

Spring Valley Community Planning Group

*** MINUTES***

Tuesday, February 13, 2024

Meeting called to order at 6:00pm

A. ROLL CALL – QUORUM

10 present, 3 absent (Eugenio, Morgan, Shaffer (arrived at 6:30pm), 2 vacant. We have a quorum.

B. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – Opportunity for the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within our jurisdiction that is not on the posted agenda.

Chief Waller, San Miguel Fire District, new fire chief, introduced himself. He wants to be accessible to the local community groups regarding fire protection, public safety, and emergency services and to facilitate SVCPG meetings at their HQ.

Ed Woodruff announced that the Water Conservation Gardens, Cuyamaca College, is closing on 2/16/24. Hopefully this is temporary and had to do with loan issues.

Elaina Sandoval asked if SVCPG could help her with getting her street, Madrid Way, repaved. There is regular flooding on this street during storms. After reviewing the map, Madrid Way is located entirely within the Valle De Oro Planning Area, so we will get that contact information to her.

C. ACTION ITEMS with designation as to whether there will be vote or not on the item:

1. Approval of Minutes: 1/9/2024. Vote on this item.

Motion to approve/second: Pearson/Gibbons, 9 Yes, 1 abstain (Lowes), 3 absent, 2 vacant. Motion passes.

2. B Waiver – Jack in the Box Remodel; APN: 505-081-23-00; 10255 Campo Rd; interior remodel, upgrade site lighting, reface signage, new drive thru entry portal, update exterior finishes of building. Presenter: Custeau. Vote on this item.

Took a little while to get this project to our agenda due to scheduling and the holidays, a remodel of the existing facility. A redo of the exterior and signage. Proponent agreed to delete the sign on the north side of the building. This is a B waiver request. Proponent has agreed to do landscaping such as rock and mulch to the bare ground to the east of the parking lot., this is still their property. Reviewed pictures of the remaining landscaping, mature trees and queen palms. This landscaping looks to be well taken care of. A new design to the limited clearance sign, an open design and internally illuminated like an entry arch or portal. Pictures of the existing and proposed elevations were presented. Temporary banners on the chain link Caltrans fence need to go away and proponent was asked to help with that. The Spring Valley designation on the building will go away. Pole signs are faded and will be resurfaced in the same square foot areas. Pole signs do not change electronically. Poster wall signs are in illuminated frames. Reviewed the menu board upgrades and the internal “Open All Night” sign. This is a B waiver as there are no changes in signage area and that current landscaping is adequate. Proponent had nothing further to add, just here for comments. Lowes asked the proponent to encourage the company to use solar power as much as possible.

Motion to approve as presented by Gibbons, second by Lowes. 11 Yes, 0 No, 2 Absent, 2 Vacant. The motion passes.

3. Informational Item: Sweetwater Authority Solar Project. Presenter: Carlos Quintero, P.E. No Vote on the item.

1. Carlos Quintero, general manager for the Sweetwater Authority, presented. They are exploring the possibility of installing a 3.7 megawatt solar array on 9.5 acres of the reservoir’s surface. The reservoir is about 700 acres. Project

could produce about 2/3 of the energy used by the Authority with an annual savings of 500, 000 to 550,000 dollars. Discuss their client service area. The array will be located near their treatment plant. Expect the environmental study to be completed in the next 2 or 3 months. Woodruff mentioned an HOA that is concerned about their view of the reservoir. Quintero says that the array will be hard to see from most views; just a few places will the array be visible. Lowes mentioned that there has been discussion about reservoir access for Spring Valley. Quinteros will get back to us about recreation options. Custeau is concerned about water sports restrictions in the future. They are considering opening the maintenance road to mountain biking and north hiking trails are now being set up, the big issue being trail maintenance. Recreation will happen some distance from the array. Snyder says that the company making the proposal has never built arrays over drinking water. The authority is doing all the studies to make sure the water is safe. Power cables will be submerged. Mark Ameron (needs correct spelling) asked about harmful materials and electrolysis issues and how it would be addressed. Harriet Taylor, co-chair of the Sweetwater CPG says solar panel cleaning agents are not compatible with our drinking water. Also that the plastics involved outgas into the drinking water and that the view from the campground is affected by the solar array. Taylor also understood that no boating would be allowed and no horses or dogs on the trails. Snyder brought up waterfowl and their interaction with the array. Quintero said this would be part of the environmental review process. Gibbons brought up the rules regarding animal manure and proximity to drinking water. Quintero responded to Gonzalez question regarding why the project by stating it is all about saving money on power and there is talk of having water producers lower their carbon footprint. Wallace asked why on water and not land. There is no single piece of land suitable for this. Robles felt some of the answers were dismissive, particularly about the array location choice. Did they document their decision process? It was an internal analysis. Custeau asked about other properties the Authority owned. Maybe use water tanks roofs? Quinteros said the decentralized idea would not be as productive. Taylor mentioned the existing solar arrays along SR54. Pierce asked if the project would grow in size and the answer is no and that the issue of glare needs to be addressed regarding elevated homes to the north. Gonzalez asked why no further growth consideration and it has to do with offsetting the 50 highest accounts as the goal. Custeau asked about hydro power generation and it is not feasible because outflows are only seasonal. Shaffer asked what the main planning factor or constraint this project. it is cost savings as the factor. Karen Henry spoke about community positions against this project. Further discussion was about the rush of this project and that the authority needs to slow the pace and ask more questions of the communities.

2. Discussion: Wildfire Fuel Reduction - Silviculture Briefing and Letter of Endorsement. Presenter: Moshe Krafchow. Vote on the item.

Moshe invented a brush control method using no large machinery to reshape the forest, bringing fire fuel material to the ground to decompose. Did this in the Tiajuana River Valley and a 4 acre demonstration on Palomar Mountain in a mixed conifer and oak forest. He is responding to needs to control brush without control burns. Current approaches do not work. His method requires less maintenance in the future and prevents erosion. Proposing a project on a 5 acre plot; 1.5 acres on public land and 3.5 acres privately held on Dictionary Hill by 5 homeowners and an HOA. Moshe explained how fuel builds up to dangerous levels and how his method reduces the danger. Custeau asked about nonnative trees and Moshe would get back to this. There are 7 rivers in the county, all overgrown and he is focused on the county. Use of grazing animals, once a year, to maintain the forest. Removing invasive species would be very expensive, so is out of the scope of the project for now. His passion is to bring these projects into the cities. He wants an endorsement from SVCPG to try this project on Dictionary Hill. Robles asked if Moshe was aware of similar projects at the local community colleges and the Fire Prevention Bureau at San Miguel. Pearson spoke of the results he has experienced from Moshe's techniques. Custeau added that we should endorse this pilot project. These projects have to be done where the people are. Wallace asked about whether chemicals are used on the ground material; no chemicals used. The use of grazing animals was described. Moshe read the endorsement memo. The memo is a support endorsement of this specific project and Moshe is OK with us drafting our own letter. Motion, by

Robles to endorse with our own letter. Second by Woodruff. Vote is 11 Yes, 0 No, 2 Absent, 2 Vacant. Motion passes. We will draft the letter and bring it to the next meeting to vote on it.

3. Discussion: Review proposed changes to the Objective Design Standards. No Vote on the item.

The ad hoc committee has been discussing and have Snyder's comments on the proposed changes. This will be a back-and-forth dialogue and this design standard is for eligible developers under state bills. We would still have to change our own checklist, if we wanted to, at another time. Pearson asked if there is also proposed changes to the zoning classifications. Snyder mentioned we should stay away from quoting zoning, because it is so broad and not specific to our CPA and that grading conditions and restrictions should stay in the checklist. Some line outs are because these standards are only for housing, not commercial. General consensus is these draft standards make the language more specific. A streamlined objective for SB development usage. #7 and #11 were struck due to commercial focus. Custeau said there's a need for some unique appearance to avoid "cookie cutter" development. Lowes and Gonzalez spoke of making specific rules regarding color schemes and architectural relief. We need to clarify, be less subjective. Custeau and Lowes suggested we say no flat roofs. We try to retain item #33 because the county doesn't follow through on right-of-way needs. Prevent building right up to the property line. Shaffer stressed these standards are strictly residential and of a limited use case for multi-family. Pierce said he would ask PDS to add a disclaimer as to why these standards are being established. Item 38 re: tree removal or retention. Custeau and Shaffer spoke of native vs non-native trees as to what should be kept or plan for mitigation if a tree is removed. #53, signage, only for multifamily development, mostly directional in use. Still use SVCPG design review checklist specs on sign types. Wallace said there are not size limits and there should be. Sign letter height can be an issue, depending on distance to the entrance. Letter height should be flexible. Keep the night sky emphasis in outdoor lighting even though the county has its own ordinance. We will send all our comments to the county and they will do a draft for further review.

D. GROUP BUSINESS

1. Announcements: Gibbons will now send out the new projects for volunteers. All new projects are assigned including one just sent out on 2/13, 9070 Jamacha Road, a former pot dispensary going back to an auto shop. Gibbons will do this one.

Custeau, through the TAC, says we have some traction on the Jamacha Rd/Sweetwater Rd signal light compatibility issue; that information coming from Caltrans. Although Caltrans needs to get involved in a problem assessment. Also, had an interaction with channel 10 news regarding the most recent Quarry Rd flooding. Custeau countered the opinion of the storage facility owner that the proposed bridge would not prevent flooding, by stating the new bridge will allow the water to flow more freely. The project is near the end of the environmental review, then a 30 day public comment, then to the BOS for a key vote. Hopefully, construction can start in 2026.

2. Reports:

Chair: Spring Valley Day is April 26th, we need volunteers for the SVCPG booth there.

Pierce took chair Vargas and supervisor Montgomery – Steppe to view the Quarry Road flood zone and chair Vargas said they are going to push this bridge through. He also took congresswoman Jacobs and supervisor Montgomery-Steppe out to tour the area around the swap meet where they stopped and spoke with homeless by the bike path and up by Elevator Rd. Sate of the county address is 2/21/24.

CSA 128 – no meeting last week, they have an open seat and Chris Pearson has volunteered.

TAC – had a meeting last week, nothin in the Sprin Valley CPA.

Highway cleanup – No update, Eugenio absent

APG – a lot of suggested issues were outside of the scope of SANDAG, so the APG feels they need to focus on transportation, turn out for the meeting was pretty good. One issue is liability and who covers the APG. Working to include sponsor groups, who were not originally included because their members are appointed, not elected, but these groups also have an

interest in what SANDAG does.

Other - none

3. Assign Projects:

PDS2022-TPM-21309 - Aleman Santiago TPM (SB9-2 Lot) PDS2024-STP-24-001 Snyder has this one.

747 Grand Ave, Robles has this one.

Site Plan - Bancroft Warehouse STP Pearson on this one.

4. Next meeting: February 27, 2024

E. ADJOURNMENT at 8:54pm