

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

REGULAR MEETING, JULY 7, 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: 7:02 PM.

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: We have one vacancy and all six members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ben Brooks; Robert Smith and Stephanie Spencer.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- a. The minutes of June 2, 2015 had been previously submitted to all, corrected and resubmitted. Ben made a motion to approve as presented, Brad gave the second and they were approved 6-0.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:

- a. This is an informal opportunity for community comments on any matters of concern within our realm of influence. There was a large crowd but no comments at this time.

4. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. The County has proposed to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA regarding an Administrative and Habitat Loss Permit for the new proposed 2 megawatt solar facility on 9.9 acres next to the existing PEEKER power plant just west of Pala. Mike Johnson representing SD County, mentioned our tentative approval last year with two conditions: one that they plant substantial landscaping to block the view of this industrial power plant from the adjacent Scenic Highway 76. This was stipulated when the power plant was built but ignored by the developer. The other provision was that the new solar facility would never be expanded in the future. Mike explained that should the applicant ever wish to expand the facility they would have to start over with a major use permit which we would review then. Brad made a suggestion that the new landscaping, which will take the place of the plants promised 6 years ago, be close in size to the trees that would be there now had they been planted when they were supposed to. Mike said that the old power plant was under the permitting control of the California Public Utility Commission, not under the control of the County. None the less, they were picking the largest size standardly available and that he would look into the possibility of larger. Eric Johnston of Independent Energy Solutions, the developer, stated that they are using the largest size that has proved to be transplantable and is available. After lengthy discussion and assurances that all that can be done, will be done to shield the plant from view as soon as possible, Ben moved to approve the project as proposed, and Stephanie gave the second, and it was approved 6-0.
- b. Next we considered the T-Y Nursery property along Hwy 76 at 15935, APN 130-100-17. The request is for a proposed administrative clearing permit. Jim Shagala, TY's planning consultant stated that the proposed area is to be used for the growth of ornamental plants. They need the permit for only 21.8 acres since the existing orange grove portion does not need the permit and much of the back portion is flood plain/protected land. There was a previous

32 home subdivision which had been approved here. The new use will cut the average daily trips from 300 to 28 and they are reducing the water usage to just 35.7 acre feet / yr. or what has been used in the past to just water the existing orange grove. We thanked them for the effort they stated they made to use drip irrigation and to half the required water that was anticipated previously. Oggie Watson, a TY water consultant countered any skepticism about the lower water usage requirements by simply stating that the claimed 36 acre feet is etched in stone in this agreement with the County. Vince Katula, the County's project manager, again described the new drip water saving methods and new, low water usage plants on less land. Andy questioned the assumption that there would be no effect on nearby water tables since the wells on TY's property have not been pumped for about 2 years now and studies done 2 years ago may not be valid today with the drought? He also questioned the need to expand here when there are many areas on other TY growing fields that are not being used by T-Y. The county rule is that you can pump as much as you have any time in the last 5 years with no impact change. Ben got assurances from the County and TY reps that the permit prohibited any sale of water off of the property. Andy asked what would happen if TY was found to have pumped more than 35.7 acre feet in a year. The County rep responded that the county would immediately shut down all of their pumping. Andy then suggested that after 4 months or so of irrigating, the impact, if any, on neighboring wells be ascertained. Oggie then challenged everyone to ascertain the effect of two new wells going in on the NE side of Rte. 76 immediately opposite this site. One of them he saw had up to 160 feet of screen there for an apparent 380 foot deep big bore well! "They intend to pump some serious water there", he said, and added that they are the largest single investor in California Agriculture and out of central California. Fritz questioned their ability to use water there off of their property. Oggie said that they are drilling 3 new wells there! Andy then got assurances from the county that the same protected area of the earlier approval (#5499) would still be marked and maintained as protected. Andy called for resolution, Fritz moved to approve their request and Stephanie gave the second. Andy suggested that we change the motion to include approval with inclusion of all conditions identified in this meeting and stipulated by the county and Fritz so moved and Stephanie gave her second again. It was approved 6-0.

- c. We then considered the County's proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment that would allow for the development of accessory agricultural uses such as microbreweries, cheese-making, onsite food production, animal raising, and such on agricultural lands consistent with the County's General Plan. We all had reviewed these changes and were in basic agreement so there were no comments for the County.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- a. We then considered the status of proposals for use of the county's PLDO funds for the improvement of sports / recreation facilities at the Pauma Valley Community Center. The initial dream of putting in artificial turf on the baseball field was curtailed by the limited funds. We have only enough money for a small, little league field, where as we have a full sized collegiate field at PVCA. Fritz mentioned that we could possibly use the funds for a very nice, shaded playground and Stephen Paul, Manager of the County Parks Development added that even a smaller field might be able to be put in. Andy suggested that the board would likely be willing to support any proposal agreed upon by PVCA and the County and for them to come up with a solid proposal. Stephen requested that PVCA provide a list of what they would like to do for his evaluation. Fritz and Stephen were to meet after the meeting to talk and look at some possibilities down on the fields.
- b. There were no communications to be considered.
- c. Under expenses, Fritz submitted a bill for \$64.56 for paper and ink for his printer. This is the first and only expense he ever submitted and it was moved to be approved by Andy, seconded by Stephanie and approved 6-0. He is to submit it directly to the county.
- d. The date of the next meeting is August 4, 2015 at 7 PM.

6. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Smith moved to adjourn at 7:55 PM and Ben gave the 2nd.
Unanimously carried.

These minutes were approved at the September 1, 2015 meeting. Ben made the motion to approve as submitted, Brad gave the second and they were approved 5-0.

Fritz Stumpges, PPCSG Secretary