

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

REGULAR MEETING, MAY 7, 2013,
APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 3

Date: May 7, 2013

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.

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: Five members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Bill Winn, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ron Barbanell; and Brad Smith. Stephanie Spencer and Ben Brooks were absent.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The Minutes of April 2, 2013 had been circulated to all board members for review and comment. One correction of Bill's had been incorporated and then it was re-circulated prior to this meeting. Ron moved to approve as amended, Bill seconded and they were approved 5-0.

3. OPEN FORUM:

- a. There was no one in the audience who wanted to speak at our open forum. This is where members of the public may speak to PPCSG on any subject matter that is within PPCSG's jurisdiction and that is not on the posted agenda. Andy made a comment here about a statement that was made at last meeting by the developers of Warner Ranch. They stated that Caltrans has approved a lateral sewer line running for 2.5 miles inside the state route 76 right of way. Andy contacted the director of the California Department Of Transportation about this and received a letter back from them stating that there was no such deal. They stated that if they approved of something like this it would be very unusual and only under specific circumstances; and more importantly the formal approval of encroachment on public right of way would only take place after there was a county approved EIR and additionally a formal submittal to them of an Encroachment Permit Application! Andy stated that we were misled and they misrepresented the facts at the last meeting and he wanted this DOT response included as an addendum to these minutes.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. We reviewed a County 2013 Draft General Plan Clean-up that had been circulated. It contained no changes directly affecting us and apparently only minor changes overall. Bill moved to accept them as presented and Brad gave the second. Andy then brought up a possible concern that we might have with the GP as it exists. This was that traffic on the 5 mile stretch of State Route 76, roughly from the quarry to Pala, is already accepted as having a failing rating. The rationale for accepting this is that it would be very difficult to make changes to fix it. We have serious concerns with the increased traffic in the area from the new College and 3,000 homes going in at I15 and SR76 and now with additional traffic from the proposed 800 homes at Warner Ranch, 100 or so up on Adams and another 100 or so at and around Turnbull's. This is all in addition to increased traffic from the Harrah's expansion, possible growth of Casino Pauma, and anticipated

growth of Pala Casino. Andy is concerned that the General Plan was based on old volumes that are no longer valid. We could all be very adversely affected by all of this new and possibly unanticipated growth. What should we do? We may need to seek changes in the GP's traffic element to address this new traffic. Fritz brought up the fact that in the past we, or at least previous group members, have gone on record in favor of keeping 76 a two lane road with turn outs and passing lanes; and opposed expansion to a 4 lane highway which would just encourage more development. Bill suggested that we have Andy sum up all of new proposed expansions and the ever increasing weekend recreational traffic. We need the traffic element to address the accumulative effects of all of these additions. Ron also brought up the 10 to 15 years that it will take for the state to actually do anything after they finally decide that it needs addressing. It was suggested that Andy craft a letter to DPDS, DPW and copy Caltrans and SANDAG with our concerns about the possibly overlooked new growth and projected increased traffic levels into the future. Then we will also have a record of our concerns to work with. Nikki mentioned that the county was proceeding with a North County Economic Development Council model which ignores the unrealistic SANDAG model. They are developing a study with incredible depth that can use new tools, such as the Joint Powers Agreement, to leverage all available assistance. She invited us to an upcoming meeting to see this new "Prosperity On Purpose" and encouraged us to contact Bill Horn and his staff with our concerns. Ron so moved and Bill gave the second. It passed 5-0.

- b. We then heard from Tom Bumgardner, CEO of Valley Center Community Recreation Center and ABC Senior Transit, about his proposal to get us to support his non-profit transportation service in the PPCSG area. He has gotten a grant to purchase two 14 passenger busses that will be used to provide door to door, home to facility and back, assistance for seniors and the disabled / handicapped. This will be of great assistance to local fire and ambulance providers who are overwhelmed with the volume of non emergency calls. We are currently spending an exorbitant amount for these high cost trips. The county has provided funding for the busses but will not do so to operate them. Tom needs funding for the first year only. This is because the new Medicare / medical, dual pay provisions in the affordable care act will pay for this service in the future. He called it free government money to do what is needed. The busses have cost \$130,000 but he still needs about \$150,000 to operate it all for a year. He asked for our support in the form of a letter recommending monetary support of his business by all who can. Ron asked for a guess of the number of potential users, to which Tom guessed about 10,000 people/trips a year. Ron said that the plan sounds great but that we don't have enough information to determine if it is an economically sound proposal. He is concerned that with all of the impending demands on "Affordable Care", and that all money is wisely spent. With limited funds, paying for one thing means not having money to do another. Fritz then also agreed and added that he was concerned about spending, not the government's money, but his money to bus people, who probably shouldn't live way out in rural areas, to doctor's appointments; and then next to go shopping for food! Bill suggested that we give Tom a letter in support of him being given grants. Brad elaborated on Tom providing currently needed services. Andy clarified that we are to advise the county on public interest issues. How can we advise the DPH on this? Brad said that in order for the county to continue to expand they need to provide more transportation services. Bill made a motion to have Andy craft such a letter and Brad gave the second. Ron wanted to go on record stating that there are many worthy social causes but what we have to have is information that shows that this makes economic sense. We also need to differentiate between charitable support and governmental support. He stated that he would have to vote against this. The vote was 3-2 to approve, with Fritz and Ron voting against.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. Next we checked to see if there were any communications that required our response. There were none that anyone knew of.
- b. Next we considered approval of operating expenses. Andy wanted to let everyone know that last month's bill for the annual PO Box was only \$46 and not the mistaken amount mentioned at the last meeting.
- c. Andy then brought up the fact that our by-laws require us to consider Stephanie's missing of three consecutive meetings. The laws say that we can vote remove her but no one wanted this. We all understand her many complicating circumstances and want to encourage her to complete her training and form 700 and to hopefully begin attending our meetings. We look forward to working with her, but if she doesn't want to, then she should resign. She will be contacted about this and we will table this until our next meeting.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

Brad moved to adjourn, Andy gave a second, all were in favor (5-0) and the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 PM.

Note attached Addendum: Letter of response from Caltrans, 2 pages.

These minutes were approved at the next meeting held August 6, 2013. Ron moved to approve as amended and circulated, Stephanie gave the second and they were approved 5-1 with Ben abstaining because he was not present at the meeting.

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary, PPCSG

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 11

4050 TAYLOR STREET, M.S. 240

SAN DIEGO, CA 92110

PHONE (619) 688-6681

FAX (619) 688-2511

TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

April 12, 2013

Mail Log #2013-1076

Mr. Charles Mathews
Chairman
Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group
16650 Highway 76
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
mathews.charles@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Mathews:

Thank you for your email dated March 25, 2013 to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Your e-mail requested information from Caltrans to assist the Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group (PPCSG) on a request to provide recommendations to the County of San Diego (County) Planning and Development Services department. The request is in regards to a proposed development called Warner Ranch and their proposal to construct a utility sewer main within State Route 76 (SR-76) right-of-way. District Director Laurie Berman has asked me to respond to your email on her behalf.

Caltrans has been in communication with representatives of Spapouri and Associates, the firm responsible for the Warner Ranch specific plan, regarding their proposal to construct a utility sewer main within Caltrans right-of-way along SR-76. To date, there has been no official encroachment permit, agreement, or documented conceptual approval by Caltrans for this proposal and discussions have only been preliminary with limited information provided to Caltrans as to the Warner Ranch proposal. Any actual formal review and approval of a utility encroachment within Caltrans right-of-way will only take place after the County's approval of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and through a formal Encroachment Permit Application submittal to Caltrans. Caltrans will also comment on the County's EIR as part of the formal public review, and provide any comments or information as it relates to utility encroachments in Caltrans right-of-way at that time.

To protect public investment in the State highway system and promote the safety of highway users, Caltrans has developed minimum standards for the occupancy and use of the State highway right-of-way for utility facilities. All utility encroachments in the State highway right-of-way shall be designed, installed, and maintained so that traffic disruption and other hazards to highway users are minimized. Any utility line proposal needs to be located as close to the right-of-way line as feasible.

Mr. Charles Mathews
April 12, 2013
Page 2

Requests for placement of longitudinal encroachments are permitted on conventional non-access controlled highways only when no other reasonable alternative is available, and it has been determined that there is available space. Requests by companies for placement of longitudinal encroachment utilities for their sole purpose that are not dedicated for public use and franchised by the local governing body are subject to special approval by the Caltrans Division of Design, Chief. The overall process takes place as part of Caltrans formal review of an Encroachment Permit Application.

Thank you for the opportunity to share information, Caltrans values and appreciates open communication with the communities we serve.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact me, at (619) 688-6681 or at bill_figge@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



BILL FIGGE
Deputy District Director Planning

c: Laurie Berman, District Director, Caltrans D11