

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 17 Jun 2019, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

Approved Minutes

The June meeting of the Fallbrook Community Planning Group was called to order at 7:00PM by Vice Chairman Jack Wood.

Twelve (12) members were present: Vice-Chairs Jack Wood and Roy Moosa, Jerry Kalman, Eileen Delaney, Donna Gebhart, Lee DeMeo, Karel Hanson, Steve Brown, Mark Mervich, William O'Connor, Victoria Stover and Kim Murphy. Chairman Jim Russell, Guy Howard and Jim Loge were excused.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three-minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item.

Kate Schwartz, a neighbor of the previously approved battery facility for SDG&E near East Mission Rd., inquired about the removal of landscaping elements that exposed her property to the open field and projected battery. She was informed that the Planning Group stipulated to the applicant that the bordering fences be landscaped. She will be given a copy of the minutes with that stipulation in them.

Bob Gonsett, a resident on Alta Vista and operator of a communications service company, is concerned about the effects of pre-emptive SDG&E elective power outages on his business, which studies communications signaling for various agencies. He wants adequate warnings by the power company. He also advised that the power company will be conducting open houses to discuss the parameters of the outages at Valley Center Middle School on Tuesday, June 25, from 5PM to 7:30PM. Valley Center Middle School is at 28102 Lake Wohford Rd. Further information is available from a Mr. Fox at the power company (858-636-1932).

Donna Gebhart reported that Al Gebhart met with Supervisor Desmond's staff and requested some form of honoring local volunteers and non-profit organizations for accomplishing community benefits and as a means to encourage volunteer efforts. She noted in particular the efforts of the Live Oak Park Coalition and the Santa Margarita Open Space Preserve activities on behalf of Fallbrook.

A community resident noted the increasing presence of homeless people in Fallbrook and wanted to know if there is anything being done to address the problem. Eileen Delaney reported that one of the Revitalization projects for Supervisor Desmond is the homeless problem.

Jack Wood reported on the condition of Planning Group Chair Jim Russell, noting that it looks as though it might be at least another six weeks while Mr. Russell is in the care of the downtown VA Hospital. An additional round of surgery is scheduled for Tuesday, June 18.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of 20 May 2019. Voting Item.

Victoria Stover moved to approve the minutes and the motion passed unanimously.

3. On February 27, 2019, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to return to the Board in 180 days with additional requirements for small cell wireless facilities for reducing cluttering, avoidance of sensitive sites, co-location, distance between poles, placement of utility boxes, residential preferred locations, undergrounding of equipment, and additional public noticing. This project proposes changes to the Zoning Ordinance to address the Board direction and to comply with the September 2018 FCC Order. County planners: Tara Lieberman (858) 495-5466 tara.lieberman@sdcounty.ca.gov, Eric Lardy eric.lardy@sdcounty.ca.gov Public Facilities Committee, Community input, Voting item, (5/30)

Both Eric Lardy and Tara Lieberman made a presentation on behalf of the County regarding the roll-out of 5G cellular technology. Of concern to those in attendance was the process and impact of the new small-cell technology on unincorporated/rural areas, in particular Fallbrook; in addition many residents and Planning Group members were annoyed that there is little future input allowed those in this unincorporated area to monitor and affect where and how the small-cell towers are deployed here. Because much of the decision-making has been mandated in a September 2018 ruling by the Federal Communications Commission, which set the ground rules for deployment, implementation is narrowly prescribed for County decision making.

Eric Lardy (EL) noted that the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission are taking input from residents and Planning Groups in July and August, but they do not like the mandated process any more than residents do.

Tara Lieberman (TL) distributed a set of documents that explain many aspects of the program to deploy 5G antennas and supporting equipment. She noted that there are eight primary considerations (included in the document attached to these minutes) governing County decision-making on antenna/pole/support equipment placement. Some 50 jurisdictions throughout the County are affected by the 5G roll-out and most of the new sites are either colocations with existing 4G poles or will be along public rights of way. Further, she indicated that the roll-out will avoid certain sites, such as schools, by using a thousand-foot buffer around those area. The sites selected are categorized as “most” and “least” preferred, and the latter largely governs locations in unincorporated areas.

They both noted that results from the County input sessions such as this meeting will go to the Planning Commission in July. EL said the governing documents will be revised in

keeping with decisions made after all community input received. Those findings will be communicated to Planning/Sponsor Groups throughout the county.

Community and Planning Group questions/concerns revolved around three broad issues: the need for those in attendance to get more information about the features and structure of the system; how 5G will be deployed in Fallbrook, and the request by the Planning Group on behalf of residents for more local input on particular site installations where they threaten the rural character of a neighborhood and/or the rights of individual property-owners.

Among questions asked were:

- Will the County take into account historic sites in unincorporated areas? TL – The County will be looking into it county-wide.
- What consideration is given to possible health-effects of the new technology? EL – The County is prohibited by Federal law from considerations of those issues.
- Will there be consequences of colocation of 5G and 4G technologies in the same area? EL — None because 5G supplements 4G.
- How many antennas are envisioned for each pole? TL—Two at the moment, but they could accommodate one or more up to four on a pole, but the limitation is intentional by the County.
- What kind of support equipment is anticipated for each site? 4G sites require a large perimeter, generators, etc. Will that be required for 5G? EL/TL – The support equipment will be mostly underground, however, what will be on the pole, other than the antenna, will be small. EL—There are no generators for 5G sites.
- Why 5G? EL— It is faster than 4G, the roll-out satisfies a mandate by the FCC and it accommodates more users.
- Will 5G have potential adverse effects on public service communications facilities, particularly for emergency responders? EL—There has been no specific analysis on radio operations, to which Steve Abbott requested that the County make sure 5G does not interfere with fire department communications.
- Will adding more antennas and equipment increase fire hazards in the area? TL – The County will make sure carriers comply with standard County fire policies. She noted much of the equipment will be underground. EL—The County will not approve installations if they do not meet County standards. TL—The sites will also adhere to CPUC standards.
- Are the poles wood or metal? TL – Wood, primarily; and they will be no higher than 50 feet.
- How close will the poles be to residences? EL – They will abide by in-place setback requirements.
- Why aren't new installs to be treated as Major Use Permits like 4G sites? TL—The FCC has taken that option away from the County, which means they are to be treated as ministerial permits, granted by the County.
- Who is funding the process of 5G roll-out? EL – Carriers will pay for the sites and inspections. He said the FCC limits fees jurisdictions can charge for oversight.

- Are there any demonstration or completed sites that can be seen in the county? EL – There are none in unincorporated areas but there are a couple in the Kerney Mesa area.
- Will Planning Groups be informed when the roll-out comes to an unincorporated area? TL – Yes, when one is proposed for an area the County and Planning Group will be notified by the carriers.
- Once the Planning Group is notified what power will they have? EL – No discretionary power, informational notice only.
- Will the staff work with local resources (Bob Gonsett in particular) “to develop suitable language to be incorporated into the zoning code draft to bring necessary protections” from 5G interference with existing communications facilities (emergency and others)? EL – The issue has not come up but he will look into it.
- Why the thousand foot distance from schools, etc.? EL – Aesthetics.
- Why co-locate 4g/5G on a pole? TL – Limit the number of poles. Each antenna when there are two 5Gs on a pole will be ten feet apart. TL noted that the County website will have more information about the locations and colocation of 4G/5G poles.
- How many carriers per pole? EL – Two.
- The FCC requires blending for the 5G gear. How will that be achieved? TL – The equipment will be painted to blend in with the area.
- How many new poles are envisioned for the County? EL – About 1600. The emphasis is on using existing facilities (It was noted by Jack Wood that there are 6500 poles in County rights of way).
- Which rights of way will the poles go on? EL – Public rights of way.
- What about site (pole) security? EL – There will be no fence around the poles to limit public access. He does not see there will be a need like there is for 4G sites.
- How fast will the roll-out occur? EL – No idea.
- How will Planning Groups be notified of a deployment in our areas? EL – Carrier applications will trigger the notification process, and it will occur five at a time (not by the hundreds or singly).
- So the carrier will show the application to planning and sponsor groups but not for approval? EL – Yes. Time frames for roll-out prohibit involving planning/sponsor groups from participating in the approval process.
- Are these groups prohibited from participating in future roll-out decisions for 5G? EL – Yes. FYI, the Board is protesting this aspect to the FCC.
- Aren't we (Planning/Sponsor Groups) losing our democratic rights to make these decisions? EL – These operations are granted to the County and becoming ministerial decisions per the FCC.

Roy Moosa moved to request the County to create a set of guidelines to make 5G roll-out in unincorporated areas tolerable to those communities affected by installation of new poles, especially in areas where there are no existing poles because of underground utilities. Further, he moved that there be a mechanism at the County that if there is no pole in an unincorporated area that the Planning/Sponsor Group be allowed to comment on its placement.

The motion was approved with Bill O'Connor against, all others in favor.

4. Rainbow Municipal Water District discussion of property at 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, Steve Strapac, District Engineer, 760-728-1178, ext. 199, sstrapac@rainbowmwd.com. Held over from the 20 May FCPG meeting. Community Input. Non-voting item. (5/1)

Mr. Strapac was not at the meeting. Steve Brown moved to continue consideration to a future meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Presentation by Nina Pisano, 858 966 1353, Cell 858 699 8090, nina.pisano@sdcounty.ca.gov, San Diego County Parks and Recreation Department, on the San Luis Rey River Park. Community input. Non-voting item.

Marcus Lubich, a manager with SD County Parks and Recreation Department, made the presentation on behalf of his department, noting that the County has acquired two parcels of land for parks at the east and west end of the Ocean Breezes project (between Old 395, Camino del Rey, Lilac Rd and CA 76). The two projects are nominally known as Downs and Dulin, the latter of concern to the Planning Group because it and the neighboring 55+ development is in the Planning Group's jurisdiction. The entire eight-mile/1600-acre stretch of the San Luis Rey River Park straddles both Fallbrook and Bonsall south of CA 76, and County general funds are being used to acquire land and develop park areas, outside of CSA 81 funding sources, within the project. It is referenced in the County's 2005 Master Plan, and will contain 20 miles of public accessible trails. The 45-acre Dulin Rd. parcel is slated to have multi-use sports fields, portions of the trail-network and restrooms (because the Downs parcel is outside of Fallbrook Community Planning Group jurisdiction, the remainder of the minutes will focus on the Dulin portion).

Mr. Lubich noted that the County is working with residents of the Rancho Monserate development where Dulin Rd. enters the park area on access issues. He said that there was an outreach meeting with about 140 residents of the complex and there will be a traffic study to determine number of projected visits and the correct way to control traffic flow through the development and out into the park area. He said the County is committed to working with the development's Homeowners' Association on those access/traffic patterns; and that there would be another community meeting after further inputs are received from those studies. He indicated that the extension of Dulin Rd. into the park area would be narrow and two-lane. Roy Moosa asked if that was the only access into the park and was told that it is. He asked if the Planning Group would see future designs and traffic patterns and was assured that, yes, the County would share those with the Planning Group.

It was noted by Donna Gebhart that residents of Rancho Monserate are concerned about safety for dog walkers and golf carts that use Dulin Rd., which Mr. Lubitsch said is the main access off 395 into the projected park. She also asked if the County would install a button or other mechanism that would allow riders in golf carts to signal for a stop in traffic, to which Marcus Lubich replied they would. She posted a picture of the interface area where the existing portion of Dulin Rd. meets the park boundary (which is attached

to these minutes) and was assured that that portion of Dulin Rd. will be two-lane only and striped. It was noted that in the future Dulin Rd. will continue all the way to Camino del Rey at the western end of the Ocean Breezes development, but that those residents will only have emergency use of the western portion of Dulin Rd. There was concern voiced about the flow of traffic through Rancho Monserate when events take place at the Dulin Park, but he expected there would be coordination with the sheriff's department when there would be events or expected surges of traffic.

When asked about the timeframe for starting the Dulin end of the project, he hoped there would be designs by next spring. Funding is expected in the next fiscal year.

Marcus Lubich also reported on other Parks and Recreation projects in Fallbrook, stating that work continues on improving both the Clemmens Lane (new restroom and converting the volleyball courts to a soccer field) and Don Dussault (new picnic and exercise areas and an improved playground) projects. In addition, he reported that the Board of Supervisors has allocated \$1 million for the acquisition of land for a skate park in Fallbrook, and that the County is fielding owner-offers to sell land for the project. He hoped to resolve the appropriate parcel selection in the coming months. He also indicated the County is working with the developers of Horse Creek Ranch on the creation of committed public parks in those developments east of I-15, and he expected the transfer of those lands to the County in the fall.

6. Presentation by Roger Boddaert, 760 728 4287 on naming a tree/flower to represent Fallbrook. Community input. Non-voting item (5/16)

Mr. Bodaert was not present and Lee DeMeo moved to continue the project to a future meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. ZAP 19-002 Request for a Minor Use Permit for a herpetoculture for the rearing and housing of live harmless reptiles for the pet industry and small animal rearing as food for the reptiles, Live harmless reptiles are turtles, tortoises, lizards, snakes and amphibians. No animals are venomous or poisonous. The project is located on the 2.06 acres at 3130 Sumac Lane, APN 125-03-26, Owner and contact person Rommie Huntington, 760-695-7535, sandfirereptile@gmail.com. County planner Sean Oberbauer, 857-495-5747, sean.oberbauer@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use and Design Review Committees. Community input. Voting item. (5/30)

Both the Land Use and Design Review committees recommended continuing the project. Eileen Delaney moved to continue the project to a future meeting once discrepancies noted by the County are resolved. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52

Respectfully Submitted, Jerry Kalman, Secretary