

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

REGULAR MEETING, JULY 1, 2014,
APPROVED MINUTES

Page 1 of 3

Date: July 1, 2014

Scheduled start time: 7:00 PM

Place: Pauma Valley Community Center
16650 Hwy. 76
Pauma Valley, Ca. 92061

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:04 PM.

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: 6 members were present. Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ron Barbanell; Ben Brooks; and Robert Smith. Stephanie Spencer was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes for the March 4 and May 6 meetings had been corrected and distributed before the meeting for final review. There were no further additions so Ben moved to approval them both, Brad gave the second and they were approved 6-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. There were no comments from the public.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. First on the agenda we heard from three representatives of the proposed Shadow Run Ranch Development off of Highway 76 and north of Adams Drive. Mark Thompson is the Project Engineer, Dan Masson is the Project Manager for the developer, and Ron Deuschendorf is the Project Manager Representative for the owner, Sherrill Schoepe. We reviewed the latest site plans and reviewed their responses to our previous comments. We discussed the noise requirements along the highway, and the 24 foot fire road requirements for Adams Drive. We then returned to the Highway 76 access intersection. Andy pressed them on their claims that Caltrans had wanted to not include west bound deceleration and exit acceleration lanes whereas his conversation with Laurie Berman, District 11 Director at Caltrans, said that they had proposed them but there were no set traffic thresholds that require them. Dan and Mark reiterated their claim that Jacob Armstrong and Karen Jewel, Caltrans design engineers who told them what was required and approved the plans, had asked to remove the lanes from their initial proposals because they didn't want to include anything that wasn't justified by traffic studies and code requirements. Andy stated his concern for failure to address forecasts of 26,000 ADT's on the highway between Interstate 15 and Cole Grade Road in the near future and that we would be pressing the county to consider this accumulation of new development impacts.

Ron then questioned them on the global picture of the project and the need for their 44 new homes. He questioned the stated study showing 153 needed here in addition to the 800 home Warner Ranch development and the maybe 2400 or more homes proposed near the Interstate. They replied that they believed that there would be a need for these higher end homes and that this need was unrelated to the other tract homes proposed elsewhere. Ron then questioned the

transition from active agriculture that has been there since the 60's, to a homeowner's association and 44 individual lots with active grove still encouraged, but not required. How will the HOA take over as this is seen as a slowly developing project? They replied that typically the developer will manage the association with shared responsibility until around 50% of the lots are sold. Ron and other's are concerned about insuring the survival of the proposed groves and want some guarantees that this important aspect of the HOA plan remains a documented requirement with binding specificity. We don't like that this important aspect be left as an option where, "homeowners have the opportunity to retain agriculture and have it managed by the HOA". Ron emphasized that none of this nice sounding agriculturally sensitive project need be there after a few years with no written requirements. They responded that they were doing the best they could to design and sell it like that but you cannot make it a requirement for agriculture to work on each individual's property. They will retain a guaranteed 39 acre grove and the buffers as part of the HOA. They will still retain the inexpensive private water supply and the connection to a larger operation which will help the owners retain viable small groves.

There was then a comment that the local school district may now be Valley Center Pauma and not Fallbrook as mentioned in one of their documents.

Andy then asked if they would consider making their proposed private park a public one. This would help the community with our shortage of parklands and mitigate their requirement to support parks through alternative PLDO county fees. They responded that they had not considered that but that they would take a look at it.

Andy then brought up his contention that the secondary access onto Adams Drive is made by easement through a separate property owned by the same developer of the project. He brought up the many problems which arise with separate access easements and suggested instead that the land be included in the project, by simple boundary adjustment or some other means. They responded that there was no way that they could begin a new boundary adjustment at this stage because the county would require a complete restart and that currently both they and the county just want this proposal to be done with! They offered that if the county, in final engineering, were to allow Sherrill to do a simple boundary adjustment, they could see no reason not to as this is what everyone would like, but the past 11 years of negotiations on this agreed plan will not currently permit it. After some final discussions about approval, Brad moved to approve this project, noting a couple of the issues that we've raised in the past and only those that have not been addressed positively. Fritz gave the second and Andy then raised one more problem area. That was the inclusion of 3 additional lots on the east side of the development, owned also by Sherrill Schoepe but not a part of this development, that are included in the annexation application into Yuima water district. He feels that this is additionally growth inducing. They responded that these 3 legal lots are permitted one house each, with one already having a home. That only leaves the two remaining lots allowed one home each and one of them the subject of possible boundary adjustment to allow the access road to be fully included in the development. Everyone was satisfied and the vote was to approve with 4 yes, 0 no, 2 absent, and 1 abstention.

- b. We next considered Initial Study / Draft Environmental Assessment documents from Caltrans. These are for the proposed intersection improvement at Highway 76 (State) and Valley Center Road (County). Fritz and Brad attended Caltrans open house public review on July 7th, 2014 here at this community center. Brad summed up their comments. First, Caltrans is offering 3 proposals: Do Nothing, A Roundabout Intersection, and A Signalized Intersection. Brad noted that both intersection improvement plans importantly eliminate the first curve into the intersection from the east and this corrects the most severe problem there; that being the limited sight distance to the east and the final sharp curve into the intersection. But, Caltrans fails to straighten the next curve east which is also not rated for the speed, being over twice as sharp as required for the speed there. It could be straightened out much better, all within the current limits

of the project. Caltrans said that improvements there were limited to signage, warning of the approaching intersection. Our recommendation was to straighten this curve also, thereby eliminating the inadequate line of sight and loss of control element of accidents responsible for many accidents in the area.

Fritz and Brad stated that Caltrans did not have any documents present to document the actual accidents at the intersection. This made it very hard to evaluate the factual need for improvements, other than to rely on hearsay. Caltrans stated that the data was in the Project Study which was not available. Three Cal Fire employees were present and they are the first responders for accidents there. Unofficially, none of them could remember an accident at this intersection right where they are stationed, but they said most were further east on the grade.

We then discussed the two options for intersection upgrade. Fritz stated he favored the roundabout but with changes. Brad, who earlier opposed the roundabout, now hesitantly favored it. Ben said that he had spoken with the owner of the fruit stand at the intersection and they had never seen an accident there, only up the grade. He felt that it was not a good idea to have heavy laden trucks, which have had to use their brakes extensively coming down the long grade, now to have to slow way down or stop for roundabout or stop for a red light intersection. He felt that straightening out the road for good sight distance to the east and additional flashing yellow lights there was best and it allowed west bound traffic from Valley Center to make the turn on to Highway 76 safely. Ron stated his impression that roundabouts were used in other parts of the country and world but that here they had more accidents than signalized intersections. Brad stated that Caltrans' data says that roundabouts are much safer and especially when considering accident severity where collisions tend to be glancing sideswipes rather than head on or t-bone types. Andy added that there are benefits to roundabout's ability to handle varying traffic volume which will be important considering the projected large increase in traffic coming out of Harrah's and Valley Center to west bound Hwy 76. Fritz then added two considerations that he felt important. Westbound trucks have been braking all the way down the grade from Lake Hinshaw and need either a thru lane or a truck emergency pull out lane. He also added that the proposed roundabout is too small with turn radii too tight to permit truck passage without having to ride up on shallow curbs. Consideration should be given to larger roundabout or a two lane one to eliminate these sharp turns.

Andy then summed up our proposal to the county: We would like to see more data from Caltrans on the accidents to be able to make an informed recommendation. This being a draft proposal we will have plenty of time to comment more accurately in the future. With this in mind, we currently favor a roundabout. We want the realignment of the downhill side of the highway. We would like consideration of an escape lane for downhill trucks. We also feel that trucks should be able to go through the roundabout without going up on curbs.

5. ADMINISTRATION:

- a. The county is requesting our summary of completed Form 700 and Ethics training dates and signatures. We reviewed remaining data required.
- b. Under expenses, Fritz presented invoices from the community center for the first and second quarters of this year. He was not able to submit the first quarter until now. There are 6 months at \$35/month, whether or not we cancelled our meetings. Fritz moved that we submit them to the county for payment, Ron gave the second and they were unanimously approved 5-0.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

- a. We adjourned at 8:04

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary PPCSG

These minutes were approved at the August 5th meeting, Ben moved, Robert 2nd, approved as submitted 4-0.