

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

**REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 1, 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: 7:01 PM.**

- a. Roll Call and quorum established: We have one vacancy and five members were present: Andy Mathews, Chairman; Brad Smith, Vice Chairman; Fritz Stumpges, Secretary; Ben Brooks; and Stephanie Spencer. Robert Smith was absent and Jeremy Barbanell has not yet been appointed officially by the Board of Supervisors. Andy has made a special call to make sure that the Supervisors consider this appointment on their next agenda.

**2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:**

- a. The minutes of July 7, 2015 had been previously submitted to all, corrected and resubmitted for final review. Ben made a motion to approve as presented, Brad gave the second and they were approved 5-0.

**3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, OPEN FORUM:**

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

**4. ACTION ITEMS:**

- a. The first item on the agenda was the requirement to again review our priority list for Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funding. Andy stated that each new house built in our district pays \$4,600 into this fund to provide for parks and recreation here. Andy stated that our #1 priority two years ago was the improvement of this community center's baseball field and asked if that is still what we wanted to do. Ben asked what other options are there? Fritz stated that he and the county's Park Development Director Stephen Paul, met and discussed options of the ballfield and an enlarged playground. He stated that Stephen recommended we try to do what we could to the ballfield, knowing that we could not afford to AstroTurf our entire full collegiate sized field. After discussion, we agreed that the baseball field at the Community Center was still our #1 priority and Brad moved to state that to the County, Stephanie gave the second and it was approved 5-0.

**5. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

- a. We then considered the apparent ongoing attempt by the Board of Supervisors to have their staff circumvent the requirements of LEED-ND and substitute a watered down "equivalent" set of requirements which would allow them to continue unwanted and specifically prohibited, leapfrog development throughout undeveloped portions of the county. Andy reviewed the attempted substitution of NGBS protocol. This would maintain some of the 'green' building standards but is entirely insufficient in controlling runaway back country development. The county spent many years and millions of taxpayer dollars coming up with the current general plan which does just that. The county derives a significant portion of its funding from new development and appears to be incapable of working with sustainable growth which would take into consideration obvious problems such as water shortages, which Stephanie

questioned. Andy asked us to allow him to respond with a letter to Mark Wardlaw stating our unanimous agreement that our current Sub-Regional Plan requirements, to not allow leapfrog development, be maintained. Any change to the General Plan would first require review, approval and modification of our Sub-Regional plan. Stephanie so moved, Brad gave the second and it was approved 5-0. See Attachment A, Andy's response to the County. We were encouraged to attend the county planning commission's meeting on 9-11-15 where this is on the agenda.

- b. The next item up for discussion was a review of California's Groundwater Sustainability Act, a mandate to form local agencies to monitor and manage regional groundwater for sustainability. There have been two meetings of local groups interested in this. Andy said that there is already an agency called the Upper San Luis Rey Watershed Authority. He is also on its board. Yuima M.W D, which is also a member of this Authority, is trying to get this agency certified as the agency to also become the new Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for our region, the Upper San Luis Rey Drainage Area. Many people are concerned about Yuima's attempt to gain control of this. Pauma Valley Community Service District is also a major player on this board. The County was centrally present in the meeting and is stating that they want a seat on all of these local groundwater agencies. Andy asked for permission to craft a letter to Mark Wardlaw of the county asking for clarification as to their desire for representation on each individual agency, what their roll would be and if the county would be willing to pay its fair share of the operating expenses of each GSA? Andy then also mentioned the unknown willingness of the local native tribes to participate at this level since they have their own higher level standing in water case rights with the federal government. It is imperative that we consider them and hopefully they see the importance of at least communicating their desires with whatever group represents the local county areas. Brad also requested that Andy include a question as to what is the County's departmental focus here; is it a Public Works, Water Quality, or a Department of Planning responsibility? Ben made the motion to approve, Stephanie gave the second and there was unanimous approval for Andy to write this enquiry. See Attachment B.
- c. We then considered the specific proposals of the Community Center to use PLDO funding mentioned above in 4a. Andy and others are concerned that nothing has been progressing for years in the way of firm plans to move forward on the park improvements. Why can't the community center get it done? Fritz said that he was the problem in that he had too many projects going to get to the big one. This board said that progress had to be made or support could shift. Fritz was given 3 months to show substantial progress.
- d. There were no communications to be considered.
- e. There were no expenses to be considered.
- f. The date of the next meeting is October 6 but several members have stated that they will not be present. We will evaluate the issues needing consideration and determine the ability to gather the needed 4 member quorum.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:** Stephanie moved to adjourn at 7:50 PM and Brad gave the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimously carried.

**Ref: Attachments A and B**

These minutes were approved as corrected and presented here at the October 6, 2016 meeting. Smith moved, Brad gave the second and they were approved 4-0.

Fritz Stumpges,  
PPCSG Secretary

**From:** Charles Mathews [<mailto:mathews.charles@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 09, 2015 3:20 PM  
**To:** Aghassi, Sarah  
**Cc:** 'Ben Brooks'; 'Bradley Smith'; 'Fritz Stumpges'; Jeremy Barbanell; Tribal Chairman Robert Smith; 'Vice Chairwoman Stephanie Spencer'; [patsyfritz@aol.com](mailto:patsyfritz@aol.com); Fitzpatrick, Lisa; 'Smith, Oliver'; [walter.rusinek@procopio.com](mailto:walter.rusinek@procopio.com); 'Mark Jackson'; 'Margarette Morgan'  
**Subject:** Land Use Policy 1.2 actions

Ms. Sarah E Aghassi

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer - County of San Diego

Dear Ms. Aghassi:

On April 14, 2015, you wrote to each member of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego ("BoS") that a response to their direction to the CAO at their March 4, 2015, meeting to return on April 22, 2015, with options for BoS consideration regarding Land Use Policy 1.2 would have to be delayed due to it being necessary "to conduct further analysis and stakeholder outreach related to Land Use Policy -1.2." You further committed that "Staff will return to the BoS after this analysis is completed and community and stakeholder input is considered." Among many others, Pala Pauma CSG provided its input formulated in a public meeting held June 2, 2015, in a letter by email addressed to Director Wardlaw dated June 3, 2015. A request to have this matter discussed at the June 20, 2015, meeting of DPDS and the chairs of the various Planning and Sponsor Group chairs was curtly refused by Mr. Lardy in his June 19, 2015, email with the commitment that "[w]e will continue to update all of the Planning and Sponsor Group chairs, and other interested parties, as new information is available on General Plan Land Use Policies." For one, Pala Pauma CSG has received no further "update" since that time.

Now, ignoring your commitment to return to the BoS with alternatives for consideration and determination by the BoS for General Plan purposes as to what is 'equivalent' to LEED-ND set out in LU 1.2, DPDS Staff has taken upon themselves the authority of the BoS to make that determination by deciding that the protocol of NGBS is equivalent to the protocol of LEED-ND. That determination is buried within Staff recommendations now presented to the Planning Commission ("PC") that the PC should recommend to the BoS, among other things, (i) a General Plan amendment, (ii) certification of an Environmental Impact Report, and (iii) summarily approving, with very limited conditions, a project and related actions; all related to the Lilac Hills Ranch Project and including the 'equivalent' determination. In particular, accepting that NGBS and LEED-ND are 'equivalent' for land use purposes will create a precedent for all future developments in San Diego.

The implications of redefining a land use policy of San Diego County and preempting the authority of the BoS to determine what is 'equivalent' to LEED-ND have broad implications that will change forever the rural areas of the County. The explicit requirements for smart growth adopted with the establishment of LEED-ND criteria will be dramatically weakened. Further, 'leapfrog development' will no longer be subject to the same restrictive conditions as under the existing General Plan ("GP"), which was created over many years and at great expense. Surely, modifications to the GP that have County-wide impact deserve comparable analysis, scrutiny and decision authority.

As expressed in its June 3, 2015 letter, Pala Pauma CSG is of the opinion that such dramatic policy moves, if they have to be made at all, should only be made after a broad CEQA analysis, recommendations, and appropriate-level decision making body decision of the County-wide impact of the LEED-ND equivalency issue. Slipping that equivalency determination into a project application prior to the BoS apparently having made any decision on the matter does not provide the level of professional and unbiased planning that I believe the voters of the County anticipate and deserve.

Respectfully,

Charles Mathews.

Chairman, Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group

+1 (760)-481-4201

Ms. Sarah E Aghassi  
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer - County of San Diego

Dear Ms. Aghassi:

While effectively chairing a public meeting held on August 25, 2015, seeking ways of addressing the requirements of State-mandated Sustainable Groundwater Management Act ("SGMA") in the San Luis Rey Valley Groundwater Basin (and more particularly the upper part of that basin), Jim Bennett of the County of San Diego ("County") staff made the comment that the County would wish to be involved in any Joint Powers Agreement or similar arrangement ("JPA") that may evolve to respond to the requirements of the SGMA so as to be able to continue to fulfill the County's mandate in land use matters. He did not respond to a follow-on question as to whether the County would then be willing to contribute a 'fair share' of the costs of forming and operating an agency thus established to develop, seek approval for, and monitor a Groundwater Sustainability Plan ("GSP").

This matter was discussed at the September 1, 2015, public meeting of the Pala Pauma Community Sponsor Group ("PPCSG") because of its potential impact upon land use matters in PPCSG's sphere of interest. As an outcome, I was asked to seek clarification of the policy of the County as it relates to giving effect to the SGMA in the unincorporated areas of the County, in particular in PPCSG's sphere of interest, and to seek responses to the following questions:

1. Is it the policy of the County that it will be a party to, or otherwise be involved in, any JPA formed to respond to the requirements of the SGMA in the unincorporated area of the County?
2. If it is the policy of the County to so become involved, what would be the form of the arrangement preferred by the County?
3. If the County wishes to be so involved would the County be willing to contribute a 'fair share' of the costs of forming and operating an agency established to develop, seek approval for, and monitor a Groundwater Sustainability Plan and, if that were to be the case, what would be the County's view of the method of calculating its 'fair share'?
4. How does the County contemplate that such involvement, if it were to be, would alter the relationship between the Planning and Sponsor Groups and the various departments of the Land Use and Environment Group?
5. How does the County contemplate that such involvement, if it were to be, would alter the existing policies and procedures regarding project review, permitting, approval, and inspection of both private and public projects?

Thank you for considering this matter.

Respectfully,

Charles Mathews.  
Chairman, Pala Pauma Valley Community Sponsor Group  
+1 (760)-481-4201