

LAKESIDE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MEETING MINUTES Wednesday, July 6, 2016 - 6:30

Members present:

Seat 1-Kristen Mitten; 2-Brian Sesko; Seat 3-Karen Ensall; Seat 4-Mike Anderson; Seat 5-Deborah Montgomery; Seat 6-Josef Kufal; Seat 10-Milt Cyphert; Seat 12-Steve Robak; Seat 13-Lisa Anderson; Seat 15-Bob Turner

Members Absent:

Seat 8-Nathan Thompson; Seat 9-Wyatt Allen; Seat 14-Julie Bugbee; Seat 7-waiting for Board of Supervisors vote; Seat 11- currently vacant

Members Late: N/A

Public present: Approximately 34 present, including 10 board members. 4 signed up for Open Forum.

OPEN HOUSE (6:00 - 6:30pm)

1) CALL TO ORDER: 6:33 PM

A. ROLL CALL - Quorum reached with 10 present.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

3) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF: June 1, 2016

A. Corrections: Page 11, 8, c, letter of support to Cal Trans for sidewalks. Motion stated in minutes was for a prior meeting vote. Need the letter of support motion added and the prior motion deleted. Comment made by Kristen Mitten that names need to be documented in the minutes on who opposed and who abstained from votes.

MOTION: was made by Karen Ensall to approve the meeting minutes for June 2016 as amended; seconded by Kristen Mitten. **VOTE:** Motion Passed (10-0-0).

4) ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. **Audio Recording** - Notification was provided that the LCPG meeting may be audio recorded for purposes of preparation of the meeting minutes.

B. **Open Seats:** There is currently one seat open on the LCPG.

i. Interested citizens who reside within the Planning Group area are encouraged to apply for the remaining position by filling out the application that is on the website.

1. Milton Cyphert has gotten some inquiries and has directed them to the website application and encouraged them to bring the application before the LCPG board.
 2. Kristen Mitten reminded the LCPG group that some of the members that were appointed have seats expiring and should get on the November Ballot if they want to stay on the board. Contact the register of voters for information and to get on the ballot.
 3. Deborah Montgomery will email the roster that has the expiration dates.
- C. LCPG announced a planned recommendation by County Staff to the Board of Supervisors to revise the current annual SDG&E County Street Lighting District annual assessment.
- i. On July 20, 2016, County staff will be recommending to the Board of Supervisors a revision to the current **annual** assessment of \$6.48 (per benefit unit) for the San Diego County Street Lighting District (District).
 - ii. There will be a second hearing on August 3, 2016 to confirm that the assessment be placed on property tax bills. Asking for community input.
 1. This will be the first rate change since Fiscal Year 2008-09. The maximum voter-approved assessment is \$25 per benefit unit (1 benefit unit = single-family home). The average rate revisions are as follows, based on the rate moving from \$6.48 to \$13.50:
 - a. **Residential Single Family (56% of Rate Payers)** – Average current rate \$6.48 will increase to \$13.50 annually
 - b. **Residential Multi-Family (41% of Rate Payers)** – Average current rate \$3.55 will increase to \$7.40 annually
 - c. **Commercial/Industrial/Agricultural (3% of Rate Payers, primarily storage units)** – Average current rate \$97.92 will increase to \$204.01 annually.

5) OPEN FORUM

- A. Brian Sesko informed the community and the board that the Parks and Recreation are planning to open up 2 to 3 thousand acres of the Boulder Oaks Preserve and put in 3 different parking/staging areas. Half the park is in the Lakeside influence but the P&R only notified a few people on Wildcat Canyon.
- i. There has only been one meeting up in Ramona.
 - ii. When asked why Lakeside wasn't notified the response was maybe Lakeside will be notified in the future.
 - iii. Boulder Oaks is on the other side of Oak Oasis off Wildcat Canyon Road.
 - iv. The plan is not thought out or planned well.
 - v. The concern is that they took the comments from the Ramona meeting only and are going to make a decision on opening up the preserve with limited funds and large impact to a lot of people.

- B. Steve Robak was at the Lakeside Water Board meeting Tuesday evening and the San Vicente boat ramp opening has been delayed. There is a legal issue between the builder and city so the ramp probably won't open this summer.
- C. Question from the public about the Hanson Pond. Wondering if trails will get open and if it is open for bikes now.
 - i. The trail from El Monte Road to Hanson Pond and the trail on the North end that parallels the road by the pump house.
 - ii. Hanson Pond is private property. The county bought 33 acres on the Willow side where the team penning is. There is a trail on that acreage that is open to the public. Eventually will be connected to the Flume trail.
- D. The public would like LCPG to get a better microphone system.

6) COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

- A. Jim Bennet presentation on the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (GMA).
 - i. County's ground water geologist.
 - ii. Reviews projects that affect ground water.
 - iii. The GMA is a game changer statewide.
 - iv. Talked about the San Diego River Valley ground water basin.
 - 1. County is going before the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2016 making a recommendation to become a groundwater sustainability agency on the San Diego River basin.
 - v. September 2014 Governor Brown signed the GMA into law.
 - 1. Created a state framework for regulating ground water in specific basins that are most critical to the state's water needs.
 - 2. Applies from Oregon to Mexico. All basins were categorized in terms of which basins were to be managed for sustainability.
 - a. Basins were prioritized from low to high priority.
 - b. 127 basins were categorized as medium to high category which is subject to sustainability management.
 - c. Central Valley has been using more ground water than what's being replenished.
 - d. Ground has been sinking from pumping.
 - e. Local agencies will be empowered to manage ALL uses on a basin to bring it into sustainability, same amount of water being drawn out that is coming in.
 - f. Locally our county is ground water poor.
 - g. Only four basins in our county that will require sustainability management in accordance with the act.
 - i. Borrego Valley
 - ii. San Pasqual Valley
 - iii. San Diego River Valley
 - iv. San Louis Rey Valley
 - h. County has become a sustainability management agency for Borrego Valley as declared through Board action in January and is working with Borrego Water district who also declared being a management agency.

3. San Diego River Valley includes Moreno Valley, El Monte Valley, Lindo Lake area of Lakeside, and on into Santee. Within these areas will be required to be sustainability managed.
- vi. There will be three phases to implement.
 1. By June 30, 2017 Public agencies that have water supply, water management, or land use authority are eligible to become ground water sustainability agencies and those will be required to complete a sustainability plan or plans for a given basin. Plans for the San Diego River Valley basin are due January 31, 2022.
 2. Once the plans are adopted there it goes through an up to two year review by the Department of Water Resources.
 3. Once adopted here is a 20 year implementation period to take action to bring the basin into sustainability if required.
- vii. If deadlines aren't met the State has the ability to intervene. Local agencies need to step up to prevent the State from controlling local ground water.
- viii. Agencies eligible to become and agency are:
 1. City of San Diego
 2. Padre Dam Municipal Water District
 3. Lakeside Water District
 4. Helix Water District
 5. City of Santee
- ix. City of San Diego indicated that they want to become an agency.
 1. They may be declaring later in August.
- x. The County is meeting later in July with all the other eligible agencies to gage basic interest in whether or not any of them will go forward to become GWA.
- xi. Once the County declares the other agencies will have 90 days to declare.
 1. The law has a provision that once an agency declares the others have a 90 day clock for others to declare to become agencies on a given basin.
- xii. Public outreach is a key component in this program.
 1. There is an interested parties list being maintained and information will be sent out to those on the list.
- xiii. The County will work with the Center of Collaborative Policy, a neutral facilitator, and any other agencies that stepped forward to help facilitate a legal agreement.
 1. The County has State money for this.
- xiv. The City of San Diego has Pueblo Water Rights to the water and has commented on basically every project in the basin for the last year and a half.
 1. The City of San Diego believes that all the water above and below the ground is theirs and all others will have to report to them.
 2. The County's stance as a local agency with land use over the basin is that there are people using the ground water for decades in the basin and as projects continue to go forward there is surplus water available in this basin the city has not utilized. The County recognizes that water as available to folks as they continue to want to develop, as long as it is within the sustainability.

- xv. Department of Water Resources adopted regulations in May 2016 which cover what has to go into the sustainability plans. The plans have to cover the entire basin and attain sustainability within 20 years. There are interim 5 year progress milestones.
- xvi. Potential groundwater management tools available to the agency's that step forward are:
 - 1. Measuring and metering ground water wells.
 - 2. Measuring extraction from each well and water levels.
 - 3. Requiring extraction and water level reports.
 - 4. If necessary setting extraction limitations on individual wells.
 - 5. Assess fees to pay for implementation of the act.
 - 6. These are options the state has provided with the law, not mandated to be utilized.
- xvii. The State Water Resources Control Board has the authority to intervene and provide a plan and manage the basin if deadlines are not met.
 - 1. They have \$100M of proposition 1 money to assist in implementation of this act.
 - 2. They view and approve the actual plans.
 - 3. They built the regulations for the actual plan.
- xviii. Some of the things that affect the county directly are:
 - 1. The County General Plan, especially the Borrego area where growth is allowed. The plan may need to be amended.
- xix. This act doesn't apply to any new wells or projects right now until an adopted plan is in place.
- xx. It will come down to the scientific study that will have to be done with the plan and whether or not there is a long term problem or not.
- xxi. The County Ground Water Ordinance is likely going to have to be amended to take into consideration any changes that are going to be required on this basin and any others that would be required to be sustainably managed.
- xxii. If using less than two acre feet a year the regulations and fees may not apply. This is at the discretion of the agencies for domestic use.
- xxiii. Next steps:
 - 1. Going to the Board of Supervisors to recommend the County become a ground water sustainability agency on the San Diego River Valley, San Pasqual, and San Louis Rey Water basins.
 - 2. If approved then work on developing legal agreements with other GWA agencies that step forward on how to work together on planning and sustainability management.
- xxiv. Public comments:
 - 1. The City of San Diego is buying the surplus land of Helix in the Valley to protect their Pueblo rights.
 - 2. Bothered that the public seems to have zero rights and already pays a large amount of money on water fees yearly even if they are only using wells.
 - 3. Concerned that wells will be metered and will be charged more fees.
 - 4. Seems like this is a done deal and public has zero say in the matter.

5. Wanted to know if the public would be told in advance the upcoming regulation and fee potential before drilling of a new well.
6. Talk is of injecting sewer water back into the aquifer. Wanted to know if that was part of this plan.
 - a. Padre Dam, the County, and several other agencies were working on a potential reuse project where treated waste water would be pumped into the aquifer and then taking it back out in the Santee portion. That is a potential project that has been in work for the last several years before this GWA regulation.
7. Wanted to know if the plan also included the Indian Reservation which uses a lot of ground water.
 - a. Barona is on the other side of the reservoir and the affect on the San Diego River Valley Ground Water would be minimal at that distance.
8. Wanted to know if this will affect Lindo Lake.
 - a. It will and the dredging project knows about it.

xxv. Board comments:

1. Wanted clarification on the plan being approved on this act.
 - a. Jim went over the deadlines again and stated that once the plan is adopted the regulations will go into effect.
2. Wanted to know what kind of detriment would it cause if the ground kept sinking and then more water was available from Mother Nature.
 - a. There would be permanent loss of the aquifer and storage capability.
3. Wanted to know if this act only applies to the people that fall within the geographic footprint of the basin displayed on the County presentation maps and if people on the hills and fractured rock are exempt.
 - a. All wells will be looked at in terms of the study but anything outside of the boundaries on the map is not subject to management.
4. Wanted to know how it would affect different sand mining projects like McGrath and Ennis, and Hanson Pond, and possible future project.
 - a. They are running under the current regulations and are aware of this new act. The future effect is not known yet. Individual projects are running their own studies but this act would be more rigorous.
5. Wanted to know if this act will be a factor in some of the decisions to approve future projects that affect the ground water.
6. Wanted to know if the County was aware that the millions of tons of sand that mining would extract also act as water storage the same as the aquifer.

- a. That is part of the evaluations that are required for the individual projects going forward which has recently been a hot issue for the City of San Diego.
 - 7. Wanted to know if the Board of Supervisors was going to make a determination on whether it is the City of San Diego or County or one of the other agencies that would become the GMA agency.
 - a. The board is only going to make a determination on whether the County will go forward and become an agency or not. The other agencies will make their own decisions.
 - b. There is a possibility that there could be numerous agencies that all become NWA agencies.
 - c. The County would be the default agency for any others that didn't step up.
- B. Ashley Osterhout on behalf of SANDAG informative presentation regarding a proposed half-cent sales tax increase ballot measure for "Keep San Diego Moving Forward", that would fund projects, repairs, maintenance, and open space management.
 - i. No proponent present, presentation.

7) PUBLIC HEARING

- A. PDS2016-MUP-16-008, PDS2016-ER-16-14-005, Cell phone tower height waiver request for 75' faux mono-tree for four wireless providers and four backup generators. Located at 12918 Wildcat Canyon Rd, Lakeside, 92040.
 - i. Representative of Telespan Communications which looks for corridors that don't have existing wireless service from the majority of the largest carriers.
 - ii. This site is a dark zone for all the carriers from the bottom of Wild Cat Canyon up to the last turn before the casino.
 - iii. This location was selected to provide coverage south on Wild Cat Canyon to where coverage starts towards Barona Casino.
 - iv. 75 foot faux Eucalyptus tree proposed on almost 4 acre parcel that already has Eucalyptus trees.
 - v. Can't be seen from the road.
 - vi. Location on property was selected due to inability to be seen from any of the neighboring parcels.
 - vii. Proposing ground space to cover the four major carriers, Verizon, AT&T, T-Mobile, and Sprint. Also space for a backup generator.
 - viii. The site is least obtrusive location and will provide good coverage.
 - ix. Board comments:
 - 1. Site aerial map shows a lot of other homes in the area. Wanted to know if they were talked to.
 - a. There was a sign out front and notices went out. Some neighbors sent in questions about what was going on, asking for more information.
 - 2. Asked about the simulation in the proposed photo and where the tree is shown.
 - 3. Wanted to know what the height allowance was for these types of towers.

- a. The height designator for this project site, pursuant to section 4010, is subject to the G designator; which is 35 feet. The project is asking for a 40 foot waiver. A 50 foot is preferred but would only accommodate one carrier. Also, the property is below Wild Cat Canyon by about 30 feet.
 - 4. Wanted to know if this was private property and if there was only a shed on it.
 - a. There is a mobile home currently.
 - 5. Wanted to know if there was housing to hold equipment.
 - a. There will be a 30x80 foot space with cinder block wall to dampen the sound. It is 120 feet from any property line.
 - 6. Wanted to know what kind of fuel would be for the backup generator.
 - a. Diesel.
- x. Public comments:
 - 1. Wanted to know if the surrounding trees would affect the wave length of the signal.
 - a. It would if trees were close but there are no trees nearby, they are spread out far enough.

MOTION: Motion made by Steve Robak to approve the height waiver for this project, seconded by Bob Turner.

- i. Board question: Wanted clarification that we are approving the height waiver over the 50 ft. regulation and that LCPG is within rights to do so.
- ii. Wanted to know what assurance can be given that the neighbors were contacted.
 - a. Two notices have been sent out to 150 surrounding homes in the last three weeks.

VOTE: Motion passed (10-0-0).

B. Quail Canyon Time Extension Request. PDS2016-TM-5202TE, PDS2016-ER-88-14-044.

- i. Proponent asking for an extension on a tentative map that was previously approved.
 - 1. Reason is plans were submitted to county and they are in their first plan check and have not received a complete plan check back due to the overload of the County.
 - 2. Plan checks would not be completed by August 12 when the project would expire. Asking for an extension to finish the processing of the plans.
- ii. Board comments:
 - 1. Wanted to know if the project was already approved.
 - a. Yes

2. Time extensions are usually automatically approved so wanted to know if there were changes.
 - a. There are no changes.
3. Wanted to know if all TPMs were discretionary and when it was approved.
 - a. All are and it was approved in 2001.
4. Wanted to know how far away the project is to Lake Jennings.
 - a. Blossom Valley right off Quail Canyon Road.
5. A horse trail is on the property.
 - a. The trail will stay there and will have fencing.

MOTION: Motion made by Steve Robak to approve the tentative map extension for this project, seconded by Mike Anderson.

1. Public comment on the project stating that the CC&R's have run out on the whole area.
2. The public wants to see the documents that go along on this project and wants to have a chance to comment.
 - a. Wants to make sure there is access to trails
 - b. Wants to ensure dedicated open space
 - c. Wants to make sure the project documentation is acceptable to the surrounding area and associations.
3. Board comment was that all LCPG is voting on is a time extension for an existing already approved project.
 - a. LCPG does not get involved with CC&R's.
4. Proponent stated that the tentative map had a site plan, there are recorded conditions, which are specific to the timing of the three phased project.
 - a. Conditions are specific on when the trails have to be dedicated.
 - b. There is an endowment that has to be funded to maintain the open space before the second phase can go in.
5. Board comment asking for a summary asking about the phases, lot sizes, and how many units.
 - a. Lot sizes are 2 acre minimum, 21 houses.
6. Board comment about the total size of the dedicated open space.
 - a. 200 acres were dedicated for phase four.
7. Board comment asking if there was any involvement with the first three phases.
 - a. No involvement, this is a standalone phase.

VOTE: Motion passed (10-0-0).

8) GROUP BUSINESS

- A. Annual CPG training:
 - i. None
- B. Members Attendance review:

- i. Same issues as last month. One person with 5 missing meetings in a calendar year. Issue was already addressed. No discussion or vote.

9) SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- A. Design Review Board (DRB):
 - i. None.
- B. County Service Area 69 (CSA 69):
 - i. None.
- C. Trails Committee Report:
 - i. None.
- D. CIP:
 - i. None.

10) ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING. 7:50pm

Next Meeting Date: Weds. August 3, 2016, starting at 6:30

Deborah Montgomery, Secretary
Lakeside Community Planning Group
lakesidecpg@gmail.com

Visit our website for Agendas, Project Materials, Announcements & more at: LCPG.weebly.com or send an email to the LCPG chair & secretary at: lakesidecpg@gmail.com

Public Disclosure

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Privacy Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error, if you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.