

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

REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 12, 2013,
APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 3

Date: November 12, 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: All six members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ron Barbanell; Stephanie Spencer; Brad Smith; and Ben Brooks. We are still 1 member short of full potential members since Bill Winn resigned.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. Andy advised that the minutes of August 6, and of September 3, 2013 had been circulated for review prior to this meeting and asked if there were any comments and if not if we could get a motion to approve. Ben moved to approve the August minutes and Fritz gave a second. They were approved 5-0. Fritz then gave a motion to approve the September minutes and Ron gave the second. They were approved 5-0. Brad abstained because he was not at the meetings. Fritz will also submit to the county the notice of insufficient members present for a quorum at the October 1st meeting. There were no real agenda items needing immediate attention and no community members present.

3. OPEN FORUM:

- a. 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. Someone stated that up on Adams Drive, above George Stockton's property there is a lot that has just been graded and there are no posted permits nor any apparent filings listed on the County website. Also, just down from the Stockton's is a single residence property that is for sale and a real estate representative claimed that there were 4 rentals on it. A search of the County Permits did not match. Andy said that we would refer these concerns to the county staff to check them out.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Next on the agenda was a proposal from SDG&E for a 2 Megawatt (approx. 400 homes) solar facility just off HWY 76 at 35453 Pala Del Norte Rd. Pala, in front of the current PEAKER plant there. They need a discretionary permit and they were here to describe the project and take comments. Ian Stewart, Regional Public affairs manager at SDG&E introduced the project. The California Public Utilities Commission is asking for investor owned utilities to create small to moderate solar projects in the range up to 5 Megawatt. Then Joe Frani, the Project Engineer for the project and also with SDG&E described the project. It would be on 8.5 acres of their land right next to the transformer substation and existing power plant which are some of the benefits of this site. It has been cleared previously. It has a beneficial solar facing and he claimed good biological properties. He introduced Jay Miller, Project manager and the person

have worked previously on several projects. Troy Strand, their owner and founder, said that who interfaces with the proposed contractor, Independent Energy Solutions and with whom they were a small, 25 person local company that had been around 15 years and that they would also use local labor and this project was very important to them. Ron then asked why anyone would want to place a big solar farm right on the gateway to this pristine valley where everyone would have to look at it. Ian explained that California is requiring 33% of their electricity be from renewable sources by 2020 and that this is a perfect location per above reasons, including local generation not requiring new transmission lines, and that it would be shielded from view by new vegetation. They replied that they would join with the Peaker Plant plan for hedges and trees to block the view from the road. A resident complained that this would add to the horrible view from all other directions. They were asked if they had a performance bond and if they would be paying a prevailing wage and they replied affirmative to both. Ron asked if there was more land that they would also be developing in this way should this one work out. He still feels that there are many controls placed on the appearance of everyone else's houses, businesses, etc.; so why would these arrays be left without control? They replied that they did own more land but that the current plans are just for this limited experimental project and the adjacent land is not as desirable for development. They were also asked about what comparable sites were considered and they replied that there were about 10 sites and now it is down to 3. They were asked if there were any toxic or hazardous chemicals involved and there are basically none. Ron asked if there was an EIR associated with the project and they replied none had been prepared yet, but the county was starting out suggesting that it was a MND (Minimum Negative Declaration). Andy said that since this was a less than 10 acre development that it fell under a discretionary permit issued by the DPDS with no EIR or Planning or Board review or approvals. They replied that the county was currently stipulating a needed rezone needed to move the land out from agricultural. They stated that they were still in initial discussions, such as this presentation, and that no actual application for a permit had been made yet. When questioned about the Peaker Plant land they replied that it was all one parcel and that the current plant was allowed on agricultural zoned land. They feel that this is pretty unfair to require the complete rezone now after what has already been done. Andy asked Fritz how the plant was planned and he replied that it was just presented as it was going in and we were allowed to suggest that they provide the vegetation to hide it from the roadway. Ron asked about the projected accumulative impacts to which they said that that would come out more when they got into the MND. When pressed for biological impacts they replied that they believed that from the non-native grassland designation, they were not impacting any sensitive species but that it fell under a general habitat loss for biology. Andy asked about the fire impact and they replied that county fire has required a 10,000 gallon reserve tank on site supplied by trucked in water trucks. County has also directed them to begin discussions with the local county fire authority and plan for annexation into it as part of the proposed project. Fritz asked if this project might be seen as SDG&E wanting to get a monopoly on solar also, with their new distribution fees which were planned for others and really hurt their projected profitability. They replied that this project was an experimental one and a directive from the PUC only. Ben asked if this project would be cost competitive with the gas plant there or was this just to meet some governmental mandate? They could only say that there are many mandates but that they are trying to balance the need for solar and gas energy. Andy said that we would see them back after this scoping plan moves forward. He added that the community is not desirable of more eyesores and are concerned with the effectiveness of the proposed camouflage. We are also concerned about future expansions and would ask you to commit to no further expansion on that site. And finally he asked that they consider providing adequate right away for the expansion of HWY 76 as this is one of the few straight a ways available for passing.

- b. Next Andy said that just this morning we received word from the Warner Ranch representatives that due to changes in their environmental consultants creating the EIR and subsequent lack of completed documentation. Andy wanted to reiterate our concerns on their last two presentations here. Is there a demonstrated need for the 800 new homes to be built there, especially in addition to the 2,000 new homes to be built only 6 miles west of there? If there is a need for the 800 homes, then is there justification for building all of them on 100 acres, making it wall to wall homes, completely out of sync with the rural character now present? Also, where is the water going to come from? There is a definite lack of water resources in the valley and for Rainbow district to think that they can provide it is completely not realistic. The state and district just does not have the water to provide for that development in addition to the new 2,000 homes down the road. Finally, we've been lied to before by the developer about the sewer system. First they were to build one on the property to which we objected and when on the second application they said that they would instead use rainbow's system and use a pressurized pump system down HWY 76 to get it there, we asked if CalTrans would go for that and they said they had their approval. Later we found that there was no such agreement. Now they want to get approval for the development and then later get approval for the sewer system. We will not consider approval for the development without sewer details. We are concerned that the developer has not considered any of our concerns in their past EIR revisions. Fritz added that we really needed to address the county, because he felt that they needed to take a stand on what their vision is for the development in the valley. Did all of us individuals give up all of our development rights in the last General Plan Amendment just so that Warner Ranch could put in 800 homes? It was brought up that this is the way the county finances all of its past unfunded projects! Nikki added that they also had an obligation to approve a certain number of units each year as determined by Sandag.

5. ADMINISTRATION:

- a. We then discussed our policy for filling the vacant seat. Andy said that he has been publishing a notice of our open seat in the local newspaper. He encouraged us to let anyone know that we might think would be interested. Fritz asked if it was our policy that the applicant would be given a chance to present their application at a meeting and that after the entire group had heard about their application and qualifications, THEN would we have a month to vet their application before having to vote. Andy replied, "Absolutely". Then Fritz reiterated what he had just asked and Andy then replied that we might then vote on it immediately. Fritz was a little upset with this 'fast track' process. Ron spoke of a possible applicant and that he was very much in favor of approving another Native American to our board to more fairly represent the makeup. It was thought that you would have to be a resident or own property here to become a member. There was some question as to the legal requirements and 'communal ownership' was not thought to be sufficient. Ron asked if we could get a county statement?
- b. Fritz mentioned that we had approved and submitted an invoice for the use of the hall for \$35 / month for the months of April, May, and June for a total of \$105. The county just paid \$70 with no comment. Fritz is to enquire with the county.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

- a. Ron moved to adjourn, Brad gave a second and with no further discussion we voted 6-0 to adjourn at 8:18

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary PPCSG

These minutes were approved at the February 4, 2014 meeting. Ron moved to approve as presented, Ben gave the second and they were approved 5-0.