

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

REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER, 4 2014
APPROVED MINUTES

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: 4 members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; and Ben Brooks. Ron Barbanell, Stephanie Spencer and Robert Smith were absent.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes of October 7, 2014 had been previously submitted to all, corrected and resubmitted. There was no further discussion and Brad moved to approve as presented. Fritz gave the second and they were approved 3-0-1 with Ben abstaining because he was not present at the original meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. Fritz mentioned a concern with a parcel(s) of land which has 5 inhabited travel trailers and no water or septic. The local water company is concerned about sanitation and has made complaints with the county. These have had no results other than to be informed that they have to find raw sewage in order to initiate action. Fritz mentioned that this is the place where it was reported that stolen property from a recently burglarized residence was found but again local authorities were unable to do anything because of legalities of not having caught them in the action. The water board is continuing their desire for legal action to clean up the place and is requesting our help. See their complaint to the county, Addendum A. Andy said that he was recently in touch with our representative to code compliance and that he will contact her about this issue but he will need Fritz to supply the address and APN number, promptly this time!
- b. Fritz then mentioned his recent request to Andy to check on what finally happened to the Corky Packard illegal residences findings. Andy had just received this request and the county had not had time to respond. Next meeting we should have a response.
- c. Fritz then mentioned an issue that Andy had circulated the prior month (9/17/2014) about some development on parcels up on Adams Drive, APN's 100-130-17 & 26, 15935 Adams Drive. Fritz was mistaken in that the address was on Highway 76 not Adams Drive. He knows that the address number belongs there; but there is no way to find many residences due to the haphazard allocation of addresses in the area. Andy said that he will check into it.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. We then considered proposals by county staff to amend the Traffic Guidelines as issued by the Department of Public Works and possible comments we might want to address. Brad

commented that they did a general review, edit and redline of the current document, not a new one. He said that at the time he had no comments but that Andy did a thorough review, considering the implications of it, and has made a new list of good concerns. Ben said that the only comments he had were concerns with the round-about which wasn't addressed in their document. Andy then presented his two page draft comments which he had previously circulated to all of us for consideration. He asked if someone would move to adopt it. Ben then commented on the section dealing with what constitutes a parade. He questioned Andy's desire to have motorcycle, bicycle, or other groups of 10 or more obtain a parade or permit. He asked for Andy's reasoning requiring such a strong stand on what appears to be naturally occurring events. Andy replied that this would involve only county roads such as Palomar Mt. road and Valley Center Road where these groups often impede normal traffic flow. Brad mentioned the similarity to a slow truck or auto which no one can pass. Andy agreed to remove the special permits section 2 he had. Ben said maybe it could be left as a question to the county as something to consider in their review. Brad came up with wording which supported this idea and Andy's other concern for adequate time for community notification of such events. We all agreed and Andy will incorporate this as a concern, to which the county should consider guidelines in their study.

Brad and all then mentioned their agreements with the other sections and thanked Andy for his diligence in finding these concerns. Brad then moved to approve Andy revising and submitting this response per our discussion, Ben gave the second and it was approved 4-0. See Addendum B for final copy of the Comments to the County.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. Andy then mentioned that he had received the adopted, mitigated, negative declaration of the county's plan to build a new roundabout at the intersection of Hwy 76 and Valley Center Road. This is their environmental review approval. It is a very large document which all of us that had sent in official comments, had been sent copies on CD. For others, it will be on the county website. We began discussions and questions to which Brad mentioned that all of our concerns and comments submitted will have been addressed in the document, even though it will appear that they are just explaining why they are dismissing them. Fritz said that it didn't appear that they enlarged the turn circle to preclude long trucks from having to cut corners and that the inner curb was a low, gradual one to permit just this. He said that they didn't seem to want to change the next incoming curve to the east to be within good curve radii vs. speed ratios either. Brad then said that, after our review of their responses, our only remaining option to effect changes we feel are still needed is to address the Caltrans design group directly with suggestions/technical changes to resolve our remaining unanswered concerns. Andy then quickly found their response to our questioning the inadequate turn radius. They said (pg. 138) that, the inscribed diameter is 130 feet, the circular roadway is 20 feet wide and the truck apron is 16 feet wide. The right away is sufficient to accommodate a truck with a kingpin to rear axle length of 35 feet. Andy said that may be sufficient for traffic on Hwy 76 to the east but traffic coming down Valley Center Road may be much longer. Rather than send an immediate response, we decided to review their proposal another month and then respond.
- b. Under operating expenses concerning rental payments to the Community Center, Fritz mentioned that he had been in contact with Lisa Fitzpatrick's superior in the expenses department, Eric Lardy. He had explained that the county has a requirement to have an active rental agreement, an invoice for specific rental dates, and proof that there was a meeting there on that date. The latter could be the official, published Agenda on record. Fritz had a copy of the proposed new rental agreement which he read. Everyone thought that the agreement was way too wordy and included more than the desired specifics. He is to have them rewrite the rental agreement with just the specifics like say it is for \$45/meeting. Andy said the current limit is \$100/meeting. Fritz said that he would have a new Agreement drawn up to be effective Jan. 1, 2015.

- c. We then discussed the recommendations for new members of the group to replace terms ending December 31, 2014. We are to send our recommendations to the supervisors for their official appointments of new members. The three current members who's terms are expiring have all reapplied. Andy has verified their good status with the register of voters and called for nominations. With no further applicants, Fritz thanked them for reapplying and moved to accept all three as our recommendations and for Andy to forward the results to the supervisors. Ben gave the second and it was passed 4-0.
- d. We then discussed our own rules of order D-2 as it pertains to our group. It states that if a member misses 3 consecutive meetings in a row that they may be removed from the group. They may be removed by the group or by the supervisors. Andy moved that we grant a specific waiver to Ron Barbanell to be excused from this requirement until February 2015 for medical reasons. Ben gave the second and it was approved 4-0.
- e. Next meeting is scheduled for December 2nd. The new Warner Ranch proposal will not be ready as was anticipated.

6. ADJOURNMENT: Fritz moved to adjourn at 7:48 and Andy gave the 2nd. Unanimously carried.

These minutes were approved at the December 2, 2014 meeting. Ben moved to approve as presented, Stephanie gave the second and they were approved 6-0.

Fritz Stumpges, Secretary PPCSG

Rene Savard

To: christopher.livonisdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: FW: Info

Subject: Regarding APN 111-120-48-00 and 111-120-49-00

Christopher the Following are the 2 contacts I have been working with to no avail.

Sheila Niguen 760-940-2996 contact person

Her supervisor Kim Kirkland 760-940-2885

May of 2013 we submitted a formal complaint that there were 2 illegal travel trailers on the above property and people were living in them with no water and no sewage; since that time we now have 3 additional travel trailers totaling 5, plus 2 tents and a horse.

There are safety concerns as well, and recently 2 homes have been burglarized .

As I understand it the county has fined the owner \$15,000 but the owner, Mr. Cassini, does not care about the fines? These trailers are close to, if not on our easement for the Rancho Estates Water Company where our main line goes up the hill to deliver potable water to our shareholders.

The neighbors have given up hope, we do not understand how when people break the law and get away with it there is no justice for our neighborhood.

- 1) Please let us know what the county has done/or is planning to do about it - Fines, Notices Etc.
- 2) What is their plan of action ?
- 3) Or are they just going to do nothing and hope it cures itself !
- 4) This type of eyesore has to affect the values of our land and home values.

Respectfully,

Al Savard Neighborhood Signatures, please sign and print name

Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group ("PPCSG")

Comments regarding draft of proposed replacement Traffic Guidelines

The below recommendations were adopted and approved by resolution made, seconded and unanimously carried at a public meeting of PPCSG held November 4, 2014 at which the draft of the proposed amendments to the Traffic Guidelines of the County of San Diego were considered.

I. Intent of the County

The redrafted introduction (Page i) changes the intent of the County from "to provide" to "to uphold" "safe and efficient traffic operation on the County maintained road system ... " That proposed change of wording changes the entire intent of the County as set forth in the proposed draft form of Traffic Guidelines, because:

1. The word "provide" is defined¹ as to:

- i make (something) available : to supply (something that is wanted or needed)
- ii give something wanted or needed to (someone or something) : to supply (someone or something) with something
- iii say that something will or should happen
- iv make it certain or possible that something will happen or be done

2. The word "uphold" is defined² among other things as to:

- i to support or defend (something, such as a law)

This proposed change reduces the responsibility of the County from accountability for safe and efficient traffic operation to a mere requirement to support and defend such. It is then uncertain as to who has the responsibility for ensuring the safety and efficiency of the County road system if the County does not accept that responsibility.

PPCSG strongly recommends that the proposed draft of the revised Traffic Guidelines be amended to use the original word "provide" in this context and the reverse the proposed replacement by the word "uphold."

II. Temporary Road Closures - Parades and Special Events

SEC. 72.249.5. of the County Code defines, (i) "parade" as ... any march, procession or assembly consisting of persons, animals or vehicles, or combination thereof, upon any street, sidewalk or alley which does not comply with normal and usual traffic regulations or controls. As set forth in the County Code. such a parade may or may not require the closure of a County road.

The geographic area of PPCSG frequently sees an assembly of vehicles causing disruption and potential safety issues to normal traffic that take place without any apparent permit of the Traffic Commissioner. Such parades consist of groups of motorcyclists and cyclists riding two abreast and consisting of twenty or more individuals. In the opinion of PPCSG such an assembly is a Parade, as defined in the County Code, and should be regulated in accordance with such. In addition the proposed ability of the Traffic Commissioner to issue permits with, in effect, no notice to the community fails to meet the entitlement of the community to reasonable notice.

Consequently PPCSG recommends that:

- i the County should consider addressing the issue of parades of motorcyclists and bicyclists in a revised draft to the Traffic Guidelines.*

¹ Merriam-Webster Dictionary at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>

² Merriam-Webster Dictionary at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>

- ii No permits of any nature shall be issued on less than 30 days notice, which would require the application to be submitted earlier to allow for County processing time and reasonable time for community input especially from CP/SGs.*

III. Oversize vehicle parking

PPCSH welcomes the addition of restraints on oversize vehicle parking, and, in particular on the basis of quality of life and aesthetics. However, in support of clarity of action on the part of residents wishing to obtain parking relief and to assist CS/PGs in supporting or otherwise commenting upon such applications, it appears that clarification of the now proposed draft Traffic Guidelines would be helpful.

Consequently PPCSG recommends that:

- i the term "those who reside in the area" be clarified so that it defines the property owners of the real property that constitutes the residential area (as defined in the applicable County Code), and*
- ii the form of "map" required be clarified to define the area that the map should cover and its acceptable source (for example only, an on-net commercial and freely available map service).*

IV. Mid block crossings

PPCSG recommends that the sight distance of motor vehicles should be a consideration in evaluating a mid-block crosswalk request, just as such is a consideration for pedestrians because, even given the purpose of the parking prohibitions, adjacency of parked vehicles may not be the only consideration as signage, etc. can impact lines of sight.