Valley Center Community Planning Group

Approved Minutes for a regular meeting held on **August 10, 2026** at 7:00 p.m. in the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, California 92082.
Dori Rattray, **Chair**; Lisa Adams, **Vice-Chair**; James Garritson, **Secretary**

Zoom Link: https://zoom.us/wc/8641906365/join?ref_from=launch&pwd=cQx1luZiawbph9bFa6DGVxP27l7bGt.1
A=Absent; **Ab=**Abstention; **DRB=**Valley Center Design Review Board; **N=**Nay; **P=**Present; **R=**Recused; **VCCPG=**Valley Center Community Planning Group; **Y=**Yea

---

A. ROLL CALL:

- The Meeting was called to order at **7:00 p.m.** and a Quorum was established with **13 members present**. Chair Rattray attended the meeting via Zoom.
- Lisa Adams - **P**
- Chris Barber - **P**
- ~~Michelle Bothof~~ **- A**
- Delores ChavezHarmes**-P**
- Vlad Ciupitu **- P**
- Susan Fajardo **- P**
- James Garritson **- P**
- Mary Hodson **- P**
- Steve Hutchison **- P**
- Karen Lieber **- P**
- Bob Littlejohn **- P**
- ~~Matt Matthews~~ **- A**
- LaVonne Norwood **- P**
- Dori Rattray **- P***
- Tom Stinson **- P**

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Ms. Adams

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

- **Motion: To approve the July 13, 2026 Minutes.**
- **Maker/Second**: Adams/Littlejohn
- **Motion VOTE 12-0-3 (Y-N-Ab).** Mr. Ciupitu, Ms. Norwood, and Ms. Adams abstained, as they did not attend the meeting last month.

D. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: Members of the public may address the Planning Group on any topic not on the agenda.

Public Comments:

- Becky Rapp (Zoom) shared concerns she has about the cannabis industry.
- Kathleen Lippit (Zoom) shared information about a public hearing that will discuss ADU policies for the County.
- Mr. Vance submitted a letter regarding speaker protocols and requested a future agenda item to review the Planning Group's procedures for fairness, transparency, and impartiality. Pursuant to the Standing Rules, he requested a formal decision to grant or deny his request and asked to be notified of the outcome.

E. PRESENTATIONS

a. Updates regarding the Albertsons Grocery Store, Michael Contreras, President, EDC, San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians

- Michael Contreras did not attend this meeting.

b. General PRA Requests: providing records and updates regarding projects (Rattray)

- There have been several PRA Requests for information lately. If you have the documents requested, please submit them. If not, just respond with "I don't have anything."

c. Draft Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Zoning Ordinance Public Review Period (Rattray)

- Next month the County will provide a presentation on the proposed BESS Zoning Ordinance.

F. ACTION ITEMS (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items)

a. Discuss continuation to use a Zoom subscription which expires in August (VOTE)

- Chair Rattray shared that she will no longer finance the Zoom subscription and will not continue to host Zoom meetings for future Planning Group meetings.
- Mr. Littlejohn read his request to post recordings and transcripts online. He requested that all minutes and recordings be hosted on a website for transparency.
- Chair Rattray shared that we are a public group with a public meeting.
- There was a lot of discussion about paying for a Zoom subscription and permanently archiving video recordings in the cloud.
- Mr. Garritson shared that the Planning Group functions as an advisory group. Public agendas and minutes are always posted on the County website and the Valley Center website.
- Mr. Littlejohn and Ms. Hodson discussed reasons for continuing a Zoom subscription for the Planning Group.
- Ms. Norwood shared that if even one person views the meetings on Zoom, the service is worthwhile. She noted that Becky Rapp and Kathleen Lippitt join monthly via Zoom to share community updates. Members of the community have the opportunity to attend meetings and stay informed. She emphasized the importance of maintaining meeting transparency.

- **Motion: To continue the use of Zoom at meetings.**
- **Maker/Second**: Hodson/Littlejohn
- **Motion FAILS 6-6-0 (Y-N-Ab).** Ms. Adams abstained.

Roll Call Vote:

- Lisa Adams - **Ab**
- Chris Barber - **N**
- ~~Michelle Bothof~~ **- A**
- Delores ChavezHarmes**-N**
- Vlad Ciupitu **- N**
- Susan Fajardo **- Y**
- James Garritson **- N**
- Mary Hodson **- Y**
- Steve Hutchison **- Y**
- Karen Lieber **- Y**
- Bob Littlejohn **-Y**
- ~~Matt Matthews~~ **- A**
- LaVonne Norwood **- Y**
- Dori Rattray **- N**
- Tom Stinson **- N**

b. Discuss if the recordings and transcripts will be posted online. (VOTE)

- A vote was not taken tonight on this item, as the motion to continue a Zoom subscription failed.

c. Discuss who will take on subscription and run the meeting. (VOTE)

- A vote was not taken tonight on this item, as the motion to continue a Zoom subscription failed.

G. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Cannabis: Dr. Matthews

- No update.

Design Review Board: Mrs. Bothof

- No update.

Parks, Rec & Trails: Mrs. Hodson

- No update.

Emergency Evacuation: Mrs. ChavezHarmes

- Mrs. ChavezHarmes shared information about fire evacuation routes.

Mobility: Mr. Barber

- Mr. Barber provided an update about Flock cameras. There was discussion about Flock cameras and privacy concerns. Mr. Ciupitu shared information about Flock cameras. Mr. Garritson and Mrs. ChavezHarmes mentioned that a previous sheriff had discussed the installation of cameras and the length of time that the videos remained in storage. There was discussion about previous camera installations and Flock cameras.
- Mr. Barber shared that the Red Light Protect at Woods Valley Rd. has helped decrease accidents at this traffic intersection. He has made the recommendation to add Red Light Protect to signals at Mirar De Valle, Lake Wohlford Rd., Lilac Rd., and Cole Grade Rd. The superintendent will try to make sure that the green light signals remain on longer during construction times.
- Mike Contreras was unable to attend the meeting tonight. Loreta Villemes now has developed an app that will categorize all of the accidents in Valley Center. There might be a conflict of interest in selling an app to the Planning Group if she participates on the Mobility Committee.

H. ADDITIONAL REPORTS:

Association of Planning: Mr. Hutchison

- Mr. Hutchison shared that the MTS will raise bus fees.

Board of Supervisors (Liaison): Ms. Norwood

- Ms. Norwood provided a report.

Enhancement: Ms. Lieber

- Ms. Lieber continues to report illegal dumping to the Department of the Public Works.

Energy: Mr. Littlejohn

- Information was shared about the Golden Pacific Powerlink.
- Temporary rerouting of utility lines along Cole Grade Road is still taking place before the County begins construction on the road sometime in October 2026. There was discussion about installing Red Light Protect at traffic signals along Cole Grade Road.

Community Plan Update - Mr. Ciupitu

- Mr. Ciupitu has reached out to Kevin Johnson. All Community plan updates remain on hold.

Government: Mr. Stinson

- The California Legislature has 1200 bills to consider in its upcoming session.

Nominations: Mrs. ChavezHarmes

- No update.

CPG Update: Chair Rattray

- No update.

Revitalization: Mr. Barber

- Information was shared about illegal street vendors, encampments, and dark sky regulations. Chief Napier will speak August 20, 2026 from 10 to 11:30 a.m.

Tribal: Mrs. Rattray

- No update.

Water: Ms. Fajardo & Dr. Matthews

- There are a number of phases for the Old Castle Pipeline Project Pipeline.

I. ADJOURNMENT:

- Next regular meeting of VCCPG: **September 14, 2026**
- Ms. Fajardo asked a question about how much time the Chair requires to add an item to the agenda. The Chair needs 96 hours or 4 days prior to a meeting to prepare anything in writing.
- **The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.**
- **Minutes were approved on September 14, 2026.**

James Garritson, Secretary

Appendix VCCPG August 10, 2026 Minutes

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

Revised Request to Amend Minutes 8-21-2026 from Randy Vance [5 Pages]

Randy Vance
13374 Mirar De Valle, Valley Center, CA 92082
Rvance777@gmail.com 760-497-5857

August 21, 2026

Dori Rattray, Chair
James Garritson, Secretary
Valley Center Community Planning Group
drattray524@aol.com

Re: Revised Written Notice of a Request to Amend the Approved Minutes of the July 13, 2026 Regular Meeting (Public Comments), and to Attach the Written Statement as an Appendix — Superseding the Letter of August 14, 2026

Dear Chair Rattray, Secretary Garritson, and Members of the Planning Group,

This letter revises and supersedes my letter of August 14, 2026, on the same subject. It is narrower than that letter: two of the six requests made on August 14 have been withdrawn, for the reason given in Section 8. Please disregard the August 14 letter and treat this one as the operative request. The matter is still asked to be heard at the September 14, 2026, regular meeting.

The substance of the request is unchanged. The minutes of the July 13, 2026, regular meeting were approved at the August meeting. The summary of my public comment in those minutes does not accurately reflect what I said or what I requested. **This letter is written notice, given in advance, of a request that the approved minutes be amended.**

This request is narrow and procedural. It is not a request that the Planning Group take any position on the Harmonia Estates project, and it is not a complaint about any individual member. I am asking only that the permanent record reflect what was actually said.

1. Why this is coming after approval

I checked the Planning Group's website approximately one hour before the August meeting for the purpose of reviewing the draft July minutes. The minutes were not available to me at that time. As a result, I had no opportunity to review them or to identify the errors described below before the Group voted to approve them. Public review before approval is the ordinary way errors of this kind are caught, and that opportunity was not available here.

I raise this as a matter of timing rather than as a criticism of anyone.

2. A note on my absence, and how I ask the Group to proceed

I will be out of state on business and do not expect to be able to attend the September 14 meeting. I am nonetheless asking that the matter be heard then, because the request is narrow, the proposed language is set out in full below, and I do not believe my presence is necessary to decide it.

So that my absence creates no difficulty for the Group, I state the following in advance. I accept any revision to the proposed language that captures the substance accurately; a member moving this amendment need not preserve my exact wording, and I will not object afterward to a version adopted in good faith. If the Group would nonetheless prefer to take the matter up when I can be present, I have no objection, and ask only that it be continued to the October regular meeting as a date certain rather than deferred generally.

I can be reached by email at Rvance777@gmail.com or by telephone at 760-497-5857 while I am traveling, and I am glad to work out the wording with the Secretary in advance of the meeting.

3. What the approved minutes say

The minutes record my comment as follows:

> *"Randy Vance shared that he has lived in Valley Center for 22 years and wanted to know more about a Planning Group member having information about the Harmonia Estates project. Randy would like an answer to a letter he has written requesting this information."*

4. Why the entry is inaccurate

There are two errors, one minor and one substantive.

First, the length of residency is stated as 22 years. My statement, which I read from a prepared text, said 23 years.

Second, and more importantly, the minutes do not record that I made an agenda request. I did not ask to "know more about a Planning Group member." I requested, on the record and in accordance with the Standing Rules, that a procedural matter be placed on a future agenda: specifically, a review of the Planning Group's own procedures and practices **for ensuring a fair, transparent, and impartial process**.

The distinction matters because the minutes for the same meeting record the immediately preceding speaker as having "made an agenda request," and direct the reader to review an appendix. My request received neither treatment, although it was made in the same manner at the same meeting. As approved, the record does not show that an agenda request was made at all.

5. Proposed amended language

To make this as easy as possible for the Secretary, I offer the following replacement text. I am not attached to the precise wording, only to the accuracy of the substance, and I would welcome any revision that captures it.

Randy Vance stated that he and his wife Diane have lived in Valley Center for 23 years. Mr. Vance made an agenda request that a procedural matter be placed on a future agenda: a review of the Planning Group's procedures and practices for ensuring a fair, transparent, and impartial process, and for maintaining public confidence in the impartiality of the Group. He noted that at the May meeting a statement concerning the Harmonia Estates project — which was not an agenda item and had not been formally presented to the Group — was read by a Planning Group member, and that he had subsequently obtained, through a California Public Records Act request, an email from the project applicant asking that same member to "share the truth" if the project came before the Group. He asked whether the presentation was consistent with the Group's normal procedures and whether members of the public with differing viewpoints should have been given an equal opportunity to respond. The Chair stated that the matter was under review by County Counsel. Mr. Vance's written statement is attached as an APPENDIX.

6. Procedural basis

Minutes that have been approved may still be corrected.

Article VI, Section II of the VCCPG Standing Rules provides that Robert's Rules of Order shall serve as the rules of order for the VCCPG for those procedures not specified by Policy I-1, with the order of precedence being Policy I-1, the Standing Rules, and then Robert's Rules of Order. Neither Policy I-1 nor the Standing Rules specifies a procedure for correcting minutes after approval, so Robert's Rules apply to this question.

Under Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, 12th edition, Section 35, an error discovered after approval is corrected by the motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted. There is no time limit on that motion. Where previous notice of the proposed amendment has been given, it is adopted by majority vote; without notice, it requires a two-thirds vote or a majority of the entire membership.

This letter is intended to serve as that previous notice for the September 14, 2026, regular meeting, so that the matter may be taken up by majority vote and so that every member has the proposed language in hand beforehand.

7. Requests

1. That this letter be placed on the agenda for the September 14, 2026, regular meeting as an action item, so that the Group may consider a motion to amend the approved July 13, 2026, minutes.
2. That the Public Comments entry for Randy Vance in the July 13, 2026, minutes be amended as set out in Section 5 above.
3. That the written statement I read at the July 13 meeting be attached to those minutes as an appendix, consistent with the treatment given to the other agenda request recorded in the same Public Comments section. A copy is enclosed.
4. That this letter and the enclosed statement be entered into the Planning Group's correspondence file and retained as part of the record, regardless of the outcome of the motion.

8. Note on the balance of my August 14 letter

My August 14 letter also asked the Group to state the grounds on which my July 13 agenda request was denied. That question is related but separate, and it belongs with the agenda request itself rather than with the correction of the minutes. I am withdrawing it from this letter so that the Group is asked to decide one thing at a time. I intend to raise it separately, in person, at the October meeting. Nothing in this letter should be read as abandoning it.

9. Closing

Minutes are the permanent public record of a body that advises the County on land use decisions. Where the record of a request differs from the request actually made, that difference can carry forward into later proceedings on the same project. I am asking only that the record show what was said. I note as well that where no recording of a meeting exists, the minutes become the sole record of what occurred. That makes their accuracy more important, not less.

I appreciate the time the Chair, the Secretary, and the members of the Group give to this work, and I recognize that minutes are prepared in good faith and under time pressure. I am glad to answer questions, to provide my statement in whatever format is convenient, or to discuss the wording with the Secretary in advance of the meeting so that the Group is presented with language everyone is comfortable with.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Randy Vance
Valley Center, California

Enclosure: "Request for Future Agenda Item — Public Comment," statement read at the July 13, 2026 regular meeting.

cc: Members of the Valley Center Community Planning Group; County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services — Community Planning Group liaison

Read at the July 13th Meeting

Request for Future Agenda Item – Public Comment

"Good evening, Madam Chair, and members of the Planning Group."

My name is Randy Vance. My wife Diane & I have lived here in Valley Center for 23 years.

I'm come before you to respectfully request that a procedural matter be placed on the August agenda.

To be clear, this request is **not** about whether the Harmonia Estates project should or should not be approved. Rather, it concerns the Planning Group's **procedures and maintaining public confidence in the fairness, impartiality, and transparency of this body**.

At the May meeting, the Harmonia Estates project was **not** an agenda item and had **not** yet been formally presented to the Planning Group. Nevertheless, a statement concerning the project was read by a Planning Group member.

Afterward, through a California Public Records Act request, I obtained an email from the Harmonia Estates project **applicant** asking that same Planning Group member to do what the applicant described as **"share the truth"** if the project came before this group.

As a member of the public, that raised several procedural questions for me. How did that statement come to be presented?

Was it consistent with the Planning Group's normal procedures?

Should members of the public with differing viewpoints have been given an equal opportunity to respond? And are there procedures that should be clarified so the public can have confidence that everyone is treated fairly?

I believe these are reasonable procedural questions. They are not about the merits of the Harmonia Estates project. They are about the procedures of this Planning Group and **the importance of ensuring a fair, transparent, and impartial process for everyone**.

Therefore, I respectfully request that this procedural matter be placed on the August agenda in accordance with the Planning Group's Standing Rules.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.