

PALA - PAUMA COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

P.O. Box 1273

Pauma Valley, CA 92061

Phone: 760-742-0426

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

Page 1 of 3

Date: March 5, 2013

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER 7:01 PM:

Roll Call and quorum established: Six members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Bill Winn, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ben Brooks and Brad Smith. Stephanie Spencer was present but had not completed the ethics training which is required to be a voting member. Ron Barbanell was absent.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. The minutes of the February 5th meeting had been circulated to all members and corrections incorporated. The minutes were re-circulated prior to the meeting. Ben then made a motion to accept these minutes as circulated, and Brad gave a 2nd. With no further discussion, the minutes were approved 4-0 with two abstentions: Bill was not present at the meeting and Stephanie is not approved to vote at this meeting.

3. OPEN FORUM:

- a. There were no comments from the audience during the open public forum.

4. DISCUSSIONS AND ACTION ITEMS:

- a. First we heard a presentation from Joe Martinez on the traffic proposals for the Harrahs Casino Expansion. He was assisted by John Boarman, LLG, who is retained by the Rincon Tribe to prepare the Traffic Impact Report and ongoing mitigation with the County. They have had working sessions and the resultant proposed mitigations were included in the Environmental Assessment Report (EA Report) to the county engineers. They are currently ready to negotiate with the county and have heard from Eric Lardy there who said that they would get their attorneys, traffic advisory committee and the tribe together. Joe said that because of safety issues at the new un-signalized North Entrance, this signal was split from the general plan and pushed forward as a separate top priority. The county has allowed them to pull this issue from the larger negotiations and present drawings and details for separate approval at the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting later, on March 20. They are trying to fast track this signal. Andy said that the initial TAC agenda had this assigned to the wrong planning group (Valley Center), had the current traffic signal shown at the wrong intersection, and the plan that was presented in the regional agenda had the signal being moved from the southern entrance to the north!; which were all wrong. They then got the agenda corrected and stated that we then could request a postponement if we needed. However, we wanted to move forward in hopes that the plan would include all aspects we felt were important so that we could give our approval.

Andy then questioned them as to the details of their proposal. What is the length of the left turn lane and pocket, and its holding capacity in cars and time? Brad asked if the turn lane was just a

striping issue? They said yes to which Brad asked if they had sufficient pavement for the 4 required lanes? They said that unfortunately they had not designed the intersection and did not have the detailed design with them. Fritz asked if it wasn't the southern signal where we had a major problem with the left turn lane being insufficient? This causes complete stopping of northbound traffic once the turn lane fills. This will be dealt with separately in the complete proposal; but Joe said that it would be addressed by having the police at special events and directing traffic to specific entrances. They said that they would be able to get the complete plans to us soon so that we could study the details. Brad concurred that we wanted these.

Secondly, we studied the traffic figures and couldn't understand them in relation to the Casino. How did they estimate the percentage of traffic at each entrance? Joe said that they used current traffic counts and added the proposed increase due to expansion. This clearly showed the need for the proposed northern signal. Brad stated our major concern was for unimpeded north-south traffic flow and to have sufficient turn pockets and signalization to prevent the filling of them. We must prevent the last car from sticking out into oncoming traffic and causing a major accident. Brad questioned anticipated traffic volumes. They stated that Hotel and Valet parking would use the south entrance and casino, dining, and special events primarily the northern entrance. Andy then questioned the internal circulation plans to direct traffic out of the site. They stated that primarily all traffic comes and goes from the same entrance due to limited access to cut across the site. There is a rear fire lane and an internal front bypass road which knowledgeable persons could take to avoid having to return to the main road just to go from hotel to casino parking.

Andy then questioned the use of the 3rd and southernmost un-signalized entrance? They stated that this was a right turn only exit and had been there from the beginning of the casino. Andy questioned the wisdom and safety of having an additional un-signalized intersection on the highway. They stated that this is not part of the development plans. Andy then asked them to consider the safety of this uncontrolled entrance. Brad reiterated the complaints from citizens at the last meeting as to dangerous situations they had encountered there where cars were coming and going without their lights on and where people just walked dangerously across the highway.

Andy continued by stating that the Environmental Assessment Report released about June of 2012 and approved by the Tribe, talked about the new north entrance having 4 lanes into the casino. He stated that it was hard to see on their plans if it still did. That would be one left turn and one right turn lane outbound, and one right turn and one left turn lane inbound. They responded that there will currently only be one inbound lane and that the left turn traffic from the center turn lane would have to share this lane with inbound traffic from the right lane turn pocket. This would be controlled by the light. Andy again questioned why they had deviated from the agreed upon EA Report? They responded that the land that would be needed for the lane is now owned by the tribe as "fee" land and has not yet been approved to be brought into the tribes "trust" land. There was a lively discussion as to the need for this simultaneous free flowing right lane traffic but all agreed that it would be of benefit in special events; that it was a deviation from the agreed upon plan; and that it would be added someday in the future. Andy reiterated that this was not what DPW had assured him upon direct questioning and that this one factor alone was severe enough for us to express our disapproval of this current plan. After some discussion Andy made a motion that we object to the fact that the current design for the one inbound lane is not in conformance with the Environmental Assessment, DPW plans, and that it is not in the best interest of traffic flow into the casino especially at times of special events. Fritz gave a second. Joe told us that this would delay taking action to alleviate the current extreme safety problem there. We then voted 5-0-1 (one abstention) to have Andy formalize our disapproval of the current plan. Joe then asked if there would then be any way we could make this a two step process: to allow the current light planned to address the current safety and then later to add the other lane. Andy said that he felt that the County would likely accommodate them but that we needed to object here.

- b.** We next considered the impact on PPCSG by the new proposed update to the General Plan Housing Element. This is intended to modify and extend the current plan out to 2020. The forecast for the number of people in the Pala Pauma area is planned to increase from the current 6,500 (2012) to 13,500 by 2050, or 38 years to double. The estimate is for 9,000 by 2030. Additionally the county is being tasked by the state to provide 20,000 homes (RHN) by the year 2020. The current county plan does not call for any additional houses to be built in the Pala Pauma area! Therefore any additional housing in our area will be in addition to the current county plans! Andy feels that this gives us a solid reason to limit future development in the area, such as Warner Ranch's 900 homes and the Adams Drive 45 homes currently under consideration. This is planning only for the unincorporated county and not city, nor tribal planning. Andy added that the Pala Pauma area was only scheduled to build 2,100 additional homes from 2010 to 2050! Nikki Symington of Rincon stated that they were ahead of most tribes in their development of a comprehensive report of current and planned housing and development. We congratulated her and wished that everyone would take serious this planning. Looking additionally at the proposed housing increase for Rainbow, next to us, they are scheduled to only add 200 homes to their 750 in the same time period. The ridiculousness of these proposals is highlighted by the current new 800 or so homes scheduled to go in there at the Highway 76/15 intersection! Andy again said that we could use this to our advantage; that this was one more reason to limit growth and not allow these large developments. Nikki said that this was not possible because of current zoning allowed in the General Plan. Brad stated that it was another example of "pie in the sky" planning he has seen. He added that we can only enforce the established rules; most development is non discretionary. Only when someone wants to deviate do we have any discretionary input.
- c.** The last item on the agenda was the request by LAFCO for comment on the Meadowood development in the Rainbow district. The plan we were given takes the current jurisdiction away from Rainbow and transfers it to VC MWD. Bill reminded us about our past objection to this idea. VC is already pricing out the farmers there and now wants to go way out and grab more responsibility so they can continue to raise rates. We are not living within our means. Bill moved that we not support the transfer of authority from Rainbow to Valley Center. Fritz seconded it and it passed again 5-0-1.

6. ADMINISTRATIVE:

- a.** Andy reviewed our completion of Ethics training and found all except Stephanie have completed the required course. She will complete it by next meeting.
- b.** There were no operating expenses.
- c.** Andy announced that on March 19 at 4 PM in this community center, there would be a county presentation on the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Highway 76 and VC Road.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Ben moved to adjourn, Brad gave a second, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:23 PM.

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary, PPCSG

These minutes were approved at the April 2, 2013 meeting. Bill moved to approved as circulated and Ron gave the second. The vote was 6-0 to approve.