

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Minutes of the November 19, 2012 Meeting

**Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice Chair: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison**

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay  
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members:

Approved: 10 December 2012

<b>1.</b>		<b>Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:</b>								<b>7: 03 PM</b>				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	A	A	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P

**Notes: Hofler arrives 7.25 pm**

**Quorum Established: 11 present**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2. Approval of Minutes:**

**Motion:** Move to approve minutes of 22 October 2012 as presented

**Maker/Second:** Hutchison/Quinley

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 10-0-1 Franck abstains [not present at subject meeting]

**3. Open Forum:**

Anderson asks about the possibility of reducing speed limits on Vesper Rd [whole road] since he is aware of 5 fatalities in recent memory. Smith explains that earlier consideration of reducing speed on Vesper Rd. resulted in no additional speed reduction measures by the County because Vesper Rd. lacked the necessary daily trips to warrant such measures. Rudolf cites another earlier, unsuccessful effort to reduce speed on Vesper Rd. Anderson cites the collision loss of the fence along his driveway on several occasions. Smith adds that traffic conditions on Vesper Rd. may change after build-out of the strip mall proposed at Valley Center Rd. and Lake Wohlford Rd.

**4. Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:**

**4.a.**

**Discussion and vote on combining various road-related funding for Valley Center including the \$425,000 road mitigation fund from San Pasqual Tribe, County Capital Improvement Project (CIP) funds currently earmarked for improvements to Cole Grade Road and mitigation funds being negotiated with Harrah's Rincon. Michael Long from Department of Public Works, DPW, will be present to make a presentation and respond to questions. (Smith)**

**Discussion:** Smith presents background of fund bundling concept. He says there are a number of funding sources available for road improvements, e.g. tribal mitigation funds and Capital Improvement Project [CIP] funds. Murali Pasumarthi, DPW, and Michael Long, DPW, present the rationale behind the suggested combination of road improvement funds. Pasumarthi recounts history of priority for road improvements and the current expenditure of San Pasqual casino funds [\$425K] to date. He then recounts specific improvements for Valley Center Road on the VCCPG list that can be handled under normal budgetary allocations and are already accomplished: Adjusted traffic light timing to help minimize congestion; moved back fence posts at several sites along heritage trail to improve sight lines for entering traffic; installed intersection approach signs at several intersections; and installed larger-sized 45 mph speed limit signs. Long continues with a description of capital improvement projects still in process for Valley Center Road as part of the San Pasqual mitigation funds: at Mirar de Valle proposing a 6 ft wide median at southern edge of intersection that will restrict southbound left turns into market; vehicle speed feedback signs at four locations in the North and South Villages; stamped concrete pedestrian crossings at Lilac/ Valley Center Rd. intersection and Woods Valley Rd./ Valley Center Rd. intersection; placement of Botts dots/Stimson markers on medians and road edges along Valley Center Rd.; and, lighting of several intersections. Long estimated that the total construction costs for these five items would

be about \$225K [later in the discussion revised to \$325K when 'soft costs' for design and engineering are factored in; leaving \$100K in unallocated funds].

Smith asks about progress on Cole Grade Rd. improvements and the status of funding. Long says money has been programmed in 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 fiscal years for construction with completion in 2016. Long says DPW is presently working to complete 30% level of design/engineering. And, he anticipates design/engineering completion in 2015.

Smith cites the Rincon hotel construction and the impact that it will have on VC Roads. He asks Pasumarthi to address those concerns. Pasumarthi cites the Environmental Evaluation [EE] documentation completed by the Rincon Tribe and the doubling of hotel and commercial floor space in that project. He says all the tribes with casinos are anticipating expansion of their facilities and have asked about a fair share contribution for road improvements needed to accommodate the expansions. He says the EE doesn't address any other development within travel corridor affected. He suggests that the left over funding [approximately \$100K] from Valley Center Rd. could be added to tribal fair share contributions to undertake a larger project than would otherwise be possible.

Davis says much of the casino traffic is using Old Castle/Lilac Rd. and wear is accelerating on that roadway. He says the focus shouldn't be only on Valley Center Rd. Pasumarthi says because of the complexity of the negotiation process with the tribes, it is difficult to say how the decision is made to include specific roads for consideration as a priority. Hutchison asks who is negotiating for the County with the tribes to establish these priorities and mitigation funding levels, and wonders if this person is familiar with the Valley Center situation. Pasumarthi says Sarah Aghassi, Deputy County Administrator, does the negotiating and it is not clear if she is familiar with road conditions in VC. Rudolf asks about the once-proposed short passing lanes along Old Castle Road/Lilac Road aimed at alleviating some congestion. Pasumarthi and Long say those lanes were not on list of requests for Valley Center Rd. improvements.

Rudolf asks Long about the planned expansion of the Cole Grade Rd. bridge at Cool Valley Rd. needing widening and how that is to be handled. Long says the County will hire a consultant for bridge design and it will likely have a natural bottom that would accommodate wildlife transit. Rudolf asks if trail realignment in conjunction with the proposed fire station at the southwest corner of Cool Valley Rd. and Cole Grade Rd. will impact bridge design. Long says It will be considered as any new project and will have to transit the review process. Davis asks if Cole Grade Rd. money will be included in the suggested funding bundle and halt improvement on Cole Grade Rd. Pasumarthi and Long say there is no intention that Cole Grade Rd. improvement funding would be a part of the proposed bundle.

Vick applauds the DPW, which has always been responsive to input by the Mobility SC. He then asks about Valley Center Rd. projects completion dates and Long says construction would start about May 2013. Vick expresses concern about recalibrating the speed limits on Valley Center Rd. [said to be scheduled for December 2013] without completion of the several noted improvements, which will help to slow traffic speeds and influence the calculation of the new speed limit. Pasumarthi says he is sensitive to speed concerns and would not recalibrate the limits until improvements are made.

Vick asks how visible the stamped concrete walks designated for intersections at Lilac Rd. and Woods Valley Rd. on Valley Center Rd. would be to approaching traffic. Long and Pasumarthi say they are aware of that concern and it will be addressed in the design of the project.

Tom Bumgardner, audience, asks about the possibility of a truck route for delivery trucks to casinos that would avoid the use of Valley Center Rd. Pasumarthi says they can review traffic features that tend to funnel trucks to Valley Center Rd. Smith explains why trucks have been directed to Lilac/Old Castle Rd. based on the limitations of Hwy. 76 for trucks over a certain length. Smith asks for a review of Lilac/Old Castle and Hwy. 76 for comparison of fitness for truck traffic. Pasumarthi says that Hwy. 76 is a state road, and is outside their purview. Davis warns about the degree of damage on Lilac/Old Castle Rd. from trucks and casino buses leading to more costly repairs if not addressed soon. Long and Pasumarthi say they will check the recent

survey of county road conditions to see if Lilac/Old Castle Rd. warrants immediate attention. Smith says Lilac/Old Castle Rd. is a continuing issue with heavy vehicle traffic limited on Hwy. 76. Pasumarthi says a letter asking for Traffic Advisory Committee and DPW staff review of limitations on large vehicle usage on Lilac/Old Castle Rd would be appropriate. Rudolf asks DPW [Long and Pasumarthi] to review any restrictions on large vehicle use and possible restrictions for such vehicles on Lilac/Old Castle Rd from Champagne Blvd. to Valley Center Rd. Smith says that given the locations of the casinos, there will be future problems that need to be reviewed by the Mobility SC.

Smith asks Long and Pasumarthi what the County is considering doing at the intersection of Lake Wohlford Rd and Valley Center Rd. re lane additions for strip mall access etc. Pasumarthi says he is aware of the issue at Sunset Rd. and Valley Center Rd. and the need for an east bound turn pocket at Sunset Rd. for right turns into mall. However, there has been no response from the applicant tribe yet.

**Motion:** Move to support DPW implementation of Valley Center Rd. improvements from VCCPG priority list for approximately \$325K [of \$425K], and support DPW efforts to proceed on Cole Grade Rd. improvements per VCCPG recommendations.

**Maker/Second:** Smith/Rudolf **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 1. 12-0-0 Voice

**Motion:** Move to request that DPW review any possible restrictions for large vehicle use on Lilac/Old Castle Rd. from Champagne Blvd. to Valley Center Rd.

**Maker/Second:** Rudolf/ Lewis **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 2. 12-0-0 Voice

**4.b.**

**Discussion and vote on a report from the Mobility sub-committee on the local public roads CIP priority list. There will also be a vote on a new mobility sub-committee member, Malcolm Smith. (Davis)**

**Discussion:** Davis asks to have a vote confirming Malcolm Smith as a new member of the Mobility SC to replace Sandy Smith. Davis then presents the history of Mobility SC work, e.g. J-36 road edge standard, mobility element roads, Community Evacuation Route Study [CERS], etc. He then reviews the new priority list for local public roads. He explains the process of identifying priorities. Davis reviews the top tier of priority 1 roads. Hofler says rights-of-way [ROW] for Villa Sierra are in place. Hofler approves of the tier 1 list. She suggests Mirar de Valle is a good alternative to Lilac/Old Castle Rd. and Valley Center Rd. She objects to additional widening of Valley Center Rd. as an easier alternative. CERS Corridor 11 [generally along Yellow Brick Road/Villa Sierra from Pauma Heights Rd. to Vesper Rd.] is good because Villa Sierra has many Irrevocable Offers to Dedicate [IOD] in place and could be an alternative to Cole Grade Rd./Valley Center Rd. Smith says there will be substantial opposition from residents to creating an attractive, easier route between the High School and Middle School. He says it is highly residential along that proposed route compared to the combination of Cole Grade Rd. and Valley Center Rd. Hofler counters saying that the IODs have been in place for many years and residents should know about the potential for that road development. She says there may be resistance from residents along that route, but it is the right thing to do for the community. Smith says people are traveling too fast on narrow, dangerous roads in an effort to avoid Valley Center Road, which is more routinely patrolled and enforced by the Highway Patrol. He re-emphasizes the potential for residents' resistance. Rudolf asks if Smith is opposed to creating local public roads to help alleviate traffic on major roads. Smith objects to that characterization, saying that creating a single local public road as the only alternative to a heavily used combination of mobility element roads would not provide a good alternative. Davis suggests this list does not address how new roads would be built.

Tom Bumgardner, audience, questions the advisability of including on the list the southern end of Valley Center Rd. in Escondido and using Valley Center money to do what the City of Escondido has already agreed to do with the County. Smith says Escondido doesn't want to spend money helping Valley Center. Smith explains County perspective on creating a 4-lane road from I-15 to Valley Center along Bear Valley Parkway and Valley Center Rd. He says we are not committing any funds, we are simply listing it as a priority to be addressed.

**Motion:** Move to approve Malcolm Smith as new member of Mobility SC

**Maker/Second:** Davis/Rudolf **Carries/Fails:** [Y-N-A] 12-0-0 Voice

**Motion:** Move that VCCPG endorse the priority matrix for Capital Improvement Project development as proposed by the Mobility SC. [Matrix appended below]

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Davis/Jackson								<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] 12-0-0 Voice							
<b>Notes:</b>															
<b>4.c.</b>		<b>Reconsideration and vote on recommendation to add Nikki Symington the Tribal Liaison Subcommittee. The rationale is new information regarding representation that has a bearing on the decision. (Smith)</b>													
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Smith expresses concern about the previous vote to deny membership on the Tribal Liaison SC to a representative [Nikki Symington] selected by the Rincon Tribe. He wants to reconsider that vote in view of the fact that Ms. Symington was selected by a sovereign nation to be their representative on the SC. Smith says we need the input from our neighbor to the east. Rudolf says there is no new information to support reconsideration of the last vote on Nikki Symington. He says there is a need to have new information to reconsider according to the rules of order. Smith says there is negative feedback on the denial of membership for Symington from other tribes. Smith says Symington is not a registered lobbyist in San Diego County and that is new information. Vick says he was not aware Symington was being promoted by the Rincon Tribe. Bumgardner, audience, objects to denying Symington membership, saying we need to have a relationship with the tribes regardless of how it is arranged. An unidentified audience member says we should have representatives from all the tribes not just Rincon. Smith and others point out that the Tribal Liaison SC has been trying for years to get the tribes to send representatives without much success. Bill Lewis, audience, suggests that Symington, as a paid consultant to the Rincon Tribe, would have to recuse herself on many votes. Rudolf says that as a paid consultant she may dominate the SC. Christine Lewis says at least we know her connections and that she has the right to represent tribe on the SC.</p>															
<b>Motion: move to reconsider Nikki Symington as a member of the Tribal Liaison SC based on new information presented.</b>															
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Lewis								<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] 2-10-0							
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N	
N	N	N	A	A	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	
<b>Notes:</b>															
<b>4.d.</b>		<b>Discussion, report and possible vote on request from Valley Center resident Danny Green on creation of a go-cart facility to enhance the activities for teens in Valley Center and provide a family friendly amusement. (Vick)</b>													
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Vick introduces Danny Green. Cites note sent to Oliver Smith by Danny Green. Green says 1500 High School and 1000 Middle School students in Valley Center and more in Escondido need something to do. He wants to have a go-cart facility with a video game arcade and such other entertainments that would be conducive to a drug free environment for young people. He cites other similar facilities that have been successful in surrounding areas. Vick says that Green presented his idea to the Parks and Recreation Board [PRB]. Tom Bumgardner, audience, says PRB supports the idea but it has no money to assist with the development. He says it would be an indoor facility. Vick adds to the notion that there are not many activities for kids in VC. Hofler asks if Green has been to the facility at Pala. Green says it is more of a racetrack, not a broader entertainment center. Quinley asks for definition of go-cart. Green defines go-cart saying his idea is not for competitive racing but is for a broader entertainment demographic. Rudolf asks about the size of the proposed facility. Green clarifies saying it would be about a1-acre indoor facility. Adds that the go-carts would be gasoline powered. Rudolf suggests the need to consult the community plan about a commercial location for the facility in North Village in the southern section. Vick cites need for recreation opportunities. Rudolf questions advisability of endorsing an idea without a specific project to review. Hutchison supports Rudolf's notion that it is premature to consider such an idea without specific project parameters. He says the VCCPG is not a promoter/developer. Vick explains his motion. Smith offers an amendment to broaden motion. Quinley thinks we could indicate our lack of opposition to the idea. Hofler says there is precedent for such a vote. Bill Lewis, audience, agrees with Rudolf re lack of a real plan. Davis asks if a SC can review the proposal and</p>															

make a more refined motion. Rudolf suggests referring to Parks and Recreation SC. Smith wants to vote to support Green somehow. Cites needs. Vick and Hofler accept amendment to their motion.	
<b>Motion:</b> Move that the VCCPG support the development of a recreational facility, such as go-cart track facility, with recreational amenities in VC and encourage the developers in the North and South Villages, and the local casinos, to consider building or leasing space to a public or private recreational facility operator.	
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Vick/Hofler	
<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] 12-0-0 Voice	
<b>4.e.</b>	<b>Following the announcement of a vacancy in the 1-15 Design Review Board and Applicants having been provided with appropriate information about the position and about the VCCPG, the Nominations sub-Committee chair Hans Britsch will introduce candidates for the position and invite each to speak. At the December 10, 2012 VCCPG meeting the Planning Group will elect/recommend a candidate to fill the vacancy. (Britsch)</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> Smith presents. Cites Dr. Andrea Bower resume. Says he has not seen an application, nor answers to standard questions. The vacancy has been advertised since August and generated only one applicant. It is suggested by Hutchison that the vacancy continue to be advertised until the December meeting allowing the present candidate to complete the application and to possibly elicit additional candidates.	
<b>Motion: Move to continue consideration of candidates to December meeting.</b>	
<b>Maker/Second:</b> Quinley/Davis	
<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] 12-0-0 Voice	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Discussion Items [No VCCPG advisory vote is to be taken for the following items]:</b>
<b>5.a.</b>	<b>Discussion of meeting with DPDS about county plans to allow digital billboards to replace other signs in rural areas including Valley Center. (Smith)</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> Smith presents digital billboards information. He says BOS has asked Department of Planning and Development Services [DPDS] to review requirements for lighted digital billboards and to devise ways of revising regulations that would not allow motion or flashing images but would allow images on such billboards to change about every 8 seconds. The BOS has suggested limitations for lighted digital billboards such as billboard companies must remove 3 ordinary billboards to put up 1 lighted digital billboard or sign; require height limits for digital billboards and signs; or, as originally proposed, only allow conversion of billboards and signs that currently exist. Smith thinks it might be useful for emergency agencies to have no-notice override for displaying emergency information on such billboards and signs. Illumination of any billboard or sign is a potential problem for night sky darkness. The County wants feedback from various groups on this issue of illuminated digital signs and billboards. It wants information by end of January. Smith suggests possible public uses of lighted billboards. Hutchison says the fire district in Valley Center has such a sign and presents relatively useless information on it most of the time. Smith says the fire district controls messaging closely, even to the point of not routinely allowing Amber Alert information to be displayed. Rudolf says, since this plan applies to the entire county, it may result in some distant billboards being dismantled and new illuminated digital ones being installed in Valley Center. Hofler says night sky issue would eliminate most of Valley Center from consideration for such installations. Quinley and Hutchison will draft a proposal for adoption by VCCPG at the January 2013 meeting.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Subcommittee Reports &amp; Business:</b>
a)	Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
b)	GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
d)	Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
e)	Parks & Recreation – Brian Bachman, Chair.
f)	Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive
g)	Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair. :
h)	Spanish Trails/Segal Ranch – Mark Jackson, Chair. - inactive
i)	Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair:
j)	Website – Robert Davis, Chair:
k)	Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.
l)	I-15/395 Master Planned Community [Accretive] – Steve Hutchison, Chair
m)	Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair

<b>7.</b>	<b>Correspondence Received for 19 November 2012 Agenda:</b>	
a)	DPDS to VCCPG; Appeal of Planning Commission Decision to Approve Sol Orchard Valley Center Solar Energy Major Use Permit; P11-027, by Lozeau Drury LLP on Behalf of Laborers International Union of North American, Local Union No. 89. The project is located at 15155 Vesper Road and would consist of 46 acres of solar panels over a 55-acre site with a production capacity of 7.5 megawatts. A hearing was held on October 31, 2012 by the Board of Supervisors to consider this appeal.	
b)	On October 31, 2012 The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego will consider ordinances amending Title 6 of the San Diego County Code relating to vector control to establish a County-wide Administrative Code to establish an Eye Gnat Abatement Appeals Board. The amendments would add eye gnats to the definition of a "vector" thereby allowing abatement actions to be taken when it is determined that eye gnats are causing a nuisance to the public. The proposed Ordinance will no longer include the authority to issue orders that pesticides must be used to abate eye gnats	
c)	DPDS to VCCPG; County wishes to explore changing sign ordinance to allow digital signs in communities like Valley Center. DPDS plans to return to BOS at the end of January to give an update on the BOS request to look at revising the sign ordinance to support digital billboards, primarily in the unincorporated areas. In the interim, DPDS will be sending additional information and meeting summaries. DPDS will be requesting formal comment to include in their report to BOS which VCCPG must offer not later than the January 10, 2013 meeting. (Quinley)	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Motion to Adjourn:</b>	<b>9.59 pm</b>
	<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Quinley	<b>Carries/Fails:</b> [Y-N-A] Voice <b>12-0-0</b>
<b>Note: Next regular meeting scheduled for December 10, 2012</b>		

Appended materials: Mobility SC Local Public Road Priority Matrix [item 4.b]:

<b>Priority 1</b>				
<b>ID #</b>	<b>Road</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Other Refs</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Tier 1</b>				
ME16A	VC Road at bottom of grade	Bevin Lane north to ESC city limit	Eureka Springs ½ mile north to connect to grade	4-lanes connection to Escondido
CERS 11	Eastern N/S Emergency	Vesper Road (k) to Pauma Heights	LPR a., LPR c., LPR j., LPR h.	Alternative schools access
ME 18	Mirar de Valle Road	North County Metro boundary [Mtn Meadows Rd.] to Road 19 [behind dairy project]	CERS 8	Southern east/west escape route and VC Rd. relief
ME 13	Cole Grade Road	New Road 14 to Pala/Pauma boundary	CIP; TIF -VC Rd to Fruitvale	
<b>Tier 2</b>				
ME 5	Old Castle Road/Lilac Rd	Old Highway 395 to VC Road	CIP	Principal east/west evacuation route
LPR s.	Stardust Lane	Hilldale to W. Oak Glen	CERS 4	High School circulation and evacuation

## Priority 1

Priority 1				
ID #	Road	Segment	Other Refs	Comments
LPR mm./LPR g.	Mesa Verde/ Anthony Rd./ Anthony Ln.	Extend LPR mm from Anthony (g) to Lilac Road/ Extend LPR g to Mesa Crest Rd. [i]		Combined LPR mm. & LPR g.
ME 3	New Road 3	West Lilac Road to West Oak Glen Road / Cole Grade Road	CERS 3	Road 3C
<b>Tier 3</b>				
LPR e.	Wilkes Road	Old Castle to Broadway	CERS 1B	
ME 16	Valley Center Road	North County Metro to Pala/Pauma boundary		
ME 6	Lilac Road	Pala/Pauma to Old Castle Road		

## Priority 2

ID #	Road	Segment	Other Refs	Comments
ME 20	Woods Valley Road	Valley Center Road to Lake Wohlford Road		
ME 19	New Road 19	Lilac Road to Valley Center Road (at Woods Valley Road)		
ME 14	New Road 14	Valley Center (at Miller Road) to VC Road (at New Road 15)		
ME1	Couser Canyon Road	Fallbrook CPA boundary to Lilac Road		
ME 11	New Road 11	Miller Road to Cole Grade Road		
ME 12	Fruitvale Road	Cole Grade Road to Villa Sierra Road		
LPR b.	Thudernut Lane	Valley Center Road to Vesper extension (k)		
LPR k.	Vesper Road	Extend to Thudernut extension		
LPR p.	Pauma Heights Road	Extend to Curran Court		
ME 8	Villa Sierra Road	Cool Valley Road to Mac Tan Road	CIP	
ME 10	Miller Road	Valley Center Road to Villa Sierra Road		
LPR r.	Hilldale Road	Extend to Mesa Crest Road (i)		
LPR w.	New Road	Old Castle to West Lilac	CERS 1A	
ME 4	Circle R Road	Old Highway 395 to West Lilac Road		
ME 9	Mac Tan Road	Villa Sierra Road to Valley Center Road		
ME 21	Lake Wohlford Rd	North County Metro to Valley Center Road		
ME 22	Paradise Mountain Rd	Lake Wohlford Road to Hell Hole Canyon		

## Priority 2

ID #	Road	Segment	Other Refs	Comments
LPR i.	Mesa Crest Road	New ME Road 3 to Country Road		
LPR u.	Cobb Lane	Extend to Cool Water Ranch	CERS 12	
LPR n.	New Road	Valley Center Road to Lilac Road		
LPR v.	Willhite/High Point	VC Rd to Cool Valley	Same as ME 15	
ME 2	West Lilac	Bonsall CPA boundary to Lilac Road		
ME 7	Cool Valley Road	Cole Grade Road to Villa Sierra Road		
LPR m.	New Road	Betsworth to Mirar de Valle	CERS 7	
LPR d.	Miller Way	Miller Road to Lilac/Old Castle		
LPR o.	McNally Road	Cole Grade to Stardust Lane (s)		
LPR t.	New Road	Miller Way (d) to Hilldale Road		
LPR f.	Cool Valley Road	Extend west to Anthony (g)		
LPR q.	Pauma Heights Road	Curran Court into Pauma Valley		
LPR y.	Cole Grade Road	Extend to new ME Road 14		
LPR z.	School Bus Lane	Extend to Road v.		
CERS 2	New Road	Lilac to McNally		
CERS 14	New Road	Guejito Rd to Paradise Mountain Rd		

## Village Road Networks

ID #	Road	Segment	Other Refs	Comments
------	------	---------	------------	----------

## Priority 2

ID #	Road	Segment	Other Refs	Comments
N Village Interior Network	School Road	Extend from Cole Grade to Miller Road	LPR x.	These roads should be built as villages are developed
	Horse Creek	Extend from Cole Grade to Indian Creek	LPR bb.	
	Indian Creek Road	New ME Road 14 to Horse Creek (bb)	LPR aa. Same as ME 17	
S Village North Interior Network	New Road	Betsworth to ME Road 19	LPR cc.	
	Old Road	Valley Center Road to ME Road 19	LPR gg.	
	New Road	ME Road 19 to Lilac	LPR hh.	
S Village S/E Interior Network	Mirar de Valle	Mirar de Valle Road to New Road ee	LPR dd.	
	New Road	Woods Valley to New Road ii	LPR ee	
	Charlan Road	Extend to ME Road 19 and east	LPR ff.	
	New Road	VC Rd to New Road ee	LPR ii.	
S Village N/E Interior Network	New Road	Connect New Roads kk and ll	LPR jj.	
	New Road	Valley Center Road to New Road jj	LPR kk.	
	New Road	Valley Center Road to New Road jj	LPR ll.	