

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Final Minutes of the November 10, 2014 Meeting

Chair: Oliver Smith; Vice 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 VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 17 November 2014; Corrected version sent 29 November 2014; Corrected and resent 2 December 2014

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:03 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M I L L E R	H U T C H I S O N	J A N I S C H	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	F R A N C K	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	F A J A R D O	L A V E N T U R E
A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	A	P	P	P	P

Notes: Quinley presides in the absence of Smith

Quorum Established: 12 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of October 13, 2014, as corrected

Maker/Second: Jackson/Quinley

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, discussion and possible vote on the removal of two oak trees from Woods Valley Road. (Jackson)

Discussion: Jackson presents a draft letter to the county, saying the Mobility SC discussed this issue and determined that one of the two specified trees should be removed because it is apparently dead and is potentially a roadway hazard. The second tree appears to be only marginally drought-stressed, and since it does not represent a threat to the roadway it should remain as it is with the hope that it will recover once sufficient rain has occurred. Rudolf notes that the latest professional recommendation on oak wood infested with the gold spotted oak borer [the cause of death in many stressed and non-stressed oaks within the county] is that such wood can be kept on the property where it was cut, if it is covered, and to prevent spreading the infestation it should not be relocated to another property. Glavinic says the nearby neighbors agree with the proposal by the Mobility SC.

Motion: Move to send the draft letter as written. [Attached]

Maker/Second: Jackson/Rudolf

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

E2

Discussion and possible vote on a letter to the DPDS Director regarding the County Staff's activity to evaluate revisions to General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 "Leapfrog Development". (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf presents a draft letter addressed to the director of PDS and the BOS. He outlines the details of Jackson's inquiry to the County staff to get information on the process being implemented to write a new definition of 'leapfrog development' and allowable exceptions. He says that such a move to redefine the term and its exceptions in the context of the General Plan Land Use Policy 1.2 [LU 1.2] will have deleterious

ramifications throughout the unincorporated areas of the county. Such a change would upend the present prohibition on leapfrog development in the General Plan. A motion is made to support and send the draft letter as written. Subsequently, during discussion, Glavinic proposes an amended form of the letter that adds language that would require the creation of “sustainable” employment and revenues if such development were permitted. He suggests that young people are leaving the county along with businesses because of the costs of obtaining homes and doing business. Glavinic reads his modified version of the letter. Jackson says he agrees with the sentiments expressed by Glavinic, but says the County staff is presently attempting to develop an “equivalent” standard to LEED-ND that will have immediate impacts by allowing leapfrog development. Glavinic says that the letter as written is inadequate. Jackson says the other issues could be addressed in a separate letter. Rudolf clarifies saying that his letter is aimed specifically at LU 1.2. Glavinic says he wants teeth in the policy to enforce the policy. Several members suggest that the modifications by Glavinic should not be included. Rudolf declines to accept an amendment.

There is no support for the modifications offered to the draft letter except for Glavinic. As a motion to approve and send the draft letter as written is on the floor, following the discussion, the vote is taken. There is no subsequent motion regarding the content of the modifications proposed by Glavinic. [Glavinic’s rejected alternative is attached below].

Motion: Move to support and send the draft letter as written. [Attached]

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Franck

Carries/Fails: 11-1-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice;** Glavinic dissents

E3

Discussion and possible vote on a letter to the VCPUSD superintendent and school board requesting that the NW corner of the now removed CCC camp (with the original entrance and flagpole area) at Valley Center Road and Valley Center School Road be preserved as a historic CCC Park. An educational kiosk paid for by public donations to be raised by the CCC Interest Group, at no expense to the school district will be placed there. (Vick)

Discussion: Vick presents. He explains he has prepared a draft letter for consideration. He recounts the history of the issue between the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District [VCPUSD] and the interest group that wanted to preserve the site. He notes that ground is broken for the development of a lacrosse playing field at the site. He asks for support for preserving a small portion of the site, which would preserve the original driveway and flagpole, with an added kiosk [setting aside about 10,000 sq. ft.]. He says the former Civilian Conservation Corps [CCC] camp is one of about 1000 and is one of the few that is still with us. He asks for a motion to support the notion of a memorial as outlined. He says a typical lacrosse field is 52,000 square feet and the site is 82,000 sq. ft., so the proposed memorial would not interfere with the building of the sports field. He reads a letter from the historical society regarding the history of the site and a marker that would include recognition of the CCC and other organizations that have subsequently occupied the site. Jackson asks for Vick to clarify the location of the pocket park proposed for the site and clarify the funding. Vick refers to a diagram showing the location of the original flagpole and driveway and then notes that funds to develop the pocket park would be raised privately. Jackson suggests that rather than present a specific site plan for the memorial, that it be left more indeterminate so the memorial and the sports field can be placed in a unified site plan. Quinley asks if Vick is asking the VCPUSD to dedicate the site for the pocket park. Vick says, yes. Quinley asks who would own site. Vick says that is not clear, but it could be dedicated to the Valley Center Parks and Recreation District. Norwood asks for clarification of the CCC acknowledgement. Vick suggests that the VCPUSD does not want to acknowledge the CCC history. Glavinic says maintenance of a park site is problematic in terms of the ongoing costs. He says the site is not remarkable. Laventure notes that the VCPUSD cares for a number of large sports fields and the small size of the pocket park would not be a maintenance burden for the district. Rudolf states that considering the resources expended by Vick, he supports the letter with Jackson’s concerns for clarification included. Jackson notes that we cannot send the letter directly to VCPUSD but can copy them with the letter sent to Mark Wardlaw, Director of PDS. Norwood wonders why Vick is persisting. Vick says the only way to create a commemoration of this historical site at this point is to have pressure from the community. Mike O’Conner, audience, says the school should not object to the memorial and that the school board is ignoring the community and the community’s history, although he disagreed with the lawsuit brought against the VCPUSD by the interest group. Vick amplifies on his concern to act now. Janisch asks that reference to the diagram be deleted from the draft letter in addition to deleting the

diagram itself. Glavinic says he thinks making the request too specific is not the right approach. He agrees with the idea of a plaque. Quinley announces that she will sign the letter on behalf of the planning group and the chair.

Motion: Move to support and send the amended proposed letter to Mark Wardlaw, Director PDS with a copy to VCPUSD, without the attached site diagram, before Thursday. [Attached]

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley

Carries/Fails: 11-1-0 [Y-N-A] Voice; Glavinic dissents

F Group Business

F1

The County Website has changed. PDS is now to be found at <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/>

Discussion: Quinley notes the change to the County website.

Glavinic announces that the Highway 76/Valley Center Road intersection will be considered at the next Mobility SC in December.

Motion: None

F4

Next regular meeting scheduled for December 8, 2014

G

Motion to Adjourn:

7.50 pm

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Norwood

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 Meeting:

1.. Preliminary Landscape Plan for Hatfield Plaza PDS2013-TPM 21202; PDS2013-STP-13-01. The project is located at Banbury Road and Valley Center Road. Owner is Woods Valley Plaza, LLC; contact person is Jerry Gaughan at 619-204-8797 (Vick)

Attached material for item E1:

November 7, 2014

To: Julie Kindler Julie.Kindler@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Proposed Removal or trimming of two oak trees on the north side of Woods Valley Road in the proximity of 14965 Woods Valley

The Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) has visited the site and by a XX-Y vote on November 10, 2014 recommends the following actions:

1. **Remove the Oak at or near the Driveway to 15002 Woods Valley Road** – The tree appears to be beyond saving. Please note that latex paint restricts respiration of the tree and the white paint applied by residents could have significantly contributed to the tree's demise.
2. **Please do not trim or remove branches from the second oak to the West** – This tree's limbs do express some brown foliage, however the tree has the ability to fully recover. This tree is not in County Right of Way, and the mildly distressed limbs do not overhang utility lines or pose a safety hazard to vehicles or humans. Pruning the tree could accelerate its demise.

Exhibit 1 is attached to make sure that we have proper identification of trees.

Thank you for contacting us for input prior to conducting your remediation actions.

Sincerely,

Oliver Smith

Chairman Valley Center Community Planning Group

Exhibit 1 – Photos and brief comments on the two oaks in question

Exhibit 1 – Photos and Brief Commentary on Woods Valley Road Oak Trees



Probably Dead Oak – If the paint is latex, it restricted respiration and contributed to its demise



Mildly Distressed Oak to the west – still viable. Affected limbs pose no issue to utilities, vehicles, or human safety.

Attached material for item E2:

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082

November 10, 2014

Oliver Smith
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Ann Quinley
Vice Chair

annquinley@gmail.com

Steve Hutchison
Secretary

hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Jeana Boulos

jeana.h.boulos@gmail.com

Hans Britsch

thomas@westerncactus.com

Bob Franck

Franckfort@yahoo.com

Larry Glavinic

larryglavinic@gmail.com

Mark Jackson

jacksonmark92026@gmail.com

Eric Laventure

mxinmotion@gmail.com

Bill Miller

LaVonne Norwood

lavonne@armorfabrication.com

Rich Rudolf

richrudolf@sbcglobal.net

Jon Vick

JonVick2@aol.com

(Two positions pending)

To: Mark Wardlaw, Director Department of Planning & Development Services

mark.wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov

CC: SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Honorable Dianne Jacob, Chair dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov

The Honorable Bill Horn, Vice Chair bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov

The Honorable Greg Cox greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov

The Honorable Dave Roberts dave.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

The Honorable Ron Roberts ron.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Re: Proposed Revisions to General Plan Land Use Policy LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development

It has come to the attention of the Valley Center Community Planning Group that the DPDS Staff is preparing recommendations to revise General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU- 1.2. Refer to Attachments 1 and 2 to understand the basis for our concern.

The full text of LU-1.2 is below:

LU 1.2 Leapfrog Development – Prohibit leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services and facilities, and that are **designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent.** For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

It is our understanding that DPDS is defining “an equivalent” to the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification.

Please involve the Planning and Sponsor Groups and other key stakeholders in any re-consideration of LU 1.2., most especially in creating any County “equivalent” to replace the highly-regarded LEED Standards for Neighborhood Development, by:

- Communicating a schedule of project milestones
- Providing an opportunity for Planning/Sponsor Group input and Public Review prior to presenting the proposed revisions to Decision Makers for a vote.

Sincerely,

Ann Quinley, Vice Chair Acting for

Oliver J. Smith
Chair, Valley Center Community Planning Group
Oliver.smith@philips.com
(760) 703-1455

Cc:

Peder Norby, Chair
Bryan Woods, Vice Chair
Michael Beck
Leon Brooks
David Pallinger
Michael Seiler

Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Travis Lyons
Margaret Morgan
Rich Caldwell
Donna Tisdale
Billie Jo Jannen
Waldon G Riggs
Kathy Goddard
Kerry Forrest
James C. Russell
Bret Sealy
Howard Cook
Dan Neirinckx
Jack Shelver
Laura Cyphert
Charles Mathews
Vern Denham
Carl Meyer
Gary Drake
Jim Piva
Betty Liska
James Comeau
Harriet Taylor
Mark Kukuchek
Louis Schooler
Sandra Farrell
Lori Myers

travislyonacpg@gmail.com
Morgan7070@cox.net
Rich@BorregoValleyInn.com
tisdale.donna@gmail.com
jannen@inbox.com
wrplanning@gmail.com
cuyamaca@nethere.com
descanso.forrest@gmail.com
russellfarms@roadrunner.com
bret@bretsealey.com
howwcook@yahoo.com
danenkx@sbcglobal.net
jack@cableusa.com
lakesidecpg@gmail.com
mathews.charles@gmail.com
kevingeisha1@yahoo.com
csmeyer@nethere.com
garydrake@gmail.com
kmansolf@gmail.com
loikaj@cox.net
jimc@jamescomeau.net
Harriettaylor@cox.net
mcchek@cox.net
louis@wfpc.com
slfarrell@cox.net
lori.myers.vdo@cox.net

Endangered Habitats League
Sierra Club
Building Industry Associaton
Backcountry Coalition

dsilverla@me.com
richard.miller@sierraclub.org
matt@biasandiego.org
bgendron@nethere.com
gcourser@hotmail.com
redfern@sandiegoaudubon.org
drbcoombs@msn.com

Attachment 1 - LEED ND telecon with County and M. Jackson 10-15-14
Attachment 2 – M. Jackson to M. Wardlaw 10-14-14 e-mail



Telephone Conference Record

Subject	Meeting Date
General Plan Land Use Policy LU – 1.2 Leapfrog	10/15/14
Dev. – Development of LEED-ND “equivalent”	4:20 to 4:40 PM

Action Items:

Action to be taken:	Responsible Party	Due date
1. None		

Discussion Items:

Discussion Items
<p>Background - In response to Mark Jackson’s 10/14/14 e-mail to Mark Wardlaw “proposed supplemental definition of General Plan Land Use Policy LU 1.2 – Leapfrog Development (attached), Director Wardlaw arranged a teleconference to discuss issues raised in the e-mail</p> <p>Participants DPDS: Mark Wardlaw, Darren Gretler, and Sami Real Public: Mark Jackson</p>
<p>1. Mark Wardlaw addressed in general the four questions asked in the attached Jackson e-mail. Wardlaw explained that DPDS was working on defining a LEED-ND “equivalent” in the context of LU-1.2. Wardlaw said that initial preliminary research of “STAR” and similar “standards” had been reviewed. Wardlaw stated that due to workload no report documents were yet completed, and no</p>
<p>2. Jackson asked who the Point of Contact for this topic. Wardlaw stated that he was.</p>
<p>3. Wardlaw stated that the project was just being launched, and there were no defined project milestones, target schedule, or defined target dates for completion. Wardlaw stated that the schedule would be driven by Lilac Hills Ranch, Warner Ranch, Newland Sierra, and <i>Vellano</i> (sp?)</p>
<p>4. Jackson stated that there were broad Stakeholder interests in this issue and that it impacted all new development in the County of San Diego. Jackson expressed his opinion that all parties (Public, Developers, Interest Groups) needed information on this subject to avoid “late hits.”</p>
<p>5. Wardlaw emphasized that all information on this subject was being shared openly. Jackson clarified that he was just asking for the information.</p>
<p>6. Jackson requested that DPDS do a broad outreach to all Stakeholders on this project, and send a short notice of objectives, schedule, and review process to Planning/Sponsor Groups, Interest Groups, and Developers. DPDS listened but did not agree to do so.</p>

7. Gretler commented that DPDS had recently “reached out” to the Public with meetings on the Lilac Hills Ranch project. Jackson concurred that Lilac Hills Ranch meetings were ongoing and necessary, but that the LEED-ND issue was much broader than Lilac Hills Ranch and needed wider involvement because it impacted all development in San Diego County.

8. Jackson, “brainstorming” offered the concept of providing Public and Interest Group experts to participate in the LEED-ND Project with the County. After a brief discussion, Jackson dismissed this concept of his as infeasible. No one argued with him.

Copy of Record provided to all?	Results of meeting summarized?	Signature of Minutes Recorder
Yes (emailed after the meeting)	Yes (emailed after the meeting)	

Attendance Roster

Name	Phone Number(s)	E-mail
Mark Wardlaw	(858) 694-2962	Mark.Wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov
Darren Gretler	(858) 694-2982	Darren.Gretler@sdcounty.ca.gov
Sami Real	(858) 694-3722	Sami.Real@sdcounty.ca.gov
Mark Jackson	(760) 731-7327	Jacksonmark92026@gmail.com

Attachment 2 - Jackson to Wardlaw 10-14-14 e-mail



Information Request - A quick question Re: proposed supplemental definition of General Plan Land Use Policy LU 1.2 - Leapfrog Development

Mark Jackson <jacksonmark92026@gmail.com> Tue, Oct 14, 2014 at 8:37 AM To: Mark Wardlaw <mark.wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov>

Mark - I am writing you directly because I have been unable to get an answer on these 4 simple questions from your staff.

DPDS is in process of providing a County definition of the "LEED-ND or equivalent" statement in General Plan Land Use Policy LU 1.2.

I need the following information (an e-mail response is fine):

1. Who at DPDS is working the LU- 1.2 Leapfrog Development LEED-ND "equivalent" issue at DPDS (the contact focal)?
2. What are the top level milestones for the project?
3. What are your target dates for completion?
4. Define the proposed County process for Public Review prior to presentation to Decision Maker(s) on this project.

As you and I are well aware, this is Public Information subject to Public Records Act Request (PRAR) disclosure.

I am trying to obtain information that is required to be disclosed at the least inconvenience to the County and lowest taxpayer cost.

Please help me achieve my goal with a response this week on this request.

Thank You,
Mark Jackson

Additional Material for Item E2:

Proposed modification of draft letter submitted by Larry Glavinic as a minority report:

Minority report COMMENT ON LEED REVISION MOTION

By Valley Center Community Planning Group (VCCPG) 11-10-2014

November 18, 2014

To: Mark Wardlaw, Director Department of Planning & Development Services
mark.wardlaw@sdcounty.ca.gov

CC: SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Honorable Dianne Jacob, Chair dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov
The Honorable Bill Horn, Vice Chair bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov
The Honorable Greg Cox greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov
The Honorable Dave Roberts dave.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov
The Honorable Ron Roberts ron.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Re: Proposed Revisions to General Plan Land Use
Policy LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development.**

Below in the **underlined revised text** was a friendly amendment to the proposed motion by the VCCPG which was **not approved**. The Minority Report felt a key component /notion was missing from LEED, i.e., positive incentives which would create positive revenues to the County and providing criteria for truly self-sustainable villages in the future. Current policy doesn't generate enough revenue for existing planned development. This notion I originally heard as a stakeholder to SANDAG's revision of the **SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan**.

"VCCPG Motion below with proposed revision:

*Proposed Revisions to General Plan Land Use Policy LU-1.2 **Leapfrog Development** and need to generate new sources of County revenue without adding more strain to the existing and planned future infrastructure needs of the County.*

It has come to the attention of the Valley Center Community Planning Group that the DPDS Staff is preparing recommendations to revise General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU- 1.2. Refer to Attachments 1 and 2 to understand the basis for our concern.

At a minimum, there is a need for clarification and criteria as to when Specific Plans and General Planned Amendments are acceptable. All new self-sustainable villages must be revenue positive for the County. The objectives might be assurances/demands that new villages include businesses which generate significant income from sources outside of San Diego County, State of California, and the Country thus reducing strain on limited county infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, electricity, & energy). These businesses at a minimum must provide local village employment, enhance community values, reduced traffic & greenhouse gases. Examples of some of these type of business have been pharmaceuticals, biotech, and telecommunication companies in San Diego County. Unless and until this is part of any planned revision to the General Plan the current vision for San Diego County continues to be flawed.

The full text of LU-1.2 is below:

LU 1.2 Leapfrog Development – Prohibit leapfrog development which is

inconsistent with the Community Development Model. Leapfrog Development restrictions do not apply to new villages that are designed to be consistent with the Community Development Model, that provide necessary services, local employment, and facilities, and that are designed to meet the LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. For purposes of this policy, leapfrog development is defined as Village densities located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

It is our understanding that DPDS is defining “an equivalent” to the LEED- Neighborhood Development Certification.

Please involve the Planning and Sponsor Groups and other key stakeholders in any re-consideration of LU 1.2., most especially in creating any County “equivalent” to replace the highly-regarded LEED Standards for Neighborhood Development, by:

- *Communicating a schedule of project milestones*
- *Providing an opportunity for Planning/Sponsor Group input and Public Review prior to presenting the proposed revisions to Decision Makers for a vote.*

Sincerely,

*Larry Glavinic
Member, Valley Center Community Planning Group”*

Cc:

Peder Norby, Chair
Bryan Woods, Vice Chair
Michael Beck
Leon Brooks
David Pallinger
Michael Seiler

Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Lisa.Fitzpatrick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Attached material for item E3:

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082



Oliver Smith
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Ann Quinley
Vice Chair

Ann.quinley@pomona.edu

Steve Hutchison
Secretary

hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Jeana Boulos

jeana.h.boulos@gmail.com

Hans Britsch

thomas@westerncactus.com

Susan Fajardo

susanfarr@vcweb.org

Bob Franck

Franckfort@yahoo.com

Larry Glavinic

ljpglavinic@yahoo.com

Mark Jackson

markjacksonvccpg@gmail.com

Susan Janisch
socaljj@cts.com

Eric Laventure

[mxinmotion@gmail.com](mailto:mخينmotion@gmail.com)

Bill Miller

cdmmiller@aol.com

LaVonne Norwood

lavonne@armorfabrication.com

Rich Rudolf

richrudolf@sbcglobal.net

Jon Vick

JonVick2@aol.com

Nov. 11, 2104

To: Mark Wardlaw, Director DPDS

Mark.wardlaw@sdcountry.ca.gov

cc: VCPUSD Board and Superintendent

Re: Historical site memorial park

The VCCPG is pleased that the filing of the final EIR for the new sports field has been completed and that VCPUSD has broken ground on this project. We are also pleased that the District and the VC History Museum have recognized the historical importance of the site as reported on the front page of the August 14, 2014 edition of ***The Times Advocate*** with a photo of the VCPUSD Superintendent and VC History Museum President, as on “the same team” in commemorating the site.

While we understand from the EIR that “a project alternative that memorializes the site as an historical or cultural resource...is not required”, we ask you to consider the following as “good reasons” to preserve a small (approximately 10,000 sf) corner of the 1.9 acre (82,764 sf) site as a memorial to the previous users of the site without detracting from the intended use of the site as a sports field:

1. A kiosk, to be provided by an anonymous donor, would provide an education resource for students, community, and visitors
2. This would commemorate an important phase of VC’s history
3. This would provide an attractive “pocket park” at the entrance to the school at no expense to the District
4. This would provide an historical point of interest on the Heritage Trail, to be extended from VC Road along Cole Grade Road in the near future
5. This would preserve a portion of an important VC historical site, highly valued by many residents and an historical site of interest to visitors

Thank you in advance for a serious and sincere consideration of preserving a small portion of this site so that the importance of this site to Valley Center’s history won’t be lost to future generations of our students, residents and visitors. Members of the VCCPG are ready to meet with you to discuss how to implement this without disruption to the school’s plans.

Sincerely,

Ann G. Quinley (Vice Chair) for

Oliver Smith, Chair

VCCPG