

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

REGULAR MEETING, MARCH, 3 2015
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: 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.
- b. There was present a great gathering of leaders and people with high concerns for the good of our community! We had the leaders from 4 nations and also neighboring communities. We had many people of high standing who are very active in our public forum and in the local community. We were humbled by the gathering and door of opportunity for communication that has been opened. Andy began by introducing Oliver Smith, his counterpart in Valley Center, and acknowledging current and past chairpersons from Rincon, Pauma, LaJolla Tribes, along with our own Chairman Smith of Pala Tribe. Ron introduced chairman Mazzetti of Rincon who said that Stephanie (our board member and Rincon vice chair) couldn't make it because...and Andy replied, "so you are her stand in?" to which the chairman replied, "I wouldn't go that far"! It was a comedic start to an important discussion! (Secretary's comment: I can't overemphasize my feeling of awe at being in the presence of the "Chief's" of 4 Tribes sitting down to discuss community relations among them and us "white men". What an honor and opportunity! It was a fitting tribute to Ron and his initiative to further our mutual understandings)

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes of December 2, 2014 had been previously submitted to all, corrected and resubmitted. There was no further discussion and Ben moved to approve as presented. Ron gave the second and they were approved 6-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. There was no further communication from the public at this informal opportunity for community comments.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Andy then began the one action item we had on the agenda. It concerned the proposed "Fee to Trust" transfer of some 23 acres of typical county zoned land now owned by the Pauma Tribe in the typical "fee" fashion where taxes are paid to the county. The Pauma Tribe now want to bring it into the Pauma Reservation as land held in 'trust' by the federal government as part of their 'Nation'. We have been asked by the county to convey to them our and community responses and comments about this transfer. They will then decide how to respond to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Note: The county has a blanket policy to deny all transfers, primarily because of loss of its tax base, but takes our comments anyway. Conversely, the BIA approves most all requests anyway! Andy stated that this was a case of

differing interests and viewpoints in the community. There are multiple rights imbedded in the values of the community and we have to work together to make things happen.

Chairman Randall Majel of the Pauma Tribe spoke as to the common practice of many tribes bringing contiguous land into their reservations, many have done it several times. This is the first time Pauma has attempted adding new land to their reservation by 'fee to trust'. With only 248 acres of mostly grove and other revenue sharing businesses important to them, they have exhausted available land for new residences of tribal members. With extended members now wishing to return to the reservation the only current alternative is to split existing homesteads. They see this as an opportunity to continue expansion of the groves along with new housing lots. They have also all grown up dreaming of being able to regain traditional lands which were taken from them, even if they have to now purchase it at a premium price!

Andy then asked for comments or concerns of non-tribal members of the community. Bobby Graziano owns land up across the street from the subject 'Maynard Properties'. Bobby stated that he has no issue with the Indian or non-Indian nature, only that of following existing land use planning. He stated that once land was brought into trust there was very little restriction on its use. There may not be these issues within existing reservations but when expansion is within an existing community there are potential problems. One issue is that a Tribe can state their intended use for this land and as soon as it is brought into trust they can change and do whatever they wish. His concern is that the final use could completely change the character of the community that exists there under current planning mandates. It is rural, low density housing and the current land is zoned for only one dwelling per each of the 3 parcels proposed to transfer. He asked that we consider this in our recommendation to the county.

Chairman Bo Mazzetti responded that all of the land around there and below, including the country club and golf course, use to be farmed by them and was all alfalfa with no one else around. Times do change. With one of the smallest reservations, they really need new housing. His family and Chairman Smith's use to farm here and if you go way back it all belonged to them. Do they like what we've done? They finally have a chance to buy back what was stolen! He asked anyone to tell of any land that was brought back into trust and made worse. He also mentioned the real reason for us not wanting the transfer is the loss of tax money but he said that the tribes give back much more than that loss. They provide road improvements, fire, ambulance and much aid you don't see. He said there were bigger issues we should be concerned about such as water. He also mentioned the many parcels within reservations that had been sold into 'fee' and now site vacant and real blights. They are forbidden to clean them up, and the county says it also can't. So there is a real, not imagined problem. Bobby then mentioned that a big problem is that this land is an island apart from the reservation connected by only a thin sliver of land and could drastically change the agricultural rural nature of his neighborhood. Chairman Mazzetti said that he understood what he was saying because that's exactly what happened to them! Chairman Majel stated that he felt that they had respected the beauty of Pauma and been a good neighbor in the past and he anticipated that to continue into the future.

Andy moved the discussion along to the concerns that once the land is in trust, can it be turned into gaming use. There appears to be some small chance but basically the law is that land purchased and added to reservation cannot be made gaming.

Patsy Fritz, who has served on the county planning commission, began her talk by telling of how she moved to Pauma after her home in Valley Center burned to the ground. It took 18 minutes for the first fire responders to arrive and they were from the Pala Reservation! She stated that the county does not guarantee any views from your property. Large parcels can cluster many homes right in front of your place, or someone could bring in a trailer, and there is nothing that you can do but plant trees or something to block your having view it.

Andy then questioned the status of Pauma Reservation Road and who has responsibility for it and what portions of it. Mazzetti then stated that there is federal money used to maintain all

tribal roads but there is a long wait for the little available funds. The road remains public and access to private property is guaranteed, though not to strictly tribal areas.

Bobby again expressed desires that he and the county be included when the decision for the use of the land is made by the Pauma Tribe. Several people spoke as to the impossibility of this. Nikki stated that it would be illegal for the Pauma Tribe to speak officially to anyone about planning issues except with the federal government. It is the engineer, environmental impact controller and so on, including planning approver for all tribal land use issues.

Carla then brought up other issues of existing water supply authorities and easements attached to current titles.

Lavonne Peck past chairwoman from the La Jolla Tribe then explained that tribes have to follow the same kind of planning and use issues as others in the county but it is through the federal government and laws such as NEPA instead of the state derived CEQA. She explained that they are only following the laws that have been mandated to them and asked that we not believe all of the false horror stories and false assumptions around.

Andy then brought the discussions to an end and asked for board input. Brad began with a question about fee to trust. When the BIA considers all comments and approval for a transfer, do they have the ability to approve, but with stipulations considering public and private issues presented? It was decided that conditions could only be made for issues with the federal approval but conditions of public concern which would infringe upon the Tribes sovereign rights could not be included. Bo Mazzetti then stated that by federal law the chairman of each tribe is on the same level as the governor of a state. Try asking Governor Brown to come down and sit here and consider your concerns in his state decisions! That you have several chairmen here on this issue is testament enough for the seriousness and effort to which they are attempting to enter into discussion and consideration of both sides of these issues.

Ben then asked Chairman Majel if all possible land had been developed on the existing reservation. Majel said that there was much land that is in agriculture which benefits the tribe and will not be disturbed. Ben then asked about existing easements on land brought into trust. Majel stated that the existing easements are transferred with the land and that Water rights and suppliers are possibly another issue that will have to be decided by higher authorities. Discussion was made to then include those easements on any FTT transfer. Someone added that they should be only the 'legal' easements.

Next, Fritz said that he was in favor of tribes being able to bring all the land that they possibly can back into their reservations. He said that he felt that it might help Bobby with his concerns if he would just look around at how the tribes have taken as good or better care of the land than the rest of the county. It cannot begin to compare with how we invaded and took their land and did all of this to their beautiful place and way of life. He stated that the land in this request is currently zoned for 3 homes. If the tribe were to build 6, well that might even be ok; but if they put in 20 then that will not be in harmony with the community there. Fritz then stated that he was a whole lot more concerned with the county leaders and the development that they approve. He doesn't see the tribes creating blight but he does see the county allowing the creep of "Irvine type" high density housing into agricultural areas.

Ron began by stating that he felt that all of the existing easements need to be included officially in this report. Later several chairpersons agreed that all current, legal easements are conveyed with the property and Andy said that he had seen them on the proposal. Ron said that he was scheduled to present later in the meeting about general communication issues but he now quoted chairman Mazzetti about Rincon's concerns for cooperation and transparency in dealing with our mutual concerns. The history of California is the history of our stealing the native's dreams and land from aboriginal times and forcing them to live in the worst places imaginable. And now we are arguing with them about even these places! So when you see these people come here to discuss these issues, you have no idea of the compromise they

carry within them and how blessed we are to have the chairpersons of 4 tribes present. We need to understand how we can take the rules we have and work together for a win-win situation. Ron then asked if we could place Nikki and his '10 points about the nature of fee to trust' into the minutes and Andy replied, "Sure". The secretary asked for an electronic file of Nikki's 10 points. Since then the file has not been able to be found.

Chairman Smith then made his statement. He supports the tribe's rights to take land into trust per the laws of the federal government.

Andy then asked that he be allowed to write a summary to be forwarded to the county. It would include our views, comments and concerns about planning, maintaining easements, the rights of the tribe to recover some of their ancestral land, and the general way in which we hope this will move towards working together as a community. Brad then asked about a vote to approve the FTT and after discussion made a motion to approve this transfer along with full recognition of all the concerns that were just stated. Fritz gave the second and it was approved 6-0. See Addendum A. for Andy's official Summary.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. Andy then changed the meeting to administrative item b first, because it is somewhat related to all that we have just been attempting. We then discussed the protocol for communication between PPCSG and Sovereign nations. This is what Ron has been working on as this subcommittee chairman. We are hoping that Ron will be able to work on this forum for community discussions between all members, including tribal, for the next several months. Ron then wanted to comment on this. He thanked Chairman Smith, Nikki, Patsy and Andy for being open to his desire to create a more open communication between all. In the beginning this was mostly unheard of. He began by empathizing just how much anger the native peoples must carry inside from all of the horrendous treatment they have been subjected to in the past, and continues somewhat to this day. He elaborated on some of these abuses which amounted to genocide and how he is now working with this Tribal Liaison Sub-Committee to forge a new friendship based on mutual understanding and desires to get along and to work to preserve this beautiful area we have. Ron wanted to present an outline of his plan and Andy said that for lack of time, we could make it an amendment to these minutes now, and get into the details next month. We now know just how prophetic Ron was when he said, "I don't want to lose a month Andy because I don't have a lot of months quite frankly. I want to get this going. I want a yes on this tonight." Andy told him that he already had the approval with his charter with the sub-committee. He said, "so go ahead and do it!" The Secretary has found an outline which has been presented as this document and it is attached as Addendum B along with Ron's Outline Table used for this meeting.
- b. We then moved to agenda 'Item a', about the DPDS Live Well San Diego – Thriving Plan Community Workshop, which our Brad and Ben attended as did Oliver Smith. This was about the county's plan to try to change their planning rules to allow them to approve a lot more high density developments in areas now not allowed. Ben then summed up: the county DPDS is looking at policy 1.2 of the general plan which has to do with limiting "leap frog development", its meaning, and its application to the unincorporated areas. Their change has the potential to allow more high density projects in rural areas. They want to eliminate the current very clear LEED-ND certification for any variant proposals to limit leap frog development and substitute some "equivalent", diluted statement which will allow the exact developments it is designed to prohibit now! They want to substitute their '10 principles of county thriving' (read = 10 principles to continued growth). LEED-ND is a U.S. based rating system to which certification is made through strict 3rd party verification of high levels of environmental responsibility and sustainability. Oliver stated that the county does not want to change the General Plan because of it will take a lot of time and effort and a lot of people will be against it. What they are proposing is to change their interpretation of LU 1.2 to allow

other exceptions. This could be such as, if the proposed development is within a ½ mile of a community road! DPDS does not even have county approval or funding for this new review and proposal and is instead funded by developers. They are doing this because even they are running into this brick wall to further unrestricted leap frog developments and they are determined to find some new interpretation which will allow them to proceed without changing the current law. When presented with the LEED-ND standard by the creators of it at this meeting, they were told that the standard is complete and needs or allows no further interpretation. Brad then added the perspective that what this group was claiming to do was trying to help define what equivalent to LEED-ND was. Then they could present it to the planning department, who would then present it to the planning commission and before the BOS so that they could all just approve it without having created it themselves or ordering a real thorough investigation or truly defining an equivalent to LEED. Brad spoke of the lack of formation of any real definition or policy there in regards to the term “equivalent” and only alluded to any possible real motive for this proposal (to the laughter of all who see this run around attempt to continue unbridled county development in rural back country). Oliver then stated that what the head of the DPDS had said was the intention of all of this, was the ability for projects which did not meet all of LEED requirements to be processed so that they could be presented to the BOS who have full and total discretionary power to approve them. They can approve anything put before them but they need a way to do this without meeting the current rules. Andy then asked what action should we and V.C. take. Oliver stated that we need to get the word out as to what is going on and to be aware of this group’s intent to present this to the DPDS without requesting a vote. This way they can put out the exact wording only two weeks before the meeting and get it presented quickly to the planning commission/BOS shortly after. Ben said that we need to express to the BOS our disappointment that they waited so long to let us know about this all and also that we expect them to come out to the planning groups and present and vet their new plan. Oliver said that they have been attempting to keep the whole thing very quiet so as not to raise the public’s attention. Andy made a motion for us to give him the approval to write a strong letter of disappointment in lack of participation with our group, secondly asking that we have participation moving forward with the ability to submit comments prior to going to the planning commission and thirdly requesting that one of their staff be present here to respond to our questions. Ben gave the second, Patsy Fritz and Fritz both said that we should add that we strongly oppose any attempt to circumvent the intent of LU 1.2 and LEED through a diminished and illegal non- “equivalent”. After this discussion we voted 6-0 to approve Andy’s motion. See Addendum C, Andy’s official response as sent to all.

- c. There were no operating expenses and Fritz reported that the county had paid all past rent for the hall and was completely up to date.
- d. The next meeting is April 7, 2015.

6. ADJOURNMENT: Ron moved to adjourn at 8:50 PM and Robert gave the 2nd. Unanimously carried.

These minutes were approved at the May 5, 2015 meeting after considerable discussion about the FTT portion. This review of these minutes included a review of the response document of the FTT to the county. The results are included in May’s minutes. We also approved the addition of the second Table to Addendum B to include Ron’s Outline Table. Ben moved to approve these minutes as stated, Stephanie gave the second and they were approved 5-0.

Fritz Stumpges,
PPCSG Secretary

Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group ("PPCSG")

Comments regarding a proposed Fee-to-Trust transfer ("FTT") in favor of the Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians ("Pauma Band") of San Diego County APNs 131-060-25, 131-090-03, and 131-090-11 ("subject parcels").

At a public meeting held March 3, 2015, PPCSG had the opportunity of hearing comments from members of its community regarding the captioned proposal. The comments came from members of bands of Indians (speaking in favor of the proposed FTT) and individuals residing adjacent to the subject parcels (generally concerned about the impact upon their locale and environment were the land to be removed from a controlling influence of the County).

After considerable discussion, and in recognition of the interests of all parties and the need for the entirety of the community to compromise in harmony, and upon motion made and unanimously carried (6 in favor, none in opposition, and 1 absent), PPCSG resolved that it supported the proposed FTT provided that without infringing upon the sovereign rights of the Pauma Band there could be assurances addressing concerns expressed by the non-tribal community so that:

1. The density of the housing that the FTT application anticipates be developed be not be materially greater than those of the land use designators presently assigned to the subject parcels.
2. Any land use other than specifically set forth in the FTT application be subject to a substantial environmental review comparable to a CEQA review.
3. All of the existing easements on and over the subject parcels continue to provide identical rights and benefits subsequent to any FTT as such easements now provide.
4. There be certainty that the identification of Pauma Reservation Road as a "Bureau of Indian Affairs road" [page 4 of the FTT application] could never result in free and unfettered public access and use being withdrawn or limited, especially with regard to private property located both on local roads and beyond the present Pauma Band reservation.
5. The issues of water rights related to the subject parcels and the delivery of water to the subject parcels be resolved so that there is no diminution of entitlements of the water company presently enjoying such rights.
6. There be arrangements such that residents continuing to pay PRD6 assessments not be disadvantaged by increased assessments as a result of any loss of any pro rata assessments now being paid in regard to the subject parcels.

[Remainder of page blank]

ROUGH DRAFT

Date: September 9, 2014

To: Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group Board: Chairman Charles Matthews, Vice Chairman. Brad Smith, Ben Brooks, Chairman Robert Smith, Vice Chairwoman Stephanie Spencer, Fritz Stumpges.

From: Ron Barbanell, Chairman, Tribal Liaison Committee, Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group

Subject: Proposed agenda for Tribal Liaison Committee conference on **“TRIBAL LAND USE OVERSIGHT BY THE PPCSG, CREATING COOPERATION”**

INTRODUCTION

The Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group (PPCSG) has questions regarding its responsibilities relative to American Indian land-use oversight. Bearing in mind that the PPCSG has oversight responsibility for two diverse communities (Native and Non-Native), four discussion points listed below are proposed topics for a conference on how to improve the outcome of land use oversight of American Indian proposed projects. The Pala Pauma Communities have a seminal opportunity to discuss subjects that previously were impossible to consider at several levels.

Because of the participation, wisdom and vision of PPCSG members Pala Chairman, Robert Smith, and Rincon Vice Chairman Stephanie Spencer, this group has an opportunity for fair and balanced discussions of the following proposed topic areas.

PROPOSED TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

1. With specificity, what is the legal basis and scope of oversight responsibilities of PPCSG, as an advisory body to the Board of Supervisors, for ALL of its community interests with regard to commenting on, requesting information about, meeting with applicants to discuss same, and finally reflecting, by report to the County of San Diego, the interests of the community, which PPCSG represents with regard to oversight of land use requests in general:
 - In other words, what are the scope of responsibilities to evaluate land use proposals by PPCSG for ALL of the interests within the geographic region it represents?
 - What are the goals of these laws and policies?

2. What are the oversight responsibilities over federal lands, such as those governed by American Indian Tribes:
 - Under what circumstances or specific laws does PPCSG have the authority to comment with regard to the sovereign lands of an American Indian Tribe?
 - What is the purpose, legal relationship and limits between the PPCSG responsibilities in providing oversight on behalf of the non-tribal community, and evaluating land use proposals by American Indian tribes?
 - What are the goals of these laws, policies, and practices?

3. What is the perspective of Tribal governments regarding the current exercise of the County land-use responsibilities and jurisdiction in relation to Tribal trust lands:

- How do local Tribal government officials linked to potential PPCSG oversight view the scope of parameters and pertinent conduct of such PPCSG oversight responsibilities when exercising such with regard to Native land use proposals?
 - Are there protocols and precedents when evaluating land use proposals or activities of American Indian Tribal governments on/ or regarding Indian Trust Land of which the PPCSG should be advised?
4. Beyond current applicable laws or policies, what are the best protocols and mechanisms for executing PPCSG review of Tribal land-use requests:
- In what ways may such interactions be improved to achieve the oversight goals and obligations?
 - What changes might bring about the best outcomes for the two communities (American Indian and Non-Native) within the PPCSG sphere of geographic influence.
 - From the perspective of the American Indian Community, how can the PPCSG improve relations, trust, and future cooperation in addressing land use issues of mutual concern?

cc:

San Diego County Supervisor Bill Horn, Fifth District
Chief of Staff Dustin Steiner, Fifth District
Chairman Bo Mazzetti, Rincon
Chairman Randel Majel, Pauma

Chairman Allen Lawson, San Pasqual
Chairwoman Lavonne Peck, La Jolla
Tribal Liaison Chairman, Larry Glavinic, Valley Center
Ex Officio, Bud Swanson, Rainbow
Ex Officio, Mike Fitzsimmons, Pauma
Ex Officio, Jeremy Barbanell, Pala
Ex Officio, Nikki Symington, Tribal Liaison officer, Rincon
Chairman Anthony Pico, Viejas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF MARCH 3RD PPCSG NOTEBOOK PREPARED BY R. BARBANELL

I.- PPCSG AGENDA FOR MARCH 3, 2015.

II.-

A.- COVER LETTER FROM DR. BARBANELL TO REVIEW LOCAL NATIVE HISTORY RELATED TO TREATY OF TEMECULA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FTT PROPOSAL FROM THE PAUMA TRIBE.

B.- REVIEW THE PROPOSED TOPIC OF DISCUSSION FOR A TRIBAL LIASON CONFERENCE TENTATIVELY TITLED "TRIBAL LAND USE OVERSIGHT BY THE PPCSG, CREATING COOPERATION."

III.- STORYBOARD PRESENTATION BY DR. BARBANELL SUPPORTING THE ABOVE.

A.- THE WAR LOVERS (POLITICAL EXERPTS INDICATING WHAT IMPORTANT ANGLO SAXON POLITICIANS MAY HAVE THOUGHT OF NATIVES AND A GENOCIDAL SOLUTION AT THE TURN OF THE 19TH CENTURY).

B.- SOME REASONS WHY TODAY'S LOCAL INDIANS MAY NOT TRUST LOCAL NON-NATIVES.

C.- ABOUT THE TREATY OF TEMECULA (WHAT WAS THE U.S. OFFER?)

D.- THE RESPONSE TO THE OFFER. THE NATIVES HAD THE POWER TO FIGHT TO PROTECT THEIR TERRITORY IN 1850, BUT ACCEPTED THE TERMS OF THE TREATY OF TEMECULA OFFERED BY THE U.S. INSTEAD. THIS ARGUMENT IS DEMONSTRATED GRAPHICALLY ON THE STORYBOARD.

E.- THE NATIVES SIGNED U.S. OFFER WHICH WAS IMMEDIATELY RENEGED UPON AND HIDDEN FOR 50 YEARS BY THE U.S. CONGRESS. THIS IS A MAJOR BLEMISH ON U.S. HISTORY AND DESERVES REASONABLE REPARATION. THIS ARGUMENT IS DEMONSTRATED GRAPHICALLY ON THE STORY BOARD.

F.- TREATY OF TEMECULA (THE SIGNERS).
(NOTE LOCAL TRIBES LISTED).

IV.- PAUMA TRIBAL FEE-TO-TRUST APPLICATION.

Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group
P O Box 1273, Pauma Valley, CA 92061
760.481.4201

By email Mark.Wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov and USPS

March 9, 2015

Mark Wardlaw,
Director, Planning and Development Services,
County of San Diego
5510 Overland Avenue,
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Mr. Wardlaw:

Re: Criteria and equivalency of LEED-ND

At a public meeting held March 3, 2015, Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group ("PPCSG") had the opportunity of hearing comments from its members who had attended the PDS Live Well San Diego – Thriving Plan workshop held February 21, 2015. Apparently that workshop was, among other things, to focus upon "questions that have come up around policy Land Use-1.2 in recent correspondence to and from PDS." Specifically including the questions: "[h]ow is the Community Development Model defined and differentiated for the varied and unique communities in the Unincorporated County; "LEED for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) spans a wide range of planning, design, development and building criteria. How do these criteria apply to the context of the Unincorporated County", and "[w]hat is equivalent to LEED-ND Criteria?"

After considerable discussion, the involvement of members of the public, and upon motion made and unanimously carried (6 in favor, none in opposition, and 1 absent), PPCSG resolved that I should convey to you the following points of concern and objections.

1. The form and content of the prepared presentation lacked clarity and focus leading to both uncertainty as to the possibility of undeclared interests being of influence and a lack of knowledge of the scope and number of proposed developments that could be the source of the PDS correspondence that had, apparently, led to the need for such workshops. Anecdotally¹ it is believed that the number of such developments is small and, if so, it could well be that such development specific issues should be addressed on an individual basis rather than by a broadening of established policy that invariably leads to unintended consequences.
2. Apparently PDS is attempting to develop a definition of the wording "or equivalent" to the LEED applicable County policies that were developed following the expenditure of millions of dollars involving many staff and uncompensated volunteer hours and adopted

¹ Patsy Fritz letter to Mark Wardlaw dated February 18, 2015 reporting an email from Eric Lardy

by the Board of Supervisors ("BoS"). Would an obvious first step not be to consult the BoS and seek their guidance, input and authority for a defined mission and goal to carry out appropriate consultation and investigation for any proposed modification of an approved land use policy¹ before sums of public money and staff hours are expended without any guidance from the BoS?

3. PPCSG is aware of one proposed development in its area that could potentially be impacted by any such change to land use policies: the development known as Warner Ranch. PPCSG has submitted to PDS its recommendations regarding the Warner Ranch development plan presented to PPCSG. Those recommendations clearly identify that, reflecting forceful community input, PPCSG does not see the Warner Ranch development as proposed being consistent with existing land use policies of the County nor with the Pala Pauma Subregional Plan. As proposed, Warner Ranch is "leapfrog development" as it represents "Village densities located away from established Villages" and is "outside established water and sewer service boundaries."

PPCSG would be in firm opposition to any proposed modifications to either established land use policies or the applicable Subregional Plan that would result in the proposed Warner Ranch development, as it is now proposed, being then in conformity with such changed policies or not considered as leapfrog development.

I now understand that the proposed March presentation to the Planning Commission has been delayed. Given the potential impact of possible changes to the land use policies, PPCSG respectfully requests that adequate time be given to all Groups to consider in public meetings any proposals that PDS may contemplate pursuing prior to their being presented to the Planning Commission and the BoS (the approval in a public meeting of which body being a mandatory requirement in the view of PPCSG).

Yours sincerely,



Charles Mathews, Chair,
Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group.

Copy: The Honorable Bill Horn, Vice Chairman - by email
Oliver Smith, Chair, Valley Center CPG - by email
PPCSG members - by email
Patsy Fritz - by email

¹ **LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development.** Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries.