

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Approved Minutes for a regular meeting held on **January 08, 2018** at 7:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.

Oliver Smith, **Chair**; Ashly Mellor, **Vice-Chair**; James Garritson, **Secretary**

A=Absent; **Ab**=Abstention; **BOS**=Board of Supervisors; **PDS**=Department of Planning & Development Services; **DPW**=Department of Public Works; **DRB**=Valley Center Design Review Board; **GP**= County General Plan; **N**=Nay; **P**=Present; **PC**=County Planning Commission; **R**=Recused; **SC**=Subcommittee; **TBD**=To Be Determined; **VCCPG**=Valley Center Community Planning Group; **VC**= Valley Center; **VCPRD**=Valley Center Parks & Recreation District; **Y**=Yea

A. Roll Call

- Meeting was called to order at **7:13 p.m.** and a Quorum was established with **9 members present.**
- Jeana Boulos - **P**
- William Del Pilar - **A**
- Susan Fajardo - **P**
- James Garritson - **P**
- Dina Gharmalkar - **P**
- Steve Hutchison - **P**
- Susan Janisch - **P**
- Kathy MacKenzie - **A**
- Ashly Mellor - **P**
- LaVonne Norwood - **P**
- Claire Plotner - **A**
- Ann Quinley - **A**
- Oliver Smith - **P**
- Jon Vick - **A**

B. Pledge of Allegiance - Ms. Janisch

C. Approval of Minutes from Regular Meeting of December 11, 2017

- **Motion: Approval of the Minutes from the December 11, 2017 Meeting.**
- **Maker/Second:** Boulos/Norwood
- **Motion Carries 8-0-1 (Y-N-Ab). Mr. Hutchison abstains, as he was not at the meeting.**

D. Public Communication/Open Forum

- Ms. Norwood says that Mr. Del Pilar has asked that the two candidates running for the Supervisor position have an open forum concerning land issues in Valley Center.

E. Action items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items).

1) Discussion and possible vote to accept Chairs Letter: Valley Center Planning Group Comment Letter to the San Diego Planning & Development Services on the INTENT TO ADOPT FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 15183 OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT for the VALLEY CENTER RITE AID; PDS2015-STP-15-022, LOG NO.

PDS2015-ER-15-08-021. Please refer to attached letter. (Smith)

- The Chair explains background about the letter he sent. Ms. Janisch and Ms. Norwood both commended the letter. Josie Fox (audience) asks if the County is required to respond to the letter. The Chair responds that the County does need to respond. Any decision made by the Supervisors is final. James Chagala, representing the Weston Town Center, also sent a letter to the County.
- **Motion: Move to approve the letter as written by the Chair.**
- **Maker/Second:** Smith/Hutchison
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

2) Discussion and possible vote on the Community Plan Update Subcommittees proposed comments and revised project alternatives for submission by the VCCPG during the public comment period for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of the General Plan

Amendment Property Specific Requests. Public comment period ends February 12, 2018. VCCPG made recommendations about alternatives to the proposed project study areas and their land uses and zoning in May 2017. (Hutchinson)

- See **Appendix** to review thumbnails of this letter.
- Mr. Hutchinson reviews a draft letter called **Comments on the San Diego County Property Specific Requests**. The letter delves into Agriculture, Traffic, and Climate Change. There are over 1900 acres of agricultural land with great potential located in two of the Valley Center PSRs [VC7+ and VC57].
- Gerry Gaughan (audience) wanted to know about what the County is currently doing about the six properties in the VC67 area. Mr. Hutchison says that there are some properties that have unpermitted buildings, but Gerry did not agree with this statement. He says that none of the properties flooded last year during the 100-year-flood. Gerry says that the County never did a backwater study. There was discussion about land use designations, property taxes, higher density requests, and the Williamson Act. Mr. Garritson shares some of his concerns about the climate change section. He believes it is still a political issue and it has the potential to become an assault on property rights.
- **Motion: Move to send the Comments on the San Diego County Property Specific Requests [PSR] General Plan Amendment and Rezone Subsequent Environmental Impact Report [SEIR] to the County.**
- **Maker/Second:** Hutchison/Janisch
- **Motion Fails 7-1-1 (Y-N-Ab).** Mr. Garritson votes Nay. Mr. Gharmalkar recuses himself because he owns land in VC57.

3) Discussion and possible vote on the Prioritization Request for Roadway Pavement Maintenance in the Valley Center Community Planning Group Area. DPW requests your assistance in updating roadway maintenance priorities in your planning area. As DPW develops future years of planning, we're asking community and sponsor groups to assist with identifying road maintenance needs in your area. This new list will help us determine where best to utilize funds and resources to provide the most beneficial impact to out roadway users. Please see attached documentation. (Smith)

- Chair Smith explains some background about Road Maintenance Priorities. He says that this list prioritizes resurfacing of existing asphalt. Rich Rudolf requested that the County maintains all of Cool Valley RD. The Chair would like to see road maintenance on Valley Center RD, Old Castle RD/Lilac Road. He would like to see that the major ingress and egress issues are maintained because at least 40% of the traffic does not involve Valley Center residents. Mr. Gharmalkar asked about Cole Grade improvements. Mr. Hutchinson voted to have Fruitvale RD as the third major priority. Ms. Fajardo mentioned making improvements to Vesper RD, but really has no road preferences to prioritize.
- A gentleman in the audience believes that Old Castle RD should be the number one priority. The motion is revised to prioritize Old Castle RD and make Valley Center RD the number two priority.
- **Motion: Move to prioritize the maintenance of these roads in this order. 1) Old Castle RD 2) Valley Center RD 3) Lilac RD 4) Fruitvale RD 5) Cool Valley RD.**
- **Maker/Second:** Smith/Janisch
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

F. Group Business

1) Meeting Updates: Next Regular Monthly VCCPG meeting: February 12, 2018

- The Chair says that he has just received information about the expansion of Valley View Casino. The VCCPG has until February 7 to make written comments.
- Here is further information about the **Valley View Casino Expansion Environmental Evaluation**.
- <http://www.analyticalcorp.com/reports/2018/01/08/valley-view-casino-expansion-environmental-evaluation/>

2) VCCPG recommendation vote on candidate nomination for empty seat #13 whose term ends 1/1/2019. (Fajardo)

- The candidate Mike Michalik did not show up tonight. Claire Collins withdrew her nomination.
- **Motion: Move to nominate Jennifer Lindley for empty seat #13.**
- **Maker/Second: Fajardo/Norwood**
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

3) Chair will be filling out a 2018 training completion list. All members need to have completed the county training to be seated and indemnified by the county, Form 700 needs to go to ROV by March 31, 2018, ethics training every 2 years (Smith)

4) Yearly elections for VCCPG officers (Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary) (Smith)

- **Motion: Move to make Oliver Smith the Chair.**
- **Maker/Second: Fajardo/Janisch**
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

- **Motion: Move to make Ashly Mellor the Vice-Chair.**
- **Maker/Second: Smith/Boulos**
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

- **Motion: Move to make James Garritson the Secretary.**
- **Maker/Second: Smith/Fajardo**
- **Motion Carries 9-0-0 (Y-N-Ab).**

5) Annual reviews for subcommittees (add new, delete old, elections for chairs and membership.) (Smith)

- The Chair recommends that the VCCPG disband the Solar Projects subcommittee. The VCCPG also reinstated the Lilac Hills Ranch subcommittee. These are the chairs and subcommittees for 2018.
 - a. Mobility – (Claire Plotner, Chair)**
 - b. Community Plan Update – (Steve Hutchison, Chair)**
 - c. Member Training – (Oliver Smith, Chair)**
 - d. Nominations – (Susan Fajardo, Chair)**
 - e. North Village – (Ann Quinley, Chair)**
 - f. Parks & Rec. – (LaVonne Norwood, Chair)**
 - g. South Village – (Jon Vick, Chair)**
 - h. Tribal Liaison – (Jeana Boulos, Chair)**
 - i. Website – (Ashly Mellor, Chair)**
 - j. Lilac Hills Ranch – (Steve Hutchison, Chair)**
 - k. Lilac Plaza – (Lavonne Norwood, Chair)**

I. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.
- Minutes were approved on February 12, 2018.

James Garritson, Secretary

Appendix VCCPG January 08, 2018 Minutes

**ROAD MAINTENANCE PRIORITIES
VALLEY CENTER COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES**

SUP. DIST.	NAME	FROM	TO	PCI	LENGTH (Mi)	CPG/SPONSOR GROUP
5	VALLEY CENTER RD*	MP 24	COLE GRADE RD	51	4.02	VALLEY CENTER
5	NORTH LAKE WOHLFORD RD*	VALLEY CENTER RD	WOODS VALLEY RD	41	1.89	VALLEY CENTER
5	OLD CASTLE RD*	LILAC RD	PAMOOSA LN	50	3.24	VALLEY CENTER
5	LILAC RD	W LILAC RD	COUSER CANYON RD	42	2.02	VALLEY CENTER
5	FRUITVALE RD	COLE GRADE RD	MAC TAN RD	54	1.77	VALLEY CENTER
5	COOL VALLEY RD	COLE GRADE RD	END CMR	36	0.76	VALLEY CENTER
5	MILLER RD*	VALLEY CENTER RD	END CMR	53	2.65	VALLEY CENTER
5	HILLDALE RD	COLE GRADE RD	END	67	0.94	VALLEY CENTER
5	WEST LILAC RD*	CIRCLE R DR	LILAC RD	76	1.84	VALLEY CENTER
5	CIRCLE R DR*	WEST LILAC	OLD HWY 395	65	3.14	VALLEY CENTER
5	OAK GLEN RD	MC NALLY RD	W OAK GLEN RD	82	0.89	VALLEY CENTER
5	WEST OAK GLEN	COLE GRADE RD	END	71	0.81	VALLEY CENTER
5	PAUMA HEIGHT RD	COLE GRADE RD	END	83	0.76	VALLEY CENTER

(*)Resurfacing may be accomplished over multiple phases

Comments on the San Diego County Property Specific Requests [PSR] General Plan Amendment and Rezone Subsequent Environmental Impact Report [SEIR]

Because of the time constraints of the public review period for the SEIR in connection with the 2017 holidays and the VCCPG's meeting schedule, along with the complexity of the SEIR, only a quick review has been possible. The release of the SEIR to the public over the holiday period seems a cynical manipulation of the public's opportunity to review and comment on such a large and important project [even acknowledging the extension of the review period to 60 days, the scope of the documentation requiring review, the technical complexity of it and our lack of professional assistance to evaluate it make our review exceedingly challenging]. Such a move flouts the goal of maximizing public comment.

There may be many issues lurking within the SEIR, however, our cursory review focuses on three areas that fail to be adequately mitigated and are inconsistent with the General Plan, the Valley Center Community Plan, and potentially a series of state laws.

Agriculture

Three of the subject PSRs are presently in agricultural preserves [VC7+, VC51, & VC57] and one has a Williamson Act contract. Applying SR2 to the study areas as the proposed and alternative maps indicate instead of SR4 or a much lower density land use designation as previously agreed in the General Plan Update [GPU] disregards the intent of GPU policy LU 7.1, which calls for protecting agricultural lands with a "lower-density land use designation." Potentially 5,473 acres of the 6,830 acres of County identified agricultural land within the project study areas will be at risk of being directly converted to non-agricultural land. Over 1900 acres of agricultural land with the greatest potential impacts are in two of the Valley Center PSRs [VC7+ and VC57].

The Valley Center Community Plan [VCCP] also calls for the preservation of agricultural land uses. It is recognized that the influence of adjacent land uses on agricultural uses can be detrimental to successful farming. The disruption of farming by a variety of economic, social and creeping urban practices has been the pattern in San Diego County and, in particular, Valley Center. The potential loss of agricultural uses through the land use designations in the proposed and alternative maps cannot easily be undone and will critically change the community character that the VCCP set out to protect. Further, The VCCP was built around the concept of the Community Development Model that defines the higher density land uses at the community center, then gradually "feathering out" to lower densities at the edges of the planning area. Such a model benefits farming by preserving larger parcels that can offer greater scale and efficiency than the smaller 2-acre parcels suggested by the County as being adequate. Likely the smaller 2-acre threshold for agricultural

There is no plan to enhance the presently ineffective network of public roads with the adoption of this project. The current GPU addresses Valley Center's expected population growth and has even added a few additional new roads to the GPU mobility element map to accommodate that growth. The PSR project acknowledges the current deficient state of the road network in Valley Center, the expected growing need for a more functional road network and it suggests that the impact of the additional dwelling units proposed by this project is not considered significant in the context of planned regional growth. But, we are concerned with what such added growth will do in the context of Valley Center. The SEIR should not conflate a regional plan with the plans for the specific CPAs that will be impacted.

The SEIR goes on to acknowledge the potentially significant cumulative impacts on roads related to population growth if projects like Lilac Hills Ranch are factored in. But, it fails to propose how the road network will handle the extra vehicle miles travelled except to say the impacts will be significant and unavoidable. All of the significant population growth, either direct or cumulative, will further impact emergency response and evacuation over a road network that is presently stressed.

The SEIR concludes, rightly, that impacts of the PSR project on transportation in Valley Center will exacerbate an already congested road network, and even with the mitigation proposed, will leave our community with significant and unavoidable impacts.

Climate Change

The SEIR displays a picture of green house gas [GHG] production that is consistent with the overwhelming conclusion of the world's scientific community. The need to reduce GHG is more than evident. The County also acknowledges that projects like the PSRs and the likely subsequent developments [Lilac Hills Ranch, Warner Ranch, Newland Sierra], which will also cause land use densities increasing, will make attaining the still undetermined CO₂ limits of the revised Climate Action Plan [CAP] even more difficult. Since 45% of the CO₂ in San Diego County is generated in vehicle exhaust, the need to reduce vehicle miles travelled [VMT] and average daily trips is paramount. The PSRs, instead, will add to the CO₂ total significantly. Stating that these projects must comply with the CAP in the future in order to proceed defies belief. A more prudent direction would be to not encourage higher rural densities that will result in more VMT in the first place. Maintaining larger parcels of open space/agricultural land is a better approach to minimizing vehicular CO₂.

Relying on green building standards for new buildings is laudable, but that is a relatively small portion of the problem. Reducing VMT by concentrating density in areas where jobs and services are more abundant is a more obvious step to reducing GHG. The proposed PSRs should be judged against the revised CAP GHG standard

success is based as much on the greater appraised value of such parcels as some notion of farming economic success.

About 1114 acres of the three Valley Center PSRs are evaluated as prime or unique farmland. The Valley Center PSRs also possess "prime" agricultural soils that are a statewide resource. The potential loss of those lands would be an irretrievable loss to the County's agricultural effort and cumulatively with other large development projects in the approval pipeline would, indeed, rise to a serious level of significance. If this project were to be adopted as proposed, it would be a large incremental step toward urbanization that would facilitate even more such decisions that would increase density in Valley Center and decimate agriculture.

As we move to higher density land uses in communities like Valley Center, the future of farming becomes progressively bleaker and bleaker as recognized in the state's Right To Farm Act, the Williamson Act, the Open Space Subvention Act as well as several County ordinances and Board of Supervisors policies. A more rational interpretation of these laws, ordinances and policies would arrive at the conclusion that the land uses in the proposed and alternate maps subvert agriculture and rise to a level of damaging significance that cannot be tolerated if agriculture is to be preserved as the GPU exhorts.

Traffic

The SEIR notes the dramatic increase in population in the PSR analysis areas between 2000 and the 2010 census [26%] and that the increase in these areas exceeds the countywide growth rate [10%]. In the same period the PSR's housing stock rose 23% nearly doubling the figure for the county as a whole. However, with the already projected growth in Valley Center in the GPU plus the addition of even greater densities as a result of the proposed PSR project, no new roads are to be constructed to mitigate the significant impacts of more traffic. Rather, the SEIR proposes to add more road segments to the list of failing roadways in the County that, for what appears to be a lack of will, cannot be mitigated.

As noted in the SEIR, the 1507 person increase in population for the Valley Center CPA resulting from the aims of the PSR project amounts to an 8 percent increase over 2015 population estimates. It goes on to suggest that such an increase in the context of the decadal census population increase [20% 2000-2020] is insignificant. However, this seems to be fake math, or at least deceptive math. Instead of the expected 20% population increase, these numbers suggest that the actual increase, with the PSR project, would be 40 percent larger. The additional population will generate 7,570 Average Daily Trips [ADT]. Such a significant increase over the already planned and vetted increase addressed in the GPU, without adding significantly to the road network expected to serve that population, will lead to a traffic calamity.

once it is adopted. There is no need to hurry the proposed changes through approval before the new, more definitive standard is determined and reviewed.

The conclusion of the SEIR that the PSR project would produce less than significant GHG impacts because of the proposed off-site mitigation measures that could be enforced is shortsighted. It allows San Diego County to pollute the air affecting the entire world by the purchase of carbon credits from elsewhere in the world. The goal should be to reduce GHG throughout the entire world, not just shift the responsibility to areas that already appreciate the need for GHG reduction.

All three areas of agriculture, traffic and climate change are intertwined. As stated earlier, there are likely other concerns in the lengthy and technical SEIR that will have a significant impact on the Valley Center community. But time and the schedule of the VCCPG have allowed for only a cursory review.