffic and engineering. After hearing the details as we were also given they voted agreement with the proposed signalization and to forward this recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to consider at their March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Andy emphasized the communities concerns that traffic flow along VC Road be the main priority and that signalization be timed so as to facilitate through traffic. We heard the details of the turn pockets and the interconnectedness and proposed timing and the way special events will be handled by CHP with manual control of the signals timing. Andy mentioned that there were concerns that the current signals were not properly addressing traffic exiting the casino in the right lane, which has exited and then the signal goes ahead and stops traffic anyway. Murali Pasumarthi, Manager of the Traffic Engineering responded that timing should be able to detect this and that he would look into it immediately to ensure proper operation so as to allay these frustrating situations. We asked that the current 50 MPH speed through these intersections be considered and prioritized. A community member expressed concerns about pedestrian foot traffic from parking lots across the street, and persons running across the highway at night for special events. She also complained about these special parking lots which allow people to exit across traffic right in front of oncoming traffic with no signalization. Then she also brought up the unsafe foot traffic to and from the bus stop across the street from the 7-11. It appears that the light is not pedestrian friendly or something. Andy then mentioned the inadequacy of the 5 car left turn lane for north bound traffic at the south entrance. The excess stopped cars force through traffic to stop even while the light is green for them. There may be inadequate room for lanes there. Brad emphasized that the primary concern here is the inadequacy of the size capacity of the left hand turn lanes and that it is a design flaw which needs addressing. Murali P. assured

him that he would check into this. Fritz then asked if it would be possible to realign Morales Lane and the excess parking traffic on it, to be in alignment with the traffic light only 50 feet or so south. Again Murali said that he could check on it. Andy then asked if the county had asked the casino traffic management what they were doing to encourage northbound traffic use the north exit and similarly with the southbound traffic, so as to lessen cross traffic? Again Murali said that he would propose signage or something to encourage beneficial traffic flow inside the Casino. Murali P. closed by saying that the Rincon Harrahs Casino has been one of the best at cooperating with the county.

- c. The last item on the agenda was about our response to the Gregory Canyon Landfill comment period. We have sent in our comments several times before and felt that we had nothing new to add. Ron mentioned that there was something that the Mayor of San Diego was going to do with the Sanitation Board or something and was wondering if we knew anything about this?

## **6. Administrative Operating Expenses**

Andy requested that we approve his request to the county for some office supplies. Fritz made a motion that he do so and Brad gave a second. Fritz also had an invoice from the Pauma Valley Community Center for the last quarter of 2012 rent for the hall. Ron moved to forward the invoice to the county for payment for the 3 months at \$35/meeting, \$105 total. Ben gave a second and it was approved 5-0. Ron asked if we could get PA system so as to better hear each other during these meetings. He offered to look into it.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT:**

Fritz moved to adjourn, Ben gave a second, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary, PPCSG

These minutes contain the following 4 page Addendum. It is a copy of the official summary of our Recommendations on the Shadow Run Ranch Site Development Proposal. It was crafted by Chairman Charles (Andy) Mathews as directed above and sent to the Board Of Supervisors in response to their request for comments.

These minutes were approved at the March 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting. Ben moved to accept as presented, Brad gave a second and it was approved 4 – 0 with two abstaining: Andy, Ben, Brad, Fritz for; none against, and Bill abstaining because he wasn't at the meeting and Stephanie was also absent from the meeting and in addition could not vote due to incomplete training records.

## Pala Pauma Valley Sponsor Group (PPCSG)

### Recommendations concerning Shadow Run Ranch Site development proposals.

The below recommendations were adopted and approved by resolution made, seconded and unanimously carried at a public meeting of PPCSG held February 5, 2013, at which the Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plan provided by the Applicant and a Draft Project Description and Letter of December 14, 2012 from DPDS to the Applicant were considered, along with an oral presentation of “Representatives” of the Applicant and their responses to both PPCSG Member and public questions.

#### I. Uncertainty of access to the Project.

1. *PPCSG recommends that once access route to the project is determined that the Tentative Map be revised, traffic calculations and intersection configurations be reestablished and reviewed prior to the publication of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review.* The draft Project Description identifies Adams Drive as being both primary and secondary access to the Project yet the December 14 letter and the oral presentation of the Representatives indicates that discussions are underway with Caltrans to have a Project access to SR-76. The Traffic Study is based upon 100% of the Project related traffic using Adams Drive. The impact of such a direct access proximate to Adams Drive could be significant and there was no information available as to the configuration of such an additional intersection, the likely traffic volumes of the two SR-76 access points, the provision of two left turn pockets, the provision of adequate slowing and acceleration lanes, the impact on the nearby bus stop, etc.
2. *PPCSG recommends that the relocation of the Adams Drive and SR-76 intersection be such as not to result in a significant reduction in screening of the Project by established trees and vegetation. Further, PPCSG recommends that there should be a requirement running with the land that precludes subsequent removal, and requires replacement of, such trees and vegetation screening of the Project.* The Tentative Map illustrates a relocation of the Adams Drive and SR-76 interchange by off-site road dedication encroaching upon APN 111-190-10. That APN and APN 111-080-16 (both presently under the ownership of the Applicant) are the locations of well established trees and bushes that screen the Project from nearby westbound traffic on SR-76.
3. *PPCSG recommends that the Noise Study of the Project be conducted again to incorporate the break in the noise barrier that would result from a direct access to SR-76 (should that be agreed) and, in any case, to be based upon weekend busy hour, not mid-afternoon, mid-week traffic volumes.* The Tentative Map illustrates a 100-foot wide noise control feature, which also acts to screen the Project from traffic passing on SR-76. A break in that feature to provide access to SR-76 will significantly reduce the effectiveness of the feature and provide direct noise access to the Project. The break will also result in reduced screening of the Project from passing traffic. In any case, it appears that data collection for the noise analysis resulting in the requirement for a noise protection easement was conducted around 5 p.m. on a Thursday – not representative of the heavier traffic volumes at weekends

## II. Completeness and accuracy of the draft Project Description.

1. *PPCSG recommends that an economic or housing study be commissioned to support the Project's second objective and establish with certainty why the most environmentally alternative project is not selected.* The second stated objective of the Project is to “[p]rovide needed housing for the community”. Further, the analysis of Project alternatives states that the No Development Alternative [NDA] would “not meet any of the [A]pplicants objectives such as providing needed housing” and that “the NDA is the environmentally preferred project.” Yet there is no economic or housing demand study to support that objective – a key to why the environmentally desirable alternative is not selected. Additionally, concern of the community is the adverse impact that there would be on the community were the Project to proceed, the demand not to occur in a reasonable timeframe and there being a large number of higher end undeveloped lots resulting in a depression of pricing throughout the area.
2. *PPCSG recommends that how the Applicant intends to manage development of the Project subsequent to grading, establishing roads and pads, etc., be fully addressed in the Project Description.* The Project Description does not adequately define whether it is the intent of the Applicant to create an infrastructure and then sell building pads to others, or to develop a master planned community by building either spec and/or custom homes on the established pads, or a combination. In particular, a concern of the community is the effect upon the to-be formed Homeowners’ Association (HoA), which is planned to have extensive responsibilities, and the ability to appropriately and dependably transfer the financial burden and authority from the Applicant to the eventual homeowners. The Representatives were unresponsive on this point.
3. *Because of their significance to the Project and the community, PPCSG recommends that a summary of the key restrictions of the proposed CC&Rs be included in the Project Description and that the approval of CC&Rs by DPDS after review by PPCSG be a condition of grant of the final map.* The Project Description contains references to the responsibilities of the HoA which are presumably to be documented in recorded CC&Rs. During the oral presentation the response of the Representatives to many key questions was “that will be defined in the CC&Rs.” Such questions included: minimum house square footage, architectural and landscaping standards, use for home-based business, etc. Apparently the CC&Rs are being drafted.
4. *PPCSG strongly recommends that the alternative of including in the Project the land under the Applicants ownership located between the Project and Adams Drive be included among the Project alternatives and there analyzed in detail.* Additionally, PPCSG recommends that a synopsis of the Project Alternatives be included in the Project Description. The Tentative Map clearly delineates the fact that land situated between the Project and Adams Drive is not to be incorporated in the Project even though such land is under ownership of the Applicant, and the Applicant has agreed to construct private roads on off-site easements across such land. Much of this land is agricultural and under fruit farming for the Applicant. If it were to be included in the development it would add to the agricultural income available to the HoA (thereby reducing costs), contribute to Project objectives, and avoid the possibility of further development of such land in the future (thereby favorably impacting the potential growth inducing impacts.).

5. *PPCSG recommends that the narrative of the Project Description and the draft EIR be amended to recognize that SR-76 passing the Project is a County Scenic Highway and to identify what additional environmental precautions will be taken.* Table COS 1 of the Conservation and Open Space element of the General Plan identifies SR-76 west of I-15 to the intersection with SR79 as a County Scenic Highway.

### III. Compatibility of Project with character of local community

1. *PPCSG strongly recommends that there be a recorded obligation running with the lots to maintain avocational agriculture, including the obligation to provide professional management, required agricultural care, and replacement of trees of greater than productive age.* Because avocational agriculture could be a feature of the forty-four over two acre lots on 101.9 acres of the 248.2-acre the Project and the provision of one 91.3-acre biological open space lot, one 47.0-acre agricultural lot, and one 7.9-acre recreational open space, the Project is conceptually consistent with the character of the local community. However, it is not certain that much of that consistency will be long term as it appears that lot owners will be free to remove fruit farming from their lots subject to HoA oversight.
2. *PPCSG recommends that the topic of the annexation process of the lots of the Project into PRD 6 and the contribution of the newly annexing APNs to the sunk cost of the existing pavement be clearly addressed.* Adams Drive is a road maintained by the County as PRD6 and funded by assessments against APNs proximate to Adams Drive. The APNs owned by the Applicant adjacent to Adams Drive are included in PRD 6. But the APNs of the Project are not. Consequently, at least in community equity, the APNs of the Project, and their eventual subdivisions, should be included in the PRD 6 assessment area. Subsequent to annexation all APNs in the PRD 6 assessment area would pay a like assessment for the maintenance of Adams Drive.
3. *PPCSG recommends that the Tentative Map, the Project Description and the environmental assessments of the EIR be amended to provide propane tank gas delivery.* The Tentative Map and the Project Description make no mention of gas supply to the Project. Enquiry of the Representatives indicated that they believed that PGE supplies mains gas to Pauma Valley. That is not the case as Pauma Valley is served only by propane tank gas delivered by road by various suppliers.

### IV. Specific Concerns

1. *PPCSG recommends that the Project Description and the draft EIR consider in detail the impacts of the timing of the construction of the Project and the construction of a 30-inch pipeline pass underneath the Project, both on the Project and on the adopted environmental study for the pipeline.* The Project is proposed to be built on land for which an Environmental Study has been approved to construct a 30-inch water pipeline. The Tentative Map illustrates that the roads to be developed in the Project are designed to coincide with the routing of the pipeline. However, the construction of the pipeline has been delayed and the timing of its eventual construction remains uncertain. One case would be if the pipeline were to be constructed prior to Project commencement, when provision would be require for pipeline maintenance access. A second case would be if the pipeline were to be constructed subsequent to Project start,

or even completion, when provision would be required for access to construct and subsequently maintain the pipeline.

2. *PPCSG recommends that the Tentative Map be amended to illustrate how non-potable water will be delivered to each of the residential lots for avocational agriculture use.* The Tentative Map illustrates on-Project storage of non-potable water for agricultural use and incorporates a limited distribution system. However the Project contemplates that metered, non-potable water will be delivered to each developed lot for avocational agriculture. The Tentative Map does not illustrate the distribution system within the Project to deliver non-potable water to each residential lot.
3. *PPCSG recommends that the Tentative Map be amended to show how fire hydrants will be located in the Project and how fire flow requirements of the responsible fire authority will be achieved, in particular will on-Project storage be required.*