

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Preliminary Minutes of the March 9, 2015 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:

Approved:

A		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								7:05 PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M I L L E R	O C C O N N E R	J A N I S C H	H U T C H I S O N	B R I T S C H	P L O T N E R	Q U I N L E Y	F A J A R D O	B O U L O S	N O R W O O D	S M I T H	V I C K	R U D O L F	G A R R I T S O N	L A V E N T U R E
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A

Notes: Britsch arrives 7.10pm

Quorum Established: 13 present

B Pledge of Allegiance

C Approval of Minutes:

Motion: Move to approve the minutes of January 12, 2015 [The February Meeting was canceled for lack of sufficient agenda]

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Quinley

Carries 13-0-0 (Y-N-A): Voice

D Public Communication/Open Forum:

Paul Herigstad, audience, presents the issue of upgrading lighting at the Adams Park tennis courts, saying he is looking for community support for a Light Emitting Diode [LED] lighting upgrade. He cites the cost effectiveness of the new LED technology. Vick asks about how many of the courts will be lighted. Herigstad says four. Smith asks about the effectiveness of the new lights for the intended purpose. Herigstad says there is technical data in his handout that addresses that question affirmatively. Plotner asks whether the proposed lights would meet particular standards. Herigstad says the proposed lights are a vast improvement over existing technology and the vendor has considerable experience installing such lights for the intended purpose. Rudolf questions Herigstad's status in asking for support, is he speaking as an individual or as a representative of the Parks and Recreation board? Herigstad is speaking as an individual. Rudolf suggests Herigstad go to other stakeholders such as the tennis club, the Parks and Recreation District Board and others for financial support.

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

E1

PDS2014-TM-5596, ER 14-09-009. Project location is 15936 Vesper Road. Principal is Joel Waymire, Polaris Development Consultants at 619-444-2923. Proposed residential development of 9 lots each with 2-acre minimum lot size. There will be grading for access roads and build pads. Water will be provided by VC Water District and wastewater will be handled with on-site septic systems. (Miller)

Discussion: Miller presents. Hands out documents. He speaks to location of project site near Vesper Road and Mactan Road. The project site consists of 20-acres divided into 9-lots. There is one existing house on-site. The proposed access road will be public. Miller has spoken to County Program Manager Dennis Campbell about the project. There is presently no scoping letter. Campbell identified some drainage issues to be resolved, but nothing major. Rudolf asks about the County's findings for project. Miller is unprepared to address findings. Rudolf suggests putting off a decision to recommend for or against the project until a scoping letter is available. He also asks about applicability of a trail requirement to the

project. Joel Waymire, project principle, says there is enough land to accommodate a trail if one is required. Rudolf asked if there is a problem if the VCCPG continues project until scoping letter is available. Waymire says no. Kerry Watts, audience, asks if the health department has reviewed the project for the appropriateness of using septic systems. Watts says the project may not get approval from the health department because of the high ground water at the proposed project site. Waymire says the property has been successfully tested for percolation per PDS. Joel has had the property for a little over two years. Norwood asks about neighborhood comments. Waymire reports that he talked to neighbors about the scope of his proposal and heard no complaints. Smith suggests Miller do a further check with neighbors and consult with the County about the availability of the scoping letter. O'Conner asks about secondary access in regard to emergency evacuation. Watts says the County is reassessing its view on secondary access requirements in some way.

Motion: Move to continue this project until a scoping letter containing findings for the project is available from the County.

Maker/Second: Miller/Norwood

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] **Voice**

E2

Discussion and vote on proposed VCCPG Standing Rules Amendments to Articles II. Members, III. Duties, and V. Subcommittees. (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf presents the VCCPG standing rule revisions. Smith notes a County Counsel comment that posting meeting agendas for VCCPG requires only one site at meeting venue, not two. Rudolf elaborates on requirements for making a VCCPG minority report. Smith describes the source of the rule revision and County Counsel's recommendation for making a minority report. Rudolf revisits agenda posting requirements citing County training instructions to post in two public places, but acknowledges that County Counsel says only one posting place is required. Rudolf explains the need for a first reading of the proposed standing rule amendments tonight and a vote to approve next month. Plotner asks for clarification on minority reports and when reports must be composed. Rudolf says the main points of a minority report must be presented at the meeting in which the issue is discussed and supporters must be identified, followed by a written report presented to the VCCPG secretary for submission with the minutes of the meeting. Norwood asks about the duties of members and if they are in the standing rules. Rudolf says the members' duties are not in the standing rules, the duties are in handbook. Plotner asks about the liability of not correctly identifying one's VCCPG membership when speaking to outside groups. Rudolf clarifies that the Chair is the official spokesperson for VCCPG. Plotner asks about the absence rules for SCs and VCCPG. Rudolf clarifies with examples. Smith adds that a third absence requires removal although initial two may be excused. Rudolf says these rules will be covered in the training for new members.

Action: First reading. VCCPG will vote to approve or reject at April 2015 meeting.

E3

Valley Center Cemetery Revised Plot Plan and Preliminary Grading Plan, MUP 14-028, CC14-0092. Project location is 28953 Miller Road; Contact is Louise Kelly at 760-749-1186. A major use permit is sought to increase the cemetery interment area, revise on-site access driveway, upgrade septic system and construct an 800 SF office building. (Laventure)

Discussion: Kerry Watts, Wynn Engineering, presents along with Louise Kelly, Cemetery Board. Watts says the project has been submitted to the County. The cemetery is running out of room for burials. The project will add 1-acre to the cemetery acquired from neighboring developer Herb Schaffer [developer to north]. The project will revise the cemetery entrance and create a new, safer exit. Garritson asks how much capacity is being added. Kelly responds that the added capacity is indeterminate for a variety of reasons. She notes that 150 plots currently remain before proposed addition is made. Rudolf asks if the current exit had sight-line problems? Yes, Watts says. The new exit will be farther north and will have improved sight distance. Rudolf asks if Right-Of-Way issue along Miller Road has **been** addressed. Watts says yes, but he can't specify the resolution publicly. He adds that the cemetery district can widen the road. Rudolf asks about the rules governing where the population of VC is eligible to be buried. Kelly clarifies the relationship with the

'competing' North County Cemetery District to explain an earlier statement she made about how the district is losing clients to their competitor. O'Conner asks about fences and other security measures. Kelly elaborates regarding cameras and access controls.

Motion: Move to approve the project as presented.

Maker/Second: O'Conner/Quinley

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

E4

Comments from the Chair concerning the "Thrive", LEED-ND workshops held by the County Department of PDS on February 11 and February 21. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith invites those members who attended the workshops to give their comments. Ann Quinley says they were sleazy and were aimed by PDS to provide an exception to leapfrog development. The goal of the workshops seemed intended to undermine the LEED-ND requirements. Smith adds details about LEED-ND and notes that compliance with LEED-ND or an equivalent would except leapfrog development from prohibition. He cites some of the criteria for leapfrog development exception in the PDS document that outlined the themes for PDS's version of a LEED-ND "equivalent". Rudolf explains LEED-ND prerequisites and contrasts them with the themes developed by PDS. Smith explains the dilemma of inconsistency presented in General Plan Policy LU-1.2 by requiring conformance with the LEED-ND standard to gain an exception for leapfrog development. O'Conner comments on the lack of attention to community evacuation needs in the PDS themes. He continues on the lack of attention to the needed infrastructure for rural communities. Norwood agrees that the workshops were very interesting. Smith notes third workshop was canceled. But, Policy LU-1.2 was discussed by the BOS during the annual review of the General Plan on 4 March 2015. The BOS asked PDS staff for options to interpretations of LU-1.2 to be presented by PDS at the BOS 22 April 2015 meeting. Smith surmises that the BOS wants every project to be considered by the BOS since they make the decisions. Smith notes that the "Thrive" workshops and the attack on LU-1.2 are not a formal initiative of the BOS. He identifies Lilac Hills Ranch and Warner Ranch as two projects that will be subjected to the result of an LU-1.2 interpretation decision. He speaks to the Newland Sierra project as having a village center located at the intersection of Deer Springs Road and Interstate-15, so, according to PDS staff, it does not meet the definition of a new village center and is therefore not classified as leapfrog development.

Motion: None

E5

Discussion and possible vote on Hatfield Center PDS 2013; TPM-21202; PDS20123; STP-13-011 (Tentative Map and Site Plan), Hatfield Center, located at Valley Center Road in the South Village. Applicant: Jerry Gaughan Architect: Mark Burginger (Miller).

Discussion: Rudolf suggests VCCPG not hear the project without the applicant present [Jerry Gaughan is not in the audience, nor is a representative]. Vick suggests that if we hear the project tonight, the audience be allowed to speak. Or, if this item is not heard tonight, the audience be allowed to speak as if in open forum. Jim Wold, audience, asks if DRB actually did approve project. Smith says, no, DRB approval was conditional and the specified conditions have not been met.

Motion: Move to continue this item until resubmitted to VCCPG by the County.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Vick

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

E6

Discussion and possible vote on a letter from the Chair of VCCPG to Planning and Development Services asking that the South Village Form-based Code be brought to us for review in April or May. Without review and approval, grant money will be lost and South Village projects will be filed and reviewed without it. (Rudolf)

Discussion: Rudolf presents. He explains the history of the County's General Plan and Community Plan and the land use designations for North Village built into the General Plan and Community Plan expecting that a specific plan would be developed that would provide further comments for approval. However, no specific plan for North Village has been forthcoming. So, the community and VCCPG have no opportunity to comment on the development, except on the site plan and design. Rudolf says a similar situation could exist in South Village. VCCPG asked for County help to develop a Form-Based Code [FBC]. The County applied for and received a grant, hired a consultant, and developed an FBC for the South Village with community help. Rudolf explains the importance of the FBC to the prospect of the community achieving its goals. He also cites the delinquency of the FBC's presentation to the community. He wants to be sure the FBC is in place before South Village landowners file for projects. He notes that without the timely implementation of the FBC, such projects would not be subject to the FBC. Norwood asks how restrictive the FBC would be for property owners. Hutchison tries to clarify the kinds of parameters that would apply based on the information offered in the public meeting held in January 2014.

Motion: Authorize the Chair to inquire, in a letter to the County, about the status of the Form Based Code project in South Village.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Vick

Carries: 13-1-0 [Y-N-A]; **Voice:** Garritson dissents

E7

The County of San Diego, Department of General Services, is processing a request to vacate an existing flowage easement located over private parcels near Valley Center Road (APNs 189-012-59 and 189-012-62). The San Diego County Flood Control District finds that the flowage easement is no longer needed as it has been replaced with a more restrictive open space easement. As part of the vacation process the Department wishes to solicit input from the VCCPG. (Miller)

Discussion: Miller presents. Smith describes project. He indicates that the County has asked for vacation of a flood plain easement in connection with the Butterfield Trails Development that was previously approved by the VCCPG. Smith notes that after approval of the project, an issue re the median on VC Road was identified, but too late for VCCPG to influence the outcome. Hutchison says the flowage easement at issue now is superseded by a more restrictive open space easement. Smith notes that he spoke to Wayne Hilbig, Butterfield Ranch project owner, who said he had no issue with vacating the flowage easement that overlapped his project's road access along Sunday Drive. Bill Lewis, consultant to Hilbig, also had no issue with the vacation. The County apparently has no jurisdiction over the flowage easement. Rudolf suggests that the County owns the flowage easement, and that we are being asked to approve the vacation as a result. He suggests that we may not know the whole story re the flowage easement and the impact it may have on the Butterfield Trails project and wonders if we are about to experience another issue like the VC Rd. median removal. He wonders who may benefit from the abandonment of the easement. Smith says we must respond to the County's request for a recommendation. Rudolf proposes postponing the VCCPG vote to get more information on who is receiving value. Vick says Hilbig and Lewis are not trustworthy based on our previous experience. Rudolf says the quandary is whether this is a subterfuge or merely an effort to cleanup a loose end. Miller notes that the South Village SC approved this issue with the available information. Rudolf questions the value of approval by VCCPG without complete information. Vick suggests that the community may have leverage if Hilbig needs the vacation for access to his project. Miller says Dennis Campbell, County Project Manager, is busy and information on particular projects is difficult to get promptly. O'Conner asks about Butterfield Trails history. Vick recounts the history of approval of Butterfield Trails and the issue of the VC Road median removal. Norwood asks for clarification on the restriction of the access road [Sunday Drive]. Rudolf expands on the history of Butterfield Trails. Garritson asks about what else could be done to save the median. Smith clarifies. Rudolf suggests the probability that the Planning Commission will not hear the issue until its May meeting. He says we should postpone the vote on this project until the April VCCPG meeting. He suggests Miller report any clarification by PDS to Smith and that VCCPG authorize Smith to represent the planning group before the Planning Commission in the interim.

Motion: Move to have Miller and Rudolf contact county planner Dennis Campbell for clarification of this issue and that the VCCPG vote be continued until the April VCCPG meeting; and, authorize Miller to report the results of any clarification on this issue to Chairperson Smith for a response and possible representation

before the Planning Commission in the interim.	
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley	
Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice	
F	Group Business
F1	Approval of reimbursing Vice-Chair for \$100--the cost of 2015 Post Office Box Rental (Quinley)
Motion: Move to approve the reimbursement of Vice Chair Ann Quinley \$100.00 for the cost of the post office box rental.	
Discussion: None	
Maker/Second: Rudolf/ Britsch	
Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice	
F2	Approval of Sonja Lindberg as a member of the CUP Subcommittee and Paul Herigstad for Lilac Hills Ranch. (Rudolf and Hutchison)
Discussion: Rudolf proposes the addition of Sonja Lindberg as a member of the Community Plan Update SC and Hutchison reports the confirmation of continuing interest by Paul Herigstad in serving on the Lilac Hills Ranch SC.	
Motion: Move to approve the addition of Sonja Lindberg to the Community Plan Update Subcommittee; Paul Herigstad to the Lilac Hills Ranch Subcommittee; and, Claire Plotner to the Tribal Liaison Subcommittee.	
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Quinley	
Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A]: Voice	
F3	Discussion and final vote on sub-committee membership (Hutchison)
Discussion: Vick, as chair of the Mobility SC, asks for the removal of Dorothy Kennedy [at her request] and the addition of Don Richards, Deb Hofler, and Mike O'Conner.	
Garritson, as chair of the Tribal Liaison SC, says Plotner will serve, and he will continue to attempt to contact former members to confirm their continuing interest in serving. Rudolf makes suggestions to Garritson about establishing the SC. Smith and Rudolf contest the usefulness of Nikki Symington as a representative of the Rincon Tribe. Smith suggests that Symington can serve if designated. Rudolf lists previous members of the Tribal SC for Garritson to contact.	
Motion: Move to approve Don Richards, Deb Hofler and Michael O'Conner for membership on the Mobility SC.	
Maker/Second: Vick/Hutchison	
Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice	
F4	Discussion, update and recommendation from the Website subcommittee (Boulos)
Discussion: Boulos presents. SC met in February and discussed ideas for a new website. The SC sees it as a resource for the community and the VCCPG for distribution of minutes or handout materials and related resources of interest. It can be used for community input/feedback and surveys regarding landmarks or community features. She mentions applicability of Facebook© and Twitter© to convey information more quickly. She suggests the background information provided for projects by the County can appear on site. There is discussion of the current domain name and its imminent expiration. Boulos suggests the revised VCCPG handbook can be on the site. It is for both VCCPG and community information. Vick asks if SC agendas should be sent to Boulos. Boulos says, yes, once the site is up. Apparently the VCCPG .com domain name expired in January. Garritson explains the need and approach to save the domain name ".com." Boulos reports that the new site will start slowly with basic information and expand. Boulos suggests a video log of meetings. Smith cites problems with recordings of VCCPG meetings and copy requirements. Hutchison adds that such recordings could present problems of transcription for impaired persons. He adds that there could be conflicts between the minutes reported by the secretary and the perceptions of what a	

recording contains. Rudolf asks if the County will make available their site to post agendas and minutes and supporting documents. That would make the task easier for VCCPG. Rudolf asks Smith if he could consult with the County. Smith will consult but is not optimistic about the result. Rudolf asks who will do all the work. Garritson says the SC will do the updating work. He says it would be simple to update or add material. He explains the possible process of subscribing to site updates. Britsch suggests it may work best by just using it once it is up. Boulos suggests SC would notify members of updates with email or some other means. Rudolf explains reservations about Facebook© and Twitter©. Boulos and Garritson explain how those social media can inspire the younger generation to participate. Vick offers Rudolf a simple system of checking all media. Boulos suggests Facebook© and Twitter© are for the future.

Motion: None

F4

Subcommittee Updates

Discussion: Parks & Recreation SC: Norwood presents. She hands out her SC report summarizing principal issues facing the district [attached below].

Mobility SC: Vick reports four driver feedback speed signs will be improved in terms of size and visual impediments. He announces a joint meeting of the Mobility and North Village SCs concerning Road 14 and the corner of Miller Road and VC Road. He cites the possibilities for an assessment district for creation and maintenance of medians and trails. He also announces a joint meeting of the Mobility SC and the Valley Center Trails Assn. regarding the 70% design milestone for Cole Grade Road.

Community Plan Update SC: Rudolf reports the SC is revising the conservation and open space section of the Community Plan. He also notes that the SC is going to be discussing the future of the now expired Champagne Specific Plan Amendment and will report a recommendation to the VCCPG.

Lilac Hills Ranch SC: Hutchison related the status of Lilac Hills Ranch project. He explained that Mark Slovick has requested an up or down vote on the project by the April meeting of the VCCPG. He reminded that there has **been** no release of responses to the comments already submitted regarding the DEIR for the project, so there is no new information on how the project may or may not be changing as a result of public input. He announced a SC meeting scheduled for 1 April 2015 at the Community Hall, room 3. A recommendation will be prepared and submitted to VCCPG at the April meeting.

Motion: To extend the VCCPG meeting for an additional 10 minutes to allow for a final SC report.

Maker/Second: Hutchison/Janisch

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

F5

Next regular meeting scheduled for 13 April 2015

G

Motion to Adjourn:

10.10pm

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley

Carries: 14-0-0 [Y-N-A] Voice

Subcommittees of the Valley Center Community Planning Group

- a) Mobility – Chair Jon Vick
- 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 – , Chair
- h) Website – Oliver Smith, Chair
- i) Lilac Hills Ranch – Steve Hutchison, Chair
- j) Solar – Oliver Smith, Chair

Correspondence Received for the Meeting:

1. PDS to VCCPG, PDS2015-7PM-21219, PDS-2015-ER-IS-02-001 Hill Top Ranch located at 30718 Pauma Heights Rd and Palomar Vista Road; owners are Gregory Beck and Suzanne Chaves at 714-308-0423; contact person is Larry Paxton at 760-294-4871. The project plan is Emmet Aquino at 858-694-8845. The project consists of a 21.1 acre parcel which will yield 5 lots each at least 2 acres. The project will rely on septic. (Fajardo)
2. PDS to VCCPG, Champaign Gardens Specific Plan Area. The Champagne Gardens Specific Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on January 13, 1999, and expired on January 13, 2007. The Specific Plan called for the development of visitor-serving commercial uses to include lodging, retail, restaurants, and an amphitheater, among other uses. The properties associated with this former Specific Plan are located on both sides of Champagne Boulevard, between Lawrence Welk Lane and Gopher Canyon Road, just east of the I-15. The Land Use Map has a 0 density for the area, so property owners could not build a single family residence on a legal lot, and allowed uses are very limited in the S88 zone with no adopted Specific Plan. PDS intends to work with property owners, associated planning groups (the area is at the intersection of the Bonsall, Valley Center, and Hidden Meadows planning areas), and other stakeholders in developing proposals for updated General Plan Land Use designations and zoning for these properties within the former Specific Plan boundaries.

Attached material for item E2:

To: VCCPG Members

From: Member Rich Rudolf

Re: Proposed Standing Rules Amendments

Date: March 9, 2015

I propose the following three amendments to our Standing Rules. Deleted language is shown in ~~strikeout~~; added language is underlined.

Note that this is "Meeting One, Take 2" because the language has been changed following County Counsel's suggested clarification regarding minority reports in Article III Section II. Also note I have deleted the proposed change shown on the version presented in January to Meeting 2 of the vacancy process, requiring posting of the agenda in two places. (County Counsel noted that was not required by Policy I-1, and I could not find any such previous requirement elsewhere or a reason to require it specially only for filling vacancies. If the Planning Group desires to add it back in, we can do that at the March meeting for approval in April.)

The first proposed amendment reflects the PDS requirements for the Chairperson to notify the department and the Clerk of the Board when a vacancy occurs; changes the return date for applications to fill VCCPG vacancies from the Wednesday preceding "Meeting 2" to Tuesday; and makes clear nominees appointed by the Board take their seats after completion of the required training. This will allow time for the Registrar of Voters to verify the applicants are registered voters within the Valley Center Planning Area, prior to submission of applications to the VCCPG for nomination, and comply with newly required PDS directives implementing Board Policy I-1.

The second proposed amendment states the duty of the VCCPG when acting on planning Action Items, as required by PDS in this year's training implementing Board Policy I-1 (articulating previous year's training); and makes clear that Minority Opinions are allowed to be presented to staff as long as they contain a statement as to which VCCPG members support that position (as allowed in the "Plan Implementation" section of Board Policy I-1) are declared at the time of the vote and provided to the Secretary to accompany forwarding of the Majority recommendations to staff.

The third proposed amendment resolves an ambiguity in Article V Section III by clarifying that subcommittee member's absences must be requested and approved by the subcommittee Chair, in advance of the scheduled meeting, or else will constitute an absence toward possible removal from the committee.

Pursuant to Article VI Section XI of the current Standing Rules the vote to approve or reject the proposed amendment cannot occur until the meeting after the Proposed Amendments are formally proposed.

For your convenience, a copy of the complete Standing Rules, as they would appear if the proposed amendments are ultimately approved in April, is attached starting at page 6.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Rudolf
Member

Proposed Amendment #1 Membership upon vacancies

ARTICLE II – MEMBERSHIP

Sections I-III: (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1)

Section IV, Vacancies: (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the following VCCPG standing Rules additions.) **The VCCPG Chairperson shall notify the PDS Department and the Clerk of the Board when a vacancy occurs (not later than 10 days following) and publicly post the Vacancy Announcement.** The Nominations Subcommittee ~~(NC)~~ shall consist of three members that shall be elected in January each year, at the same meeting during which officer elections are conducted. The Nominations Subcommittee shall manage the process of filling vacancies to the VCCPG and to all other organizations on which the VCCPG is authorized or required to provide a representative (i.e. VC DRB, I-15 DRB). Should a vacancy be known in advance or when there is a scheduled vacancy, the Nominations Subcommittee Chairperson shall, with the concurrence and coordination of the VCCPG Chairperson, initiate the vacancy filling process in advance so as to reduce or eliminate the time a seat will be vacant.

MEETING 1—The VCCPG Chairperson shall officially announce any known vacancy(s) at the first Regular Meeting during which the vacancy is known (Meeting 1). If possible, vacancies shall be included in the preliminary and final agendas for that meeting.

INTERIM PERIOD BETWEEN MEETING 1 AND MEETING 2—The Nominations Subcommittee shall initiate public notification of any vacancy(s) in all appropriate venues (newspapers, websites, etc.) in order to maximize public awareness and participation. Public announcements shall begin as soon as possible after the official announcement of any vacancy(s) and shall continue without interruption until the next Regular Meeting [meeting 2]. In order to assure prompt public notice, when a vacancy is known in advance, the Nominations Subcommittee may take action before an official vacancy announcement in order to ensure public notification begins promptly after the official announcement of any vacancy(s). Public notification shall include the vacancy(s) seat number(s), term of office, I-1 requirements, point of contact information for the Nominations Subcommittee and any other pertinent information. The Nominations Subcommittee shall specifically attempt to contact prior candidates, subcommittee members and other known persons who may be interested in serving.

The Nominations Subcommittee shall provide standardized application packages promptly to all persons who indicate an interest in serving. Packages should include:

- a. Welcoming letter,
- b. General information about the PG, vacancy process and candidate responsibilities,
- c. Nominations Subcommittee and VCCPG contact information,
- d. San Diego County Boards and Commissions Application form,
- e. Sample single page resume (long resumes are not desired or required).
- f. Standardized set of questions that candidates will be expected to address before the Planning Group. (Questions should be general in nature and allow the Planning Group to assess the views of the candidates. Questions should deal with how the candidate views the Valley Center Community Plan, their current concerns and vision for the community and specific skills and experience the candidates possess.)

Prospective candidates must return completed application packages to the Nominations Subcommittee no later **then four than five** business days prior to the beginning of the second Regular Meeting (meeting 2)(i.e. applications must be received by the Nominations Committee by 7:00 pm on **Wednesday Tuesday** for a Regular Meeting on

Monday evening). After receiving applications, the Nominations Subcommittee shall review the packages, **obtain Registrar of Voters office verification that applicants are registered voters living in the Valley Center planning area, and then** compile the list of qualified candidates and make copies of the application packages for VCCPG members.

Completed application packages must include:

- a. Completed county Boards and Commissions application form,
- b. Statement that the applicant is a registered voter in the planning area,
- c. Resume of qualifications, and
- d. Written responses to the standard set of questions.

MEETING 2—Candidate introductions shall be published in the agendas for the second Regular Meeting after a vacancy is announced. The Nominations Subcommittee shall distribute copies of completed application packages for every qualified candidate to VCCPG members at that meeting and introduce the candidates to the VCCPG. The Nominations Subcommittee Chairperson shall make known to the VCCPG if any applications were not accepted along with the reasons for any such rejections. The VCCPG Chairperson shall allow each candidate to address the VCCPG. Candidates should answer the standard questions provided to them by the Nominations Subcommittee along with any other personal comments.

MEETING 3—The VCCPG Chairperson shall conduct elections at the third Regular Meeting after the subject vacancy(s) is announced (Meeting 3). By a majority vote of authorized members, the VCCPG may vote to extend scheduled deadlines or votes. In order to prevail, a candidate must receive a majority of votes of the authorized membership (8). If no candidate receives a majority of authorized votes, the candidate with the fewest votes shall be eliminated and another round of voting shall be conducted. Additional rounds of voting shall be conducted in like manner until a candidate prevails. Should two candidates tie for the fewest number of votes, an additional round of voting shall be conducted between those candidates in order to determine which candidate will be eliminated.

FOLLOW-UP—The Nominations Subcommittee shall retain applications and applicants will remain qualified candidates for a period of one year from the date of the latest vote in which the candidate participated. Any such candidate must provide a written statement of their intent to run for a specific vacancy to the Nominations Subcommittee prior to the beginning of the meeting at which the vote for that vacancy is scheduled. Such candidates may run for any vacancy on the VCCPG or to the other organizations on which the VCCPG is authorized or required to provide a representative. The VCCPG Chairperson will promptly forward the name of prevailing candidates to the county Board of Supervisors for their approval. **Board-approved nominees assume their seats upon completion of required training courses.**

[Approved 11-14-2005]

Proposed Amendment #2 Duties and Minority Reports

ARTICLE III – DUTIES

Section: I (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1)

Section: II (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the VCCPG standing Rules.)

The Planning Group member assigned to report on an agenda item shall notify the project proponent that the project will be on the agenda, and notify the Chairperson that the item is ready for consideration. If the project proponent is not present when the matter is considered, the item may be continued until the proponent is present to answer questions.

Whenever Members identify themselves as members of the VCCPG, they shall immediately state whether they are acting for the group, as an individual member, or as a private citizen. If statements or conduct are not in accordance with the requirements of Board Policies I-1 and I-1A, members may be held personally liable.

Planning Group recommendations shall focus on: Completeness and accuracy of the Project Description; Compatibility with Community Character; Consistency with the Community Plan; Consistency with the County General Plan and applicable zoning regulations; and Concerns with the Project's environmental impacts. Minority opinions may also be provided, if declared at the time of the vote. The proposed Minority opinion shall be discussed when declared and supporter(s) identified. Any Minority opinion must be sent to the Secretary to accompany the Majority recommendations to staff, and must include a statement identifying which members supported the Minority opinion.

Section: III – IV (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1)

Proposed Amendment #3 Subcommittee absences

ARTICLE V – SUBCOMMITTEES

Section I-II: (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1)

Section III: (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the following VCCPG standing Rules.)

A Subcommittee may be formed or abolished, at any time, by a majority vote of the VCCPG. The purpose and scope of activities of each subcommittee shall be established by the VCCPG upon creation of the subcommittee. The major purpose of a Subcommittee is to gather pertinent information relative to the committee's stated purpose, study it, and make recommendations to the VCCPG based on said information.

Membership on Subcommittees is open to all interested residents, including volunteers who reside outside of the planning area, but requires nomination by a VCCPG member and a majority vote from the VCCPG. Non-planning area residents shall not exceed fifty percent of total subcommittee membership. Membership may be lost by three (3) consecutive absences, unless the member notifies the Subcommittee chairperson **and is excused by the Chair** in advance of each meeting. At the next VCCPG meeting removal would be by majority vote. The Chairperson of each subcommittee shall present a copy of VCCPG's Standing Rules and applicable portions of I-1 to each subcommittee member, prior to commencement of the first subcommittee meeting.

The Chair of the Subcommittee shall make a presentation to the VCCPG quarterly, or more frequently as necessary. The Chair of each Subcommittee shall include within the Subcommittee's report to the VCCPG a record of all votes cast, including which VCCPG members disqualified themselves from participating because of conflict of interest, as required by Board Policy I-1 and I-1A. Any member may file a minority report. No recommendations by a Subcommittee shall be construed as binding or as the official position of the VCCPG.

[Approved 11-14-2005]

Section IV: (As per County of San Diego Board of Supervisor's Policy I-1 and augmented with the VCCPG standing Rules.)

Section V. When time permits, Subcommittee meetings should be announced at regular VCCPG meetings to maximize public participation. Relevant project proponents should be notified at least one week prior to the meeting. The Subcommittee Chairperson shall cause to be posted a meeting Notice and Agenda, outside the meeting place, not less than 24 hours prior to the meeting. There can be no discussion of or action on matters not on the agenda.

[Approved with consolidation of Sections VI-XIV, 10-0 3/8/04]

Attached material for item F4:

Valley Center Parks & Recreation
Subcommittee Report March 9, 2015

- The board is hoping for a close date of 3-16-15 for escrow on the 15 acre lot on Valley Center Rd.
- The district does not currently have funding to maintain all of the facilities it owns. So the board has been and is still currently looking for ways to get a constant source of income for that purpose.
- Larry Glavnic & new board member Jon Vic are heading up a Finance Committee to look for new funding opportunities’.
- Their first meeting will be Thursday, March 12, 2015.
- A local Eagle Scout has proposed to build a large mail box receptacle to place on the property so community members can put old torn American Flags in and the flags will be disposed of in the proper way by the Eagle Scout.
- We will soon have a new bike park in Valley Center behind Schebillia Field. The board is excited to offer this to the community.
- Little League is up and running strong.
- The district is getting a new secretary. Doug should know by now who it is.
- Western Day/Stamped Rodeo is being put on this year by The Optimist Club of Valley Center. They meet the second Tuesday of every month and are excited to host the biggest yearly event that Valley Center has to offer.
- The district is also putting up new fencing and gates around the perimeter of the Community Hall for added security at events.

Respectfully submitted by:

LaVonne Norwood

Valley Center Parks & Recreation Subcommittee Chair