Valley Center Community Planning Group
Minutes of the April 14, 2014 Meeting
Chair: Oliver Smith Chair: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison
7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082
A=Absent/Abstain BOS=Board of Supervisors PDS=Department of Planning & Development Services DPW=Department of Public Works DRB=Valley Center Design Review Board N=Nay P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VC=Valley Center VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 2 May 2014; 7 May 2014 as corrected
Approved: 12 May 2014

A Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: 7:05 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUTCHISON</td>
<td>GLAVINIC</td>
<td>BRITSCH</td>
<td>FRANK</td>
<td>QUICK</td>
<td>BOULOS</td>
<td>NORWOOD</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>RUDOLF</td>
<td>LAVENTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Britsch arrives 7.08pm
Quorum Established: 11 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:
Motion: Move to approve the minutes of March 10, 2014, as corrected
Maker/Second: Quinley/Norwood
Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 (Y-N-A) Voice

D Public Communication/Open Forum:
None

E Action Items [VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items]:

E1 Report and discussion of the status of Weston Towne Center at Cole Grade and Valley Center Roads. PDS2013-STP 13-029; Owner is Weston Valley Center LLC at 310-473-0040 and herb@herbschaffer.com; Contact person is James Chagala at 760-751-2691 and Planning@chagala.com. The project currently under review is the commercial town center area of about 11 acres. Approximately 83 acres of the Weston Town Center would be used for residential development at an average density of 7.10 dwelling units per acre and approximately 529 residential units are planned. About 17 acres of open space, park and/or trail areas are proposed. Main access to the commercial portion would be from Indian Creek Road off Valley Center Road. The project may be served by a sewage recycling plant proposed by Valley View Properties and operated by VCMWD. (Quinley)

Discussion: Postponed until a future meeting by mutual agreement with the applicant.

E2 Pennell Second Dwelling; PDS2014-AD-14-010; Owner is Timothy V. Pennell who lives at project location at 12736 Hideaway Lake Road in Valley Center; email: timpennell597@msn.com or 619-247-7925. Applicant proposes the construction of an 801 square-foot second dwelling adjacent to a 2,157 square-foot existing one. (Glavinic)

Discussion: Glavinic presents. Regarding the present project, he spoke to one neighbor, however, other neighbors were unavailable to consult. Hideaway Lake is to the west of the project, and Glavinic spoke to them, but they raised no issues. Jackson asks if the proposed project is a non-conforming use? Glavinic says no. He says 5-years ago the County changed the rules for a second dwelling. The old County regulation for the size of a second dwelling on a single lot was 30% of main house; the new regulation for
size is 25% of main house [539 sq. ft. in this case] on a 2-acre lot. Glavinic contests the characterization of this project as nonconforming. Rudolf reiterates Jackson’s issue about whether this is beyond the ‘by right’ limit of 25% for a 2157 sq. ft. main house. The present request is for an exception to build a second dwelling of 868 sq. ft. [about 40% of main house] which exceeds the limit of 539 sq. ft. Timothy Pennell explains the family circumstances surrounding his request. He is asking for a variance for the difference. A second dwelling of 40% of the main house requires an administrative permit. Pennell has addressed the septic issue by creating a second septic system. Vick asks if such a property can be rented out after Pennell’s intended use for his mother. Jackson follows with a question on consistency with the General Plan. Rudolf asks if there is a prohibition on renting. Pennell says he doesn’t want it rentable but has multiple relatives who would like to move in. It apparently is subsequently rentable.

**Motion:** To approve with the standard conditions outlined in the scoping letter.

**Carries/Fails:** 12-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

**Discussion and vote on Verizon, Aquacate Cell Phone tower project, PDS 2013-MUP-13-022, Owner is Brad Diskin at 15202 Aquacate Lane; Applicant is Verizon Wireless and contact person is Margie Sullivan, Agent for Verizon Wireless at 760-613-3488 or Margie.sullivan@plancorninc.com. Verizon Wireless is proposing to install 12 antennas, 21 remote radio units, and 1 microwave dish antenna inside a new 35’ faux water tank. The equipment necessary to operate the facility will be located in a proposed 12’ x 22’ concrete block building on a new concrete pad. Installation of an emergency generator will be placed inside a new concrete block wall enclosure. (Norwood)**

**Motion:** To approve the application with the following conditions: 1. The proponent must float a large visible balloon at the center of where the proposed water tower will go for two weeks before construction begins. 2. At the completion of construction, all public and private roads used during construction to be assessed for damage due to construction traffic. The applicant will meet with the Paso Robles road maintenance association to establish acceptable repairs, if needed. 3. Meet all County scoping requirements.

**Carries/Fails:** 11-0-1 [Y-N-A]; Franck recuses

**Notes:** Franck recuses because of a former work relationship with Verizon

**Discussion and vote on letters and issues from the Mobility Subcommittee to San Diego County Department of Public Works and to the Board of Supervisors. (Jackson):**
a. Letter concerning Sunset Road and Vesper Road intersection. DPW has requested comments on their proposed changes to intersection controls in an effort to assist the community in managing speed and safety.

b. Letter of thanks and appreciation to DPW for major repairs and resurfacing of over 4 miles of Lilac Road—a major arterial road in Valley Center.

c. Mobility subcommittee letter to DPW on proposed Cole Grade Solar Project (PDS 2013-MUP-13-019) reflecting Mobility issues that the proposed project raises.

d. Mobility ranking and priorities by DPW regarding Valley Center Public Roads for a) Capital improvements including new roads, lane additions, bridge improvements; b) maintenance work on existing public roads

e. Mobility subcommittee recommendations for Butterfield Trails project Sunday Drive/Valley Center that are compliant with VC community plan.

Discussion: Recorded by item:

a. Quinley presides in place of Smith on this item. Jackson presents the circumstances of speed and accidents on Sunset Road. The County measured the speed and volume and notes that the speed of vehicles can be excessive, but the traffic volume is very low. The County policy is not to post speed limits on such streets with very low traffic volume. Jackson explains that DPW suggests controlling the Vesper Road and Sunset Road intersection by a two-way stop. He says the Mobility SC suggests a four-way stop. Smith, from audience, points out that Mactan Road, with shoulders and perhaps less traffic volume, is posted at 45 mph. He says the traffic between the middle school and high school create more volume on Sunset Road. He asks for removing speed limits on Mactan Road, or applying them to Sunset Road. He says that traffic speeds on Sunset Road routinely reach 65 mph. Rudolf suggests amendments to the letter to address lines and attribution and add the VCCPG vote total after the Mobility SC vote total.

b. Jackson presents a letter to thank DPW for recent major road resurfacing of a portion of Lilac Road. Franck notes that a segment of Circle R Road has been similarly resurfaced.

c. Jackson presents a letter regarding the Cole Grade solar project (PDS 2013-MUP-13-019) and related mobility issues, and he asks for conditioning the project with an Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate [IOD] roadway on its frontage with Wilhite Road and undergrounding utilities along its frontage with Cole Grade Road. Smith suggests forwarding these recommendations to the Solar SC and to Chris Brown, as representative of applicant. Proposed letter forwarded to Solar SC for consideration. No motion.

d. Jackson says the County, for the first time since 2005, has asked for the community’s sense of priority on maintenance of existing roads and construction of new roads. The County is proposing two treatments: slurry seal and repaving. Jackson reviews the Capital Improvement Plan [CIP] priority list [appended below]. He also reviews the proposed lists of New Roads/Intersection Safety Improvements and Travel Lane Additions [appended below]. Glavinic questions estimated cost and degree of difficulty of the Lilac/West Lilac intersection line of sight improvement. Jackson explains how he estimated the cost and reasserts the need for a better sight line. Smith questions the merits of the Cool Valley Road/Fruitvale connector, observing that neighbors protested such a connector during the General Plan Update discussions. Rudolf says the connector was approved over those objections. Rudolf questions need for a right turn lane from Valley Center Road to Lilac Road and suggests restriping the existing roadway for a right lane. Vick concurs. Glavinic agrees if it is possible within the width of the existing roadway. Vick suggests an adjustment that might work. Rudolf suggests elimination of the proposed 40-ft right turn lane and instead inserting restriping to accommodate a right turn lane on southbound VC road.

Jackson reviews a proposed list of road maintenance projects and the County’s two repair alternatives. The list is based on the Pavement Condition Index [PCI] provided by the County. He explains that the cost of the slurry...
treatment is about 20% of the cost of resurfacing. He cites the proposed letter’s attachment C [appended below]. Smith, citing a Valley Center Road segment, says the noise generated on slurry is dramatically higher than other surfaces. Hutchison and Jackson note that the segment of VC road cited received a chip coat treatment, which is a different process and material than the proposed slurry. Jackson reviews the recommended road segments for such repairs. Glavinic notes that Hilldale and Couser Canyon have already been repaired and suggests substituting Miller road instead. Jackson notes that the County’s PCI and personal observations differ widely. He notes that the SC is not trained in determining needed maintenance treatments under given circumstances, but did its best to respond to the County’s request for input. He also explains the need for Old 395 repair along most of its length, even though much of it is not in Valley Center. Glavinic wants to amend attachment C to include Miller Road from Valley Center Road to Wilhite Road, and wants to eliminate items 6&7. A discussion about the relative merits of repairing Miller versus Couser Canyon and Hilldale Roads ensues. It is decided to insert Miller Road as item 6 and move others down in priority. Rudolf thanks mobility SC for tremendous effort. Britsch seconds that notion.

e. Jackson presents. The approved Butterfield Trails project proposes a left turn improvement of a refuge lane, by replacing 650-feet of planted and raised median on Valley Center [VC] Road at Sunday Drive. The County standard for mitigating left turns at such intersections is 300 peak-hour trips [left turns from Sunday Drive onto Valley Center Road]. The project’s traffic study estimates 32 peak-hour trips at build out, so the volume is vastly under the threshold for mitigation required by DPW. The mitigation would require removing 650 ft. of planted and raised median. Such mitigation is in major conflict with the Valley Center Design Review guidelines. Franck asks how peak-hour data was determined. Jackson says data is from the project traffic study. Smith notes that the data is 4-years old and peak hour traffic on VC Road is greater now. Laventure describes an alternate informal study that confirms peak traffic times. Jackson says VC Road has over 24K trips and the project does not meet the standard to require mitigation. Jackson says the Mobility SC recommends closing the gap in median to mitigate unsafe left turns from Sunday drive onto VC Road. Southbound traffic could move through Woods Valley Development to Woods Valley Road or make a right turn followed by a U-turn south. Vick notes that the main problem is northbound traffic volume on VC Road. Glavinic suggests making the recommendation to eliminate left turns from Sunday Drive more prominent in the letter. Smith proposes an alternative mitigation of adding a traffic light at Sunday Drive. He says it will more safely break traffic for left turns. Rudolf restates the discussion thus far to compare with Smith’s alternative. Jackson responds that a southbound route through Woods Valley Estates to Woods Valley Road is less than 800-feet farther given the location of homes on the site. He notes that based on traffic road standards for warrants to install a traffic light to impede traffic for the purpose of facilitating left turns, the project is significantly below that standard. Smith contests the need for additional turn lanes. Quinley cites her experience on Ridge Ranch Road and is not concerned about the extra travel required to make a U-turn on VC Road. Glavinic understands Smith’s desire for a traffic signal, but says it may be better placed at Mirar De Valle. Smith doesn’t see any value for the Woods Valley development to allow Butterfield Trails project traffic to pass through to the south. Jackson says an agreement for emergency access already exists between the two and Woods Valley residents could also use Sunday Drive to go northbound. Smith says he is upset with the County for not advising VCCPG of the conditioned removal of the median. Quinley says the County’s project manager, Dennis Campbell reports VCCPG knew about the median removal according to the minutes of the South Village SC. Vick cites the minutes of the South Village SC, saying that there was misleading information given to the subcommittee. He adds that the South Village SC would not have approved the application if correct and full information had been provided. He says that other projects will also want access to VC Road and that they will want intersection control as well. This project will be precedent setting. Glavinic worries about another precedent that this recommendation may set for rerouting traffic through developments. Laventure says proponent already has ROW through Woods Valley Estates. Rudolf asks to amend letter by adding vote of VCCPG after Mobility SC vote total Vote.

**Motion:** Item a. To approve the Chair sending the proposed letter, as amended by Rudolf.

**Maker/Second:** Glavinic/Laventure  
**Carries/Fails:** 11-0-1 [Y-N-A]: Smith recused because he is a resident along Sunset Road.

**Motion:** Item b. To send proposed letter to DPW.
Motion: Item d. To approve sending letter to DPW with maintenance and construction priorities list, as amended.

Maker/Second: Jackson/Norwood

Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]

Motion: Item e. To approve Chair sending the proposed letter, as amended, which recommends closing the gap in the existing median on Valley Center Road.

Maker/Second: Jackson/Rudolf

Carries/Fails: 10-2-0 [Y-N-A]; Glavinic and Smith dissent

Discussion and possible vote on a letter to the Board of Supervisors regarding a request to the Board of Supervisors made by the Land Development Performance Review Committee (DDPRC0). For reference, an e-mail from the Spring Valley Planning Group Chair James Comeau will be distributed at the April 14, 2014 Valley Center Community Planning Group meeting. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presents a proposed letter to be sent by the chair. Explains history and charter of Land Development Performance Review Committee. He notes the composition of the committee as being weighted toward the point of view of developers. The chairperson is Chris Brown, a lobbyist, who works extensively with developers and who continually leans toward expanding the committee’s role in land use policy. The committee is appropriate for development process reviews and cost containment, but not for land use policy. Rudolf seconds with friendly amendment to insert correct vote by VCCPG and today’s date [agreed]. Vick suggests amendment to last line on first page [see handout].

Motion: To direct the chair to send the proposed letter as amended by Rudolf and Vick.

Maker/Second: Quinley/Rudolf

Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A]

F Group Business

F1 Prospective new VCCPG members

Discussion: Britsch says that Mr. Juan Macias is the only applicant for seat number one.

Motion: To approve Juan Macias for seat #1 of the VCCPG

Maker/Second: Britsch/Glavinic

Carries/Fails: 6-6-0 [Y-N-A]:

F2 Introduction and possible vote on candidates for open seats on the VCCPG (Britsch)

Discussion: Britsch says there are two applicants for seat 14. He introduces Susan Janisch who then describes her work history and other pertinent experiences. Hutchison asks about her views on the VC Community Plan. She has reviewed it and suggests that there are perhaps future issues with water availability and sewer. Janisch says after retiring, she and her husband moved to VC looking for a rural community. They like the country, space and quiet of VC. Vick asks what she might have contributed to the discussion of the Mobility SC issues. She expresses concern for population growth. She mentions roundabouts as a possible solution to some mobility problems.
Britsch introduces Boris Dobrotin and he describes his qualifications and experience. He is an engineer. He explains that he moved to VC because he and his wife would never be here [he and his wife would be traveling the world]; been in VC for 15 years. Lived in San Dimas previously. Rudolf asks what he likes about VC. He likes the chaparral, is close enough to his children in Los Angeles, and close to the ocean. He wants VC to remain rural. Rudolf reminds that we need to extend the application period for seat #1. VCCPG will vote next month on seat #14. There is a need to advertise for seat #1.

**Motion:** None

**F4**  
Next regular meeting scheduled for May 12, 2014

**G**  
Motion to Adjourn: 9.47 pm  
Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley  
Carries/Fails: 12-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

**Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group**

- a) Mobility – Mark Jackson
- b) Community Plan Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair
- e) Parks & Recreation – LaVonne Norwood Johnson, Chair
- f) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair
- g) Tribal Liaison – Larry Glavinic, Chair
- h) Website – Oliver Smith, Chair
- i) Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- j) Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair

**Correspondence Received for the April Meeting:**

1. PDS2013-MUP-73-248W2, Skyline Ranch Country Club, LTD, 18218 Paradise Mountain Road at Latigo Road, Applicant is Fred Gritzen for Skyline Ranch Country Club, LLC at 858-756-4144 or deldios@sbcglobal.net; Project Contact Person is Sharon Thornton for Wynn Engineering, Inc. at 760-749-8722 or Sharon@wynnengineering.com. Skyline Ranch Country Club proposes to submit a Major Use Permit Modification request to update and modernize the community buildings within the mobile home park located on Paradise Mountain Road. They will rehabilitate the existing office/restroom/storage/laundry/maintenance building. A replacement pre-fabricated steel Maintenance structure is proposed. The gated entryway off Paradise Mountain Road will be improved. (Franck)

2. PDS2014-AD-14-020, Construction of a second dwelling unit at 10320 Lilac Ridge Ranch, Escondido, CA 92026; Applicant is Stephanie Lupton at 760-224-9704 or sjdrafting@gmail.com. This project entails the conversion of the guesthouse garage into living space. Two parking stalls will be provided outside the structure. (Boulos)

3. County of San Diego Planning Commission to the VCCPG; Hearing is April 11, 2014 for ATT Wireless-Lake Wohlford Wireless Telecommunication Facility; PDS2013-MUP-03-118W located at 26725 N. Lake Wohlford Road; This is a request for the Planning Commission to evaluate the proposed project, for a Major Use Permit (MUP) modification to an existing wireless telecommunication facility.

4. Local Agency Formation Commission agenda for April 7, 2014 meeting at 9:00 County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highways, San Diego. The Agenda includes adoption of an Amendment to the Spheres of Influence for the Valley Center Municipal Water District.

**Appended Material:**

**Item E4 a.**
To: Kenton Jones Kenton.Jones@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Sunset Road/Vesper Road proposed intersection controls

Kenton,

The VCCPG has reviewed the County proposed intersection control which is to convert the intersection of Vesper Road and Sunset Road to a two way stop for east and westbound Vesper Road traffic.

Recommendations

The Valley Center Community Planning Group appreciates the quick response by DPW to the request for traffic analysis and problem solution.

After review of comments from area residents, the primary issue is speed control, both on Vesper Road and Sunset Road. There are frequent and continuing reports of traffic travelling at unsafe speeds on both roads.

DPW, following guidelines and regulations, has informed us that posting speed limit signs on the two roads with their small volume of traffic isn’t a conforming solution.

So, we accept as a given that speed limit signage will not change.

The VCCPG doesn’t have the technical depth and practical experience of DPW, but our collective judgment is that a 4 way stop on the Vesper/Sunset Road intersection would have the added benefit of controlling Sunset Road speed, particularly the downhill southbound traffic on Sunset, which area residents have indicated as a problem. The VCCPG recommends a 4 way stop at the intersection, and seeks DPW’s comments and advice on this approach.

Another key safety issue is the existing sight distance line for eastbound Vesper Road traffic at the Sunset Road intersection. Brush on the southwest corner of Vesper Road at the Sunset Road intersection greatly limits visibility to the south on Sunset Road. VCCPG does not know whether the County has prescriptive rights to clear the brush for safety purposes, or needs landowner permission to clear the brush. If it is appropriate, VCCPG can contact the landowner to assist with obtaining needed permissions for brush clearance.

Again, the VCCPG thanks DPW for their attention to our requests and looks forward to their comments on this slightly different solution.

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, Valley Center Community Planning Group

ps. As a matter of record, I recused myself due to conflict of interest from this group discussion and vote on the basis that I reside on Sunset Rd. This letter is verbatim of what was approved by the remaining VCCPG membership with a vote of 11-0-1 at our regular monthly meeting on April 14, 2014.
April 15, 2014

To: Richard Crompton  Richard.Crompton@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Thank You for Lilac Road repairs!

Director Crompton:

The Valley Center Community Planning Group would like to take a minute to thank DPW for the remediation repairs that are underway in the month of March 2014 for Lilac Road between Valley Center Road and West Lilac Road.

We at VCCPG have only a limited appreciation of DPW Road Maintenance fiscal constraints and attendant budget cycle times. We do appreciate the quick turn repair of this approximately 4 mile section of two lane public road that is a major route into Valley Center and the Tribal Gaming Centers nearby. DPW quick turn repair actions likely are a major future cost avoidance of more extensive repairs.

A very heartfelt "Thank you DPW!" from Valley Center!

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, Valley Center Community Planning Group

cc:
Kenton Jones Kenton.Jones@sdcounty.ca.gov;
Terry Rayback Terrence.Rayback@sdcounty.ca.gov;
Murali Pasumarthi Murali.Pasumarthi@sdcounty.ca.gov
April 14, 2014
To: Derek Gade DPW Deputy Director Derek.Gade@sdcounty.ca.gov
    Frank Arebalo DPW Project Manager Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov
    Kenton Jones DPW Chief, Safety Kenton.Jones@sdcounty.ca.gov
    Chris Champine 5th District Senior Policy Advisor Christopher.Champine@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Valley Center Community Planning Group Prioritization of Future Road Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) and Road Maintenance projects

References:

a) Derek Gade to Oliver Smith letter dated February 7, 2014

Dear Director Gade and Sr. Policy Advisor Champine:

The Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) appreciates the opportunity to provide input on future Road CIP and Maintenance Projects. VCCPG's Mobility Subcommittee has provided the recommendations below which were approved by a 11-1-0 vote of the VCCPG on April 14, 2014.

The Mobility Subcommittee employed a structured process described in Attachment A – Selection and Prioritization Criteria which seeks to balance budget constraints with Community needs for Safety, Emergency Evacuation, and Mobility.

**Capital Improvement Projects**

VCCPG recognizes the scarcity of funding for County Public Roads. VCCPG recommends for the FY 2014 to 2018/9 CIP plan (See Attachment B) a total of eight projects in three categories in descending order of priority:

A). Underway Projects fully funded in County and Escondido current 5 year CIP Plans

1. Valley Center Road widening project from the bottom of the grade to Beven Drive in the City of Escondido. The majority of the project is funded and is scheduled to start construction in Sept 2014.
2. Cole Grade Road widening project from Horse Creek Rd to Pauma Heights Rd. This County Project has funding plans to enable completion of construction in 2017.

B). New Roads/Intersection Safety Improvements

3. New Road Evacuation Route 8 – Valley Center Road to Mountain Meadow Road (refer to Attachment D – Evacuation Route 8). This is Valley Center’s most pressing new project, driven by the need for additional East-West Emergency Evacuation routes to serve Valley Center’s growing population. This route and road has been evaluated as the best cost/benefit solution in a County funded August 2011 study. VCCPG will be working with the 5th District Supervisor and his office to secure funding for this new road. VCCPG will only move forward on this project with the concurrence of the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group.
4. Lilac Rd/West Lilac Rd. intersection – This intersection doesn’t meet Sight Distance requirement for Northbound Lilac left turns onto West Lilac Road and is an immediate pressing Safety issue. Additional grading to bring Sight Distance up to DPW standards is a modest investment in Public Safety on this Circulation Element Road intersection.
5. Cool Valley Rd. south connector new road to Fruitvale Rd. – This project has initial Engineering Study 2017 funding identified in the County 5 year CIP. VCCPG believes that this road is a lower priority than Evacuation Road 8 and the first priority for new roads should be given to Evacuation Route 8 (Priority 3).

C). Widening and Travel Lane Additions

6. The upgrade of Valley Center Road from Cole Grade to N. Lake Wohlford Rd from a two lane road to a four lane 4.2 A Boulevard configuration. Valley View and Harrah’s Casino traffic has and will continue to degrade Level Of Service (LOS) on this section of Valley Center Rd until improvements are constructed.
7. In the near future, the Old Castle/Lilac Road route from Valley Center Road to Old Hwy 395 will require a passing lane on the two significant grades on the route. At the best surveyed location, somewhere between Old Hwy 395 and Anthony Road a passing lane in two locations should be added at the two major uphill grades. The significant grades in these locations have growing LOS issues driven by slow moving Commercial vehicles impeding traffic flow on the grades.

8. Restriping to accomodate a right hand turn lane on Southbound Valley Center Road/Lilac Road intersection.

**Road Maintenance Projects**

The Mobility Subcommittee offers the following observations and caveats on the Maintenance priorities which are listed in Attachment C:

1. The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) metrics appear to be generated from maintenance records, not recent surveys. Our observations of current road conditions vary widely in both directions to the PCI’s listed.

2. VCCPG doesn’t have DPW’s skill set to trade off various forms of preventative maintenance. We assumed that Slurry Seal doesn’t have functional utility below PCI 60, although this may not be accurate. An expanded use of Slurry Seal beyond our recommendations may be beneficial.

3. Our Maintenance priorities trade off large sections of Circulation Element Roads. Our resurface priorities are for 1-2 mile sections of road. Conditions likely will exist where smaller road sections need repair and funding is not available to resurface in 1 or 2 mile increments. Please accept and use our Resurface priorities for establishing (for example) that the Community believes repairing and resurfacing Circle R Drive for the approximate 1 mile stretch between Circle R Ct and Ridge Creek Rd is more important than Couser Canyon Rd repairs. In this example, we value Circle R Dr higher, because it is a Circulation Element Road and Evacuation route that has far more traffic than Couser Canyon.

The Mobility Subcommittee would also like to state that Old Highway 395 borders the Western boundary of Valley Center and the condition of Old Highway 395 surface from Highway 76 to Mountain Meadows/Deer Springs is in the worst condition of any Circulation Element Road in the County that we know of. Advocacy for repairs may be divided since this segment of Old Hwy 395 runs through Fallbrook, Bonsall, Hidden Meadows, and North County Metro jurisdictions. Please ensure that Old Highway 395 is repaired and resurfaced in the near future.

VCCPG has not prioritized or commented on Maintenance priorities for South Lake Wohlford Road because it is not within VCCPG jurisdiction (it is North County Metro). This road does serve as an alternate Evacuation Corridor for Paradise Mountain residents. We believe that existing road conditions are adequate for the traffic load for the next five years.

Should you have further questions regarding this report, please contact Mobility Subcommittee Chairman Mark Jackson at markjacksonvccpg@gmail.com or 760-731-7327.

Sincerely,

Oliver Smith

Chairman Valley Center Community Planning Group

Attachments:

Attachment A – Selection/Prioritization Criteria
Attachment B - Capital Improvement Plan 2014 – 18/19 Priorities
Attachment C - Maintenance Priorities 2014- 18/19
Attachment D - Evacuation Route 8

**ATTACHMENT A – SELECTION/PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA**

1. MAINTENANCE PRIORITIES
   - **Requested Product** - A ranked listing of top 20 road sections based on their Alpha listing and Map. Assume two choices, Slurry Seal or Asphalitic Concrete (AC) resurface
- **PCI** 0-40 Poor; 41-70 Fair; 71-100 Good

No budget guidelines given other than total annual budget $6 million.
Assume: $1 million/year for Valley Center roads
Assume: Slurry Seal Effective 60 to 80 PCI
Assume: AC Resurface below 60 PCI
Assume: AC cold plane, road bed repairs and 2" AC resurface $1.25 to $1.50 sq. ft. or $200 – $250k/2 lane road mile (2 each 14’ lanes + shoulder)
Assume: Slurry Seal $.25 to $.30 sq. ft. ($40 - $50k/2 lane road mile+ shoulder)

**Selection criteria**

a. Road condition – Pavement Condition Index
b. Level of Traffic on road (e.g. Evacuation Routes and Mobility Element Roads take priority)
c. DPW SHOULD, BUT VCCPG DOESN’T HAVE ENOUGH INFO for: Cost Avoidance: example is a timely slurry seal to avoid a resurface. Cost of slurry seal is ~ 20% of 2” AC resurface.

**Time frame: 5 years 2014-18/19.**

2. **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

- **Requested Product** - A ranked listing of Capital Improvement Projects (new roads, bridges, increased travel lanes, etc.). No budget information given

Assume: the following projects are already programmed and either are 100% funded or current plans provide full funding by January, 2017

1. Valley Center Road – Widening to 4 travel lanes, full 4.2 A/B Boulevard between North Lake Wohlford Road and Bevin Drive (City of Escondido project with County funding). This very high priority project eliminates a bottleneck with critical Evacuation/Safety issues for Valley Center’s main arterial road.

2. Cole Grade widening from Fruitvale Road to Pauma Heights Road

**Selection criteria**

a. Public Safety and Additional Emergency Evacuation Route(s)
b. Additional travel lanes/intersection improvement to remediate LOS E/F service existing/projected

**Time frame: 5 years 2014-18.**

**Attachment B – Capital Improvement Plan Priorities**
## Projects Already Planned with Funding Secured and in FY 2014 - 2018/9 CIP plans

### Priority NAME FROM TO LENGTH COST $ M COMMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>NAME FROM TO</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>COST $ M</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VALLEY CENTER RD BOTTOM OF GRADE BEVEN DRIVE (ESCO City)</td>
<td>~ 2</td>
<td>$9.80</td>
<td>Construction start Sep 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COLE GRADE RD. HORSE CREEK RD PAUMA HEIGHTS RD</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>Widening and travel lane additions Construction complete 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Roads/Intersection Safety Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>NAME FROM TO</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>COST $ M</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EVAC ROUTE 8 VALLEY CENTER RD MTN MEADOW RD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>WEST EVAC ROUTE TO I-15 COST ESTIMATE FROM 2011 FEHR &amp; PEERS STUDY (attached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LILAC/W. LILAC INTERSECTION AT INTERSECTION</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>IMPROVE SIGHT DISTANCE TO STANDARDS ON THIS DANGEROUS CE ROAD INTERSECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COOL VALLEY SOUTH CONNECTOR EXTENSION COOL VALLEY TO FRUITVALE</td>
<td>~ 1 ~ 3</td>
<td>COOL VALLEY TO FRUITVALE ($0.1M in CIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel Lane Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>NAME FROM TO</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VALLEY CENTER RD COLE GRADE N. LAKE WOHLFORD RD.</td>
<td>~2.9</td>
<td>UPGRADE TO 4.2A/B BLVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OLD CASTLE/ OLD HWY 395 LILAC ROAD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VALLEY CENTER RD SOUTH BOUND RIGHT TURN ONTO LILAC RD</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>RESTRIP RIGHT TURN LANE FOR WB RIGHT HAND TURN ONTO LILAC RD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment C – Maintenance Priorities**
## 2014 TO 2018-19

### SLURRY SEALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>NAME FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>PCI</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>COST $ M</th>
<th>CPG</th>
<th>TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WOODS VALLEY RD NORTH LAKE WOHLFORD</td>
<td>VALLEY CENTER RD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>SEAL DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRUITVALE RD MAC TAN RD</td>
<td>COLE GRADE RD</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>SEAL DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MAC TAN RD VESPER RD</td>
<td>FRUITVALE RD</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>SEAL DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LILAC RD W. LILAC RD</td>
<td>OLD CASTLE RD</td>
<td>Hi 50'</td>
<td>~1.5</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>SEAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASPHALT CONCRETE OVERLAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>NAME FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>PCI</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>COST $ M</th>
<th>CPG</th>
<th>TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MAC TAN RD FRUITVALE RD</td>
<td>END</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAC TAN RD VALLEY CENTER RD</td>
<td>VESPER RD</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIRCLE R RD RIDGE CREEK RD PVT</td>
<td>CIRCLE R CT</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>COOL VALLEY COLE GRADE</td>
<td>VILLA SIERRA RD</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>~1.5</td>
<td>$0.38</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LILAC RD N. OLD LILAC RD</td>
<td>W. LILAC RD</td>
<td>Hi 40'</td>
<td>~1.75</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MILLER RD VALLEY CENTER RD</td>
<td>WILHITE RD (END CMR)</td>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>~1.3</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HILLDALE RD COLE GRADE</td>
<td>HILLTOP DR PVT</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COUSER CYN RD IMP 02.0</td>
<td>LILAC RD</td>
<td>&lt;35</td>
<td>~3</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>VCCPG</td>
<td>RESURFACE DPW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item E4 e.
Darren Gretler DPDS Deputy Director [Darren.Gretler@sdcounty.ca.gov]
Dennis Campbell DPDS Project Manager [Dennis.Campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov]
Richard Crompton DPW Director [Richard.Crompton@sdcounty.ca.gov]

Subject: Proposed destruction of 650 feet of existing raised median on Valley Center Road

Director Gretler,

The Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) has reviewed the proposed left turn solution (650 feet in two locations of existing raised medians replaced by left turn refuge lanes) for Sunday Drive/Valley Center Road intersection proposed by the Butterfield Trails Project (PDS2008-3100-5551) for the benefit of left turn traffic from Sunday Drive onto Valley Center Road. The Butterfield Trails project is a 71 unit Residential Dwelling Unit Private Development.

The VCCPG finds the following major inconsistencies with DPW’s Public Road Standards.

1. The traffic volume is FAR BELOW the DPW Public Road Warrant 300 peak hour threshold for the proposed left turn solution - The Butterfield Trails Traffic Impact Study projects the following peak hour left turn traffic (AM/PM):
   a. Sunday Drive to Southbound Valley Center Road (32/17)
   b. Southbound Valley Center Road to Sunday Drive (7/20)

   THE DPW PUBLIC ROAD DESIGN STANDARDS THRESHOLD FOR THIS SOLUTION IS 300 PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC (below):

   4.4 C 3. Page 13 of 48: “Boulevard with raised median/Community Collector with raised median:

   Where the left turn traffic volume at an intersection on the above Mobility Element road is estimated to exceed 300 vehicles at peak hour, an additional 12 feet of right-of-way shall be required for provision of a dual left turn lane. Minimum length of the additional left turn lane shall be 300 feet plus appropriate taper.”

2. The proposed Sunday Drive/Valley Center Road left turn solution is in MAJOR conflict with the approved Valley Center Community Plan that baselines Valley Center Road vegetated raised medians as a primary design element.

DPW Public Road Design Standards Section 9.1 EXCEPTION PROCESSING PROCEDURES Page 43 of 48 states: “A community planning or sponsor group may recommend that a project proponent process an exception request when a project does not align with an established community plan for the area.
County staff will assess the appropriateness of the requested exception. In addition to engineering and regulatory concerns, the following factors may be considered: consistency with existing road characteristics and geometrics in the project vicinity, effects on safety of all road users, likelihood of future public or private upgrades to the affected roads, compatibility with existing land uses including access points to and from individual properties, established front-yard setbacks, potential impacts to environmental and cultural resources, consistency with the adopted General Plan, Community Plan and Specific Plans for the area, utility relocations, project and plan submittals made prior to the adoption of these standards, and established community character guidelines in the area.”

The Valley Center Community Planning Group is requesting that a Public Road Design Exception be processed in accordance with the County’s Public Roads Design Standards and serves advance notice that VCCPG recommends that it be denied based on the abovementioned facts.

Summary
- The Butterfield Trails Project is a subdivision of 71 Residential Dwelling Units housing approximately 206 residents.
- In 2010, Valley Center had 6638 EDU or approximately 19,250 residents.
- Valley Center Road is the Community’s main arterial circulation road with current measured daily traffic in excess of 24,000 ADT.
- To allow a very small private development generating less than 10% of the traffic warrant threshold to disrupt traffic flow on Valley Center Road in addition to destroying our Community Design baseline concept is unacceptable to the Community.
- There are three appropriate traffic management design actions prescribed by DPW Public Road Standards and Traffic Guidelines that comport with the Butterfield Trails traffic load:
  1. We agree with DPW that accessing Sunday Drive via left turns from or onto Valley Center Road using the existing openings in the raised planted median would be a safety hazard at Butterfield Trails projected traffic loads. VCCPG in a 9-2-0 vote recommends elimination of this option by “closing the existing hole” in the median by extending the raised median across the existing openings, therefore precluding unsafe left hand turns. We recommend this action to be implemented immediately by DPW in the interest of Public Safety.
  2. (If necessary) negotiate expanded reciprocal easement rights with the Woods Valley Subdivision so that Southbound Valley Center Road traffic can use the Augusta Drive/Woods Valley Road right turn route to the signal controlled intersection at Woods Valley/Valley Center Road. As a reciprocal right, Woods Valley Subdivision residents could use Sunday Drive for their Northbound Valley Center Road traffic. This reciprocal agreement would benefit both parties and have a synergistic favorable impact in reducing total Community traffic.
  3. Southbound Valley Center Traffic originating from Sunday Drive can make a Northbound right hand turn on Valley Center Road and safely execute a U-turn where sight distance and traffic permit.
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VCCPG has a scheduled meeting with DPDS on April 23 and would like to discuss the County response to this letter at that meeting.

This letter was approved by the VCCPG in a 12-0-0 vote on April 14, 2014.

Regards,

Oliver Smith
Chair, Valley Center Community Planning Group

References:
b). DPW Public Road Standards dated March 2012
Item E5:

April 14, 2014
To:
Supervisor Dianne Jacob, Chairwoman
Supervisor Bill Horn, Vice Chairman
Supervisor Greg Cox
Supervisor Dave Roberts
Supervisor Ron Roberts
CC: Sarah Aghassi, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

From: Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG)

Subject: LAND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMO DATED FEBRUARY 20, 2014 AND RELATED MEMO’S (attached)

Chairwoman Jacob and Honorable Supervisors:

The Land Development Performance Review Committee (LDPRC) was established by your Board via Resolution No. 12-135 dated 08/08/2012 (attached).

The purpose and intent of your Board is quite clear as is stated in the Mission Statement in Resolution No 12-135:

(c) Mission Statement: To work with County staff to develop meaningful performance measures that capture project timelines and costs to demonstrate efficiencies gained over time through process improvements.

LDPRC meetings are made very accessible to the Public. Members of the VCCPG have attended some meetings, joined by other Planning and Sponsor Group members not seated on the LDPRC.

Periodically, some members of the LDPRC have discussed and expressed their personal opinions on how they would like to change various elements of Land Use Policy.

Department of Planning and Development Services (DPDS) staff has tactfully reminded these individuals and groups of individuals that the clear intention of the Mission Statement is to recommend process improvements that will decrease cost and cycle time on processing of Ministerial and Discretionary Permits.

Not satisfied with DPDS’s answer, the February 20, 2014 LDPRC memo to the Board is a request by members to widen the purview of the LDPRC to include Land Use Policy issues, even though this is only vaguely hinted at in the language requesting charter clarification.
VCCPG believes that DPDS’s interpretation of a limited LDPRC Mission/Charter appropriately excludes Land Use Policy

The composition of the LDPRC seven member Committee is heavily weighted towards the Building Industry with four of the seven members from Industry. The Chair is a registered Lobbyist.

The current composition is appropriate to improve Ministerial and Discretionary Permit processes and cycle time improvement initiatives. Industry is a deeply involved Stakeholder and pays the Permit fees. It is appropriate that Industry have the best possible understanding of the Permit processes so they can optimize processing cycle time and related cost.

Conversely, the LDPRC’s composition is inappropriate to formulate changes to Land Use Policy and other related matters

Land Use Policy discussions require a larger Community and Environmental representation to achieve a balanced integrated view.

As your Board will recall, a predecessor working group, the Red Tape Reduction Task Force was comprised nearly entirely of Industry members and recommended elimination of Planning and Sponsor Groups.

Please do not increase the Charter boundaries of the Land Development Performance Review Committee when this matter comes before you on May 7, 2014

This letter was approved by the VCCPG in a 12-0-0 vote on April 14, 2014.

Sincerely,

Oliver Smith

Chairman Valley Center Community Planning Group

CC:

Mark Wardlaw, Director Planning and Development Services
Darren Gretler, Deputy Director PDS
Megan Jones, Group Program Manager, Land Use and Environmental Group

Attachments:
February 20, 2014 Memo for LDP Review Committee Report to BOS (Board Resolution No. 12-135 dated 08/08/2012 is included in the Memo)