

Attachment F – Community Planning/ Sponsor Group Recommendations

From: [Neal, Stephanie](#)
To: [Easland, Camila](#)
Subject: FW: Comments: Small Cell Wireless Facilities Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 01, 2019 1:31:02 PM

Stephanie Neal

Junior Land Use/Environmental Planner, Advance Planning
County of San Diego | Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Ave. Ste. 310 | San Diego, CA 92123
Stephanie.Neal@sdcounty.ca.gov
(858) 495-5341

From: The D Dills <theddills@att.net>
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2019 12:45 PM
To: Lieberman, Tara <Tara.Lieberman@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Neal, Stephanie <Stephanie.Neal@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Don Willis <DWillis4930@sbcglobal.net>; Joe Zagara <joe@zagaramanagement.com>; 'Laurel Lemarie' <whyfret1@mac.com>; Nelson Beth <beth.nelson@me.com>; Niko Christenfeld <nchristenfeld@ucsd.edu>; Philip Fisch <philipfisch@gmail.com>; Rachel Laffer <rachellaffer@hotmail.com>; Steve Thomas <st@valueselling.com>; Susan Williams <swilliams0303@icloud.com>; Tim Parillo <tparillo@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments: Small Cell Wireless Facilities Ordinance

July 1, 2019

San Dieguito Planning Group

P.O. Box 2789
Rancho Santa Fe, CA, 92067

Tara Lieberman
Land Use/Environmental Planner, Advance Planning
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego California 92123

Re: Small Cell Wireless Facilities Ordinance

Dear Ms. Lieberman,

Below is the list of DRAFT San Dieguito Planning Group comments to the proposed zoning ordinance for Small Cell Wireless Facilities. At the next San Dieguito Planning Group meeting scheduled for 7:00pm, Thursday, July 11, 2019, we will formally vote to support this list of comments for submittal to the SD County PDS Advanced Planning.

Please note that since the new ordinance allows ministerial approval without comment by planning groups and/or homeowners' associations, and favors the right of way for installation, the community character of San Dieguito area may be adversely effected in places where the right of ways are used as trail easements for equestrian and hiking, as well as impacting the aesthetics of the San Dieguito area.

1. Make pre-application site visit a requirement.

Rationale: This will give participating parties an opportunity to ask all the appropriate questions and recommend any changes because of varying conditions.

2. Support Structure Removal and Performance Bond: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant and the owner of record of any proposed new Tower or support structure shall, at its sole cost and expense, file with the Administrator a bond or other form of security that is acceptable to the County as to the type of security and the form and manner of execution, in an amount of at least \$75,000 for a Tower or \$20,000 for a support structure that is not a Tower, and with such sureties as are deemed adequate by the County to assure the faithful performance of the terms and conditions of this Ordinance and conditions of any Special Use Permit issued pursuant to this Ordinance. The full amount of the bond or security shall remain in full force and effect throughout the term of the Special Use Permit/ use agreement and/or until any necessary site restoration is completed to restore the site to a condition comparable to that which existed prior to the issuance of the original Special Use Permit.

3. The applicant will be limited to submitting only five (5) cell sites per application, with only one application per 48 hr. period.

Rationale: Applicant may overwhelm staff with applications, making it difficult to review within the application processing time limit.

4. The applicant will pick up building permits within 30 days of approval. Applicant will begin construction within 90 days of approval, else begin application process again or justify why extension needed.

Rationale: Prevents "warehousing" of permits by applicant, i.e., leaving many approved applications at County for pick up until convenient for applicant; this is inconvenient for staff. If construction doesn't begin within the allotted timeframe, applicant must submit new application or justify why they deserve extension.

5. The applicant will provide a letter verifying that the site/ applicant/carrier will comply with all Federal, State, County, and municipality rules and regulations. All FCC, FAA, OSHA and other federal regulations that require training, equipment, specific program development, caused by the installation of any portion of a Wireless facility, to include Small Cell installations, will be at the applicant's expense. The applicant will fund an

Escrow account, held by the county, for the duration of the Permit/ agreement, funding for at least one half the total program's projected costs will be required as part of the application. The escrow account will be reviewed on a scheduled basis. The account will not go below a minimum of thirty-six (36) months of potential funding. The applicant/carrier will be contacted to fund the Escrow account for any and all the appropriate programs.

6. The applicant will provide one hundred (100) foot setback and Fall Zone in all areas and use Class 3 poles.

Rationale: If hit by a motorist, a lighter weight pole may fall onto road or structure, etc.

7. No site will be closer than one hundred (100) feet to any occupied residence/ structure. Additional set back rules for residential areas of a minimum of five hundred (500) feet apply.

8. Height limitation is 35', one provider per site.

Rationale: Providers are allowed to increase height by 10% per year; lower height will have less impact on Community Character.

9. Cell sites not to be located in "sensitive areas."

Rationale: There are areas within the County that are considered "Sensitive Areas." These areas can be quite extensive in certain locations. The "Pre Application" meeting will mitigate/ eliminate the potential site placement in these areas.

10. Sound mitigation is required on equipment.

Rationale: Reduce the impact to Community Character by insulating the equipment boxes. Equipment may be seen, not heard.

11. Applicants must work within County-approved Wireless Facilities Master Plans, where applicable.

Rationale: Some areas have Wireless Facilities Master Plans that specify a range of locations from Most Desirable to Least Desirable; provide aesthetic requirements, etc.

12. Where operating facilities in the County right of ways, facilities shall not impede use of public and private equestrian trails, including location of underground equipment.

Rationale: Facilities and equipment in trails may make the trails hazardous to use, thereby invalidating the County or local insurance on those trails.

13. Encourage under-grounding of equipment where feasible, after staff and planning group and/or HOA review.

Rationale: Aesthetic elements will be improved if equipment boxes are underground. However, vaults in equestrian trails may make the trails unsafe to use and may invalidate the County or local insurance on those trails.

14. If fiber-optic cable is available, applicant is required to use it or justify why not feasible.

Rationale: Fewer nodes may be needed if fiber-optic cable is used, reducing impact on Community Character.

Thank you for the opportunity for the San Dieguito Planning Group to comment on the proposed Small Cell Wireless Facilities Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Douglas Dill
Chair
San Dieguito Planning Group



Virus-free. www.avast.com

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 17 Jun 2019, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

Preliminary Minutes

The June meeting of the Fallbrook Community Planning Group was called to order at 7:00PM by Vice Chairman Jack Wood.

Twelve (12) members were present: Vice-Chairs Jack Wood and Roy Moosa, Jerry Kalman, Eileen Delaney, Donna Gebhart, Lee DeMeo, Karel Hanson, Steve Brown, Mark Mervich, William O'Connor, Victoria Stover and Kim Murphy. Chairman Jim Russell, Guy Howard and Jim Loge were excused.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three-minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item.

Kate Schwartz, a neighbor of the previously approved battery facility for SDG&E near East Mission Rd., inquired about the removal of landscaping elements that exposed her property to the open field and projected battery. She was informed that the Planning Group stipulated to the applicant that the bordering fences be landscaped. She will be given a copy of the minutes with that stipulation in them.

Bob Gonsett, a resident on Alta Vista and operator of a communications service company, is concerned about the effects of pre-emptive SDG&E elective power outages on his business, which studies communications signaling for various agencies. He wants adequate warnings by the power company. He also advised that the power company will be conducting open houses to discuss the parameters of the outages at Valley Center Middle School on Tuesday, June 25, from 5PM to 7:30PM. Valley Center Middle School is at 28102 Lake Wohford Rd. Further information is available from a Mr. Fox at the power company (858-636-1932).

Donna Gebhart reported that Al Gebhart met with Supervisor Desmond's staff and requested some form of honoring local volunteers and non-profit organizations for accomplishing community benefits and as a means to encourage volunteer efforts. She noted in particular the efforts of the Live Oak Park Coalition and the Santa Margarita Open Space Preserve activities on behalf of Fallbrook.

A community resident noted the increasing presence of homeless people in Fallbrook and wanted to know if there is anything being done to address the problem. Eileen Delaney reported that one of the Revitalization projects for Supervisor Desmond is the homeless problem.

Jack Wood reported on the condition of Planning Group Chair Jim Russell, noting that it looks as though it might be at least another six weeks while Mr. Russell is in the care of the downtown VA Hospital. An additional round of surgery is scheduled for Tuesday, June 18.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of 20 May 2019. Voting Item.

Victoria Stover moved to approve the minutes and the motion passed unanimously.

3. On February 27, 2019, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed staff to return to the Board in 180 days with additional requirements for small cell wireless facilities for reducing cluttering, avoidance of sensitive sites, co-location, distance between poles, placement of utility boxes, residential preferred locations, undergrounding of equipment, and additional public noticing. This project proposes changes to the Zoning Ordinance to address the Board direction and to comply with the September 2018 FCC Order. County planners: Tara Lieberman (858) 495-5466 tara.lieberman@sdcounty.ca.gov, Eric Lardy eric.lardy@sdcounty.ca.gov Public Facilities Committee, Community input, Voting item, (5/30)

Both Eric Lardy and Tara Lieberman made a presentation on behalf of the County regarding the roll-out of 5G cellular technology. Of concern to those in attendance was the process and impact of the new small-cell technology on unincorporated/rural areas, in particular Fallbrook; in addition many residents and Planning Group members were annoyed that there is little future input allowed those in this unincorporated area to monitor and affect where and how the small-cell towers are deployed here. Because much of the decision-making has been mandated in a September 2018 ruling by the Federal Communications Commission, which set the ground rules for deployment, implementation is narrowly prescribed for County decision making.

Eric Lardy (EL) noted that the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission are taking input from residents and Planning Groups in July and August, but they do not like the mandated process any more than residents do.

Tara Leiberman (TL) distributed a set of documents that explain many aspects of the program to deploy 5G antennas and supporting equipment. She noted that there are eight primary considerations (included in the document attached to these minutes) governing County decision-making on antenna/pole/support equipment placement. Some 50 jurisdictions throughout the County are affected by the 5G roll-out and most of the new sites are either colocations with existing 4G poles or will be along public rights of way. Further, she indicated that the roll-out will avoid certain sites, such as schools, by using a thousand-foot buffer around those area. The sites selected are categorized as “most” and “least” preferred, and the latter largely governs locations in unincorporated areas.

They both noted that results from the County input sessions such as this meeting will go to the Planning Commission in July. EL said the governing documents will be revised in

keeping with decisions made after all community input received. Those findings will be communicated to Planning/Sponsor Groups throughout the county.

Community and Planning Group questions/concerns revolved around three broad issues: the need for those in attendance to get more information about the features and structure of the system; how 5G will be deployed in Fallbrook, and the request by the Planning Group on behalf of residents for more local input on particular site installations where they threaten the rural character of a neighborhood and/or the rights of individual property-owners.

Among questions asked were:

- Will the County take into account historic sites in unincorporated areas? TL – The County will be looking into it county-wide.
- What consideration is given to possible health-effects of the new technology? EL – The County is prohibited by Federal law from considerations of those issues.
- Will there be consequences of colocation of 5G and 4G technologies in the same area? EL — None because 5G supplements 4G.
- How many antennas are envisioned for each pole? TL—Two at the moment, but they could accommodate one or more up to four on a pole, but the limitation is intentional by the County.
- What kind of support equipment is anticipated for each site? 4G sites require a large perimeter, generators, etc. Will that be required for 5G? EL/TL – The support equipment will be mostly underground, however, what will be on the pole, other than the antenna, will be small. EL—There are no generators for 5G sites.
- Why 5G? EL— It is faster than 4G, the roll-out satisfies a mandate by the FCC and it accommodates more users.
- Will 5G have potential adverse effects on public service communications facilities, particularly for emergency responders? EL—There has been no specific analysis on radio operations, to which Steve Abbott requested that the County make sure 5G does not interfere with fire department communications.
- Will adding more antennas and equipment increase fire hazards in the area? TL – The County will make sure carriers comply with standard County fire policies. She noted much of the equipment will be underground. EL—The County will not approve installations if they do not meet County standards. TL—The sites will also adhere to CPUC standards.
- Are the poles wood or metal? TL – Wood, primarily; and they will be no higher than 50 feet.
- How close will the poles be to residences? EL – They will abide by in-place setback requirements.
- Why aren't new installs to be treated as Major Use Permits like 4G sites? TL—The FCC has taken that option away from the County, which means they are to be treated as ministerial permits, granted by the County.
- Who is funding the process of 5G roll-out? EL – Carriers will pay for the sites and inspections. He said the FCC limits fees jurisdictions can charge for oversight.

- Are there any demonstration or completed sites that can be seen in the county? EL – There are none in unincorporated areas but there are a couple in the Kerney Mesa area.
- Will Planning Groups be informed when the roll-out comes to an unincorporated area? TL – Yes, when one is proposed for an area the County and Planning Group will be notified by the carriers.
- Once the Planning Group is notified what power will they have? EL – No discretionary power, informational notice only.
- Will the staff work with local resources (Bob Gonsett in particular) “to develop suitable language to be incorporated into the zoning code draft to bring necessary protections” from 5G interference with existing communications facilities (emergency and others)? EL – The issue has not come up but he will look into it.
- Why the thousand foot distance from schools, etc.? EL – Aesthetics.
- Why co-locate 4g/5G on a pole? TL – Limit the number of poles. Each antenna when there are two 5Gs on a pole will be ten feet apart. TL noted that the County website will have more information about the locations and colocation of 4G/5G poles.
- How many carriers per pole? EL – Two.
- The FCC requires blending for the 5G gear. How will that be achieved? TL – The equipment will be painted to blend in with the area.
- How many new poles are envisioned for the County? EL –About 1600. The emphasis is on using existing facilities (It was noted by Jack Wood that there are 6500 poles in County rights of way).
- Which rights of way will the poles go on? EL – Public rights of way.
- What about site (pole) security? EL – There will be no fence around the poles to limit public access. He does not see there will be a need like there is for 4G sites.
- How fast will the roll-out occur? EL – No idea.
- How will Planning Groups be notified of a deployment in our areas? EL – Carrier applications will trigger the notification process, and it will occur five at a time (not by the hundreds or singly).
- So the carrier will show the application to planning and sponsor groups but not for approval? EL – Yes. Time frames for roll-out prohibit involving planning/sponsor groups from participating in the approval process.
- Are these groups prohibited from participating in future roll-out decisions for 5G? EL – Yes. FYI, the Board is protesting this aspect to the FCC.
- Aren’t we (Planning/Sponsor Groups) losing our democratic rights to make these decisions? EL – These operations are granted to the County and becoming ministerial decisions per the FCC.

Roy Moosa moved to request the County to create a set of guidelines to make 5G roll-out in unincorporated areas tolerable to those communities affected by installation of new poles, especially in areas where there are no existing poles because of underground utilities. Further, he moved that there be a mechanism at the County that if there is no pole in an unincorporated area that the Planning/Sponsor Group be allowed to comment on its placement.

The motion was approved with Bill O'Connor against, all others in favor.

4. Rainbow Municipal Water District discussion of property at 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, Steve Strapac, District Engineer, 760-728-1178, ext. 199, sstrapac@rainbowmwd.com. Held over from the 20 May FCPG meeting. Community Input. Non-voting item. (5/1)

Mr. Strapac was not at the meeting. Steve Brown moved to continue consideration to a future meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Presentation by Nina Pisano, 858 966 1353, Cell 858 699 8090, nina.pisano@sdcounty.ca.gov, San Diego County Parks and Recreation Department, on the San Luis Rey River Park. Community input. Non-voting item.

Marcus Lubitsch, a manager with SD County Parks and Recreation Department, made the presentation on behalf of his department, noting that the County has acquired two parcels of land for parks at the east and west end of the Ocean Breezes project (between Old 395, Camino del Rey, Lilac Rd and CA 76). The two projects are nominally known as Downs and Dulin, the latter of concern to the Planning Group because it and the neighboring 55+ development is in the Planning Group's jurisdiction. The entire eight-mile/1600-acre stretch of the San Luis Rey River Park straddles both Fallbrook and Bonsall south of CA 76, and County general funds are being used to acquire land and develop park areas, outside of CSA 81 funding sources, within the project. It is referenced in the County's 2005 Master Plan, and will contain 20 miles of public accessible trails. The 45-acre Dulin Rd. parcel is slated to have multi-use sports fields, portions of the trail-network and restrooms (because the Downs parcel is outside of Fallbrook Community Planning Group jurisdiction, the remainder of the minutes will focus on the Dulin portion).

Mr. Lubitsch noted that the County is working with residents of the Rancho Monserate development where Dulin Rd. enters the park area on access issues. He said that there was an outreach meeting with about 140 residents of the complex and there will be a traffic study to determine number of projected visits and the correct way to control traffic flow through the development and out into the park area. He said the County is committed to working with the development's Homeowners' Association on those access/traffic patterns; and that there would be another community meeting after further inputs are received from those studies. He indicated that the extension of Dulin Rd. into the park area would be narrow and two-lane. Roy Moosa asked if that was the only access into the park and was told that it is. He asked if the Planning Group would see future designs and traffic patterns and was assured that, yes, the County would share those with the Planning Group.

It was noted by Donna Gebhart that residents of Rancho Monserate are concerned about safety for dog walkers and golf carts that use Dulin Rd., which Mr. Lubitsch said is the main access off 395 into the projected park. She also asked if the County would install a button or other mechanism that would allow riders in golf carts to signal for a stop in traffic, to which Marcus Lubitsch replied they would. She posted a picture of the

interface area where the existing portion of Dulin Rd. meets the park boundary (which is attached to these minutes) and was assured that that portion of Dulin Rd. will be two-lane only and striped. It was noted that in the future Dulin Rd. will continue all the way to Camino del Rey at the western end of the Ocean Breezes development, but that those residents will only have emergency use of the western portion of Dulin Rd. There was concern voiced about the flow of traffic through Rancho Monserate when events take place at the Dulin Park, but he expected there would be coordination with the sheriff's department when there would be events or expected surges of traffic.

When asked about the timeframe for starting the Dulin end of the project, he hoped there would be designs by next spring. Funding is expected in the next fiscal year.

Marcus Lubitsch also reported on other Parks and Recreation projects in Fallbrook, stating that work continues on improving both the Clemmens Lane (new restroom and converting the volleyball courts to a soccer field) and Don Dussault (new picnic and exercise areas and an improved playground) projects. In addition, he reported that the Board of Supervisors has allocated \$1 million for the acquisition of land for a skate park in Fallbrook, and that the County is fielding owner-offers to sell land for the project. He hoped to resolve the appropriate parcel selection in the coming months. He also indicated the County is working with the developers of Horse Creek Ranch on the creation of committed public parks in those developments east of I-15, and he expected the transfer of those lands to the County in the fall.

6. Presentation by Roger Boddaert, 760 728 4287 on naming a tree/flower to represent Fallbrook. Community input. Non-voting item (5/16)

Mr. Bodaert was not present and Lee DeMeo moved to continue the project to a future meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. ZAP 19-002 Request for a Minor Use Permit for a herpetoculture for the rearing and housing of live harmless reptiles for the pet industry and small animal rearing as food for the reptiles, Live harmless reptiles are turtles, tortoises, lizards, snakes and amphibians. No animals are venomous or poisonous. The project is located on the 2.06 acres at 3130 Sumac Lane, APN 125-03-26, Owner and contact person Rommie Huntington, 760-695-7535, sandfirereptile@gmail.com. County planner Sean Oberbauer, 857-495-5747, sean.oberbauer@sdcounty.ca.gov. Land Use and Design Review Committees. Community input. Voting item. (5/30)

Both the Land Use and Design Review committees recommended continuing the project. Eileen Delaney moved to continue the project to a future meeting once discrepancies noted by the County are resolved. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52

Respectfully Submitted, Jerry Kalman, Secretary



DESCANSO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
Post Office Box 38, Descanso CA 91916-0038

Planning and Development Services

Attn: Tara Lieberman

5510 Overland Ave, Suit 310

San Diego CA, 92123

Via Email: PDS.AdvancePlanning@sdcounty.ca.gov

GROUP MEMBERS

Seat 1:
Kerry Forrest, Chair

Seat 2:
Jo Ellen Quinting

Seat 3:
David Mellner

Seat 4:
John Elliott

Seat 5:
Mark Gassert

Seat 6:
William Bauer

Seat 7:
Terry Gibson

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ORDINANCE UPDATE FOR
SMALL CELL WIRELESS FACILITIES

Dear Tara Lieberman,

The Descanso Community Planning Group (DCPG) has received and reviewed the Draft Zoning Ordinance Update for Small Cell Wireless Facilities (SCWF) and its supporting documents. The DCPG wishes to make it known that our rural community strongly supports the development of wireless and optical fiber infrastructure in our community. The move towards less restrictions in the installation of SCWF is supported by the members of the DCPG.

Currently Descanso residents have very few choices for reliable cellular service as well as high speed affordable internet and wifi options. The Land Line service (hardwire communication lines) provided by ATT are being phased out as quickly as the company can reduce the number of existing users. The loss of this service is leaving some residents with no form of communication service in areas where cellular service is not available at this time, leaving the residents highly vulnerable in cases of health or other emergencies.

Comments of the DCPG are as follows:

1. Attachment X, 6992 Small Cell Wireless Facility Application Requirements A.3 Include Libraries in the 1,000 foot setback.
2. Attachment X, 6992 Small Cell Wireless Facility Application Requirements. The DCPG wishes to know, why the set back is being applied? If indeed there is no health risk to children caused by the electromagnetic waves that SCWF emit why is there a 1000 foot set back being applied.

The document labeled “ Options for Small Cell Wireless Facilities” Topic area “ Distance from schools, childcare centers, hospitals or churches (6992.A.3) FCC Order indicates this is allowed based on Aesthetics not health. If this is the case and the electromagnetic waves are not a risk then why the setback? However if PDS is applying this set back to reflect possible yet undetermined health risks to children should this not also be reflected where children and their parents reside?

3. The DCPG supports the new proposed development standards for SCWF within the document. San Diego Gas & Electric is currently installing excessively large new metal power poles on very big support structures throughout the community despite our objections during the EIR review process. These poles will undoubtedly serve as future locations for the SCWF as outlined in this revision. Community character and aesthetics have been excessively damaged by SDGE Power Pole replacement and the DCPG wishes that these additional SCWF structures do not further degrade our community character, aesthetics and views.
4. Is the connection to fiber optic cable as shown in “ Configuration Preferences” required in the installation of SCWF's? If so will these cables be installed within our community and will they be underground or attached to more poles or existing poles causing more damage to our communities character, aesthetics and views?
5. The Descanso Community Plan was crafted in the 2020 Master Plan update. At that time the Wireless Community Master Plan was included in the Community Plan. This plan is very out of date and does not reflect current practices and technology. The DCPG will be pursuing an update of the Wireless Community Plan for our geographic area. We request PDS assistance in this endeavor.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Zoning Ordinance Update for Small Cell Wireless Facilities. Please take our comments seriously and help us protect what is left of our community character, post SDGE Power Pole installations.

Regards,

Kerry Forrest, Chair
DCPG

Cc: DCPG File

Valley Center Community Planning Group

PO Box 127 Valley Center CA 92082



Oliver Smith
(seat 11)
Chair

oliver.smith@philips.com

Jeana Boulos
(seat 9)
Vice Chair

jeana.h.boulos@gmail.com

Kathy MacKenzie
(seat 15)
Secretary

valleycenterplans@gmail.com

Susan Fajardo
(seat 14)

susanfarr@vcweb.org

James Garritson
(seat 12)

vc@garritson.com

Dina Gharmalkar
(seat 4)

dinargharmalkar@yahoo.com

Delores Chavez Harmes
(seat 5)

dee@cfvcr.com

Steve Hutchison
(seat 2)

hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Susan Janisch
(seat 3)

socalji@cts.com

LaVonne Norwood
(seat 10)

lavonne@armorfabrication.com

William Del Pilar
(seat 1)

wdelpilar-vccpg@outlook.com

Kevin Smith
(seat 7)

sikls8@gmail.com

Seat 8 (Open)

Renee Wolf
(seat 6)

renee@essentialaddictions.com

Lisa Adams
(seat 13)

lhadamscs@yahoo.com

June 29, 2019

To: Tara Lieberman
San Diego County Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123 [MS O-650]

RE: Comments on draft Zoning Ordinance Update for Small Cell Wireless Facilities

Tara:

The Valley Center Community Planning Group has reviewed the draft Zoning Ordinance Update for Small Cell Wireless (SCW) Facilities and would like to make the following recommendations:

- 1) There is a concern that the discretionary process currently in use for full size cell towers will change to a non-discretionary process. We make it a point to carefully evaluate cell tower applications and talk to the neighbors involved to get their input. Is this opportunity to evaluate and make recommendations to the county for SCW facilities in Valley Center going away?
- 2) Does VCCPG have the opportunity to make comments on the preferences and avoidance areas for SCW facilities noted on the county provided maps?
- 3) Who makes the decision as to whether there is an aesthetics issue with a SCW facility location? Will VCCPG be given an opportunity to evaluate and make recommendations for this issue?
- 4) Will VCCPG be notified of proposed SCW facilities prior to their being approved?
- 5) Please advise where in the ordinance any undergrounding of equipment is required to have any public and/or private lands used repaired to at least the previously existing conditions.

Because of the public notice time frame of May 30, 2019 to June 30, 2019 and the only VCCPG meeting in that time frame being May 10, 2019, there was insufficient time for VCCPG to corporately review and make a formal recommendation. Therefore, I am submitting these recommendations in advance of a VCCPG recommendation vote to be held at our regular meeting on July 8, 2019. If the recommendation of the group is not to support this letter, I will be in contact.

If you have further questions, I can be reached at (760) 703-1455.

Respectfully,

Oliver Smith, Chair
Valley Center Community Planning Group

From: [Lieberman, Tara](#)
To: [Neal, Stephanie](#); [Shute, Madeline](#)
Subject: FW: Sweetwater CPG
Date: Wednesday, June 05, 2019 3:20:54 PM
Importance: High

From: Stephen <stephen.stonehouse@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2019 10:09 AM
To: Lardy, Eric <Eric.Lardy@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lieberman, Tara <Tara.Lieberman@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Anderson, Marshall <Marshall.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Sweetwater CPG
Importance: High

Thank you all for presenting at last night's meeting. As discussed, we would appreciate the County sending someone to present information on "Granny Flats" at a future meeting.

Also, please include in Staff's presentation to the Board, our objection to not having the CPG's included in the process of these cell towers being built in OUR communities. To my view, this goes against what our Planning Group's purpose is.

Thank you,

Stephen Stonehouse

Co-chair, Sweetwater CPG

Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group

From: Billie Jo Jannen, Chairman
Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group

To: Chairman Michael Seiler, San Diego County Planning Commission
Chairman Dianne Jacob, San Diego County Board of Supervisors
Staff, San Diego County Planning and Development

July 1, 2019

Re; **Small Cell Wireless ordinance update**

Dear Officials and Staff:

Thank you revisiting this ordinance as a single item. It very much got lost in the shuffle of the original ordinance update and it deserves this effort to make it more nuanced to community needs and health, despite the strictures handed down by the FCC.

The Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group voted unanimously on July 1 to forward the following advice on the update language of Small Cell Wireless/5G regulations.

- ▶ **Please require that each installation be equipped with at least two days of battery backup.**
- ▶ **We propose that 3,000 feet should be the minimum distance from sensitive receptors.**
- ▶ **Due to our large lot sizes, we request that project notices be sent to any property within 3,000 feet.**
- ▶ **Errors in the required neighbor noticing should stop processing until a corrected notice is sent and neighbors have time to respond.**
- ▶ **Please set an appropriate time limit for the developer to correct an application and a short time limit for completing the project, once approved.**
- ▶ **We suggest a worker health survey as part of the annual reporting mentioned in staff's option sheet**
- ▶ **Please place a warning sign on each pole that holds a 5G unit.**
- ▶ **Please approve 5G master plans ONLY after full consultation with the community and reserve final approval to the BOS.**
- ▶ **Please provide an option for a CPG or CSG to selectively minimize units in a 5G master plan on a "without cause" basis, with approval of a super-majority (66 2/3) of residents within the unit's service area.**

Worker health in annual report

We have been told repeatedly that no one is allowed to talk about health when regulating these installations, but I suspect it is more correct to say that you can't base siting and permitting decisions on health issues. You can TALK about anything you deem appropriate to serve the public need. In view of the newness and ubiquity of 5G technology, as well as stances taken by respected authorities, you would be remiss if you

Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group

didn't make some effort to discover whether it is doing harm to your constituents. With this in mind, *we suggest that you create a database, or some other mechanism, to track local 5G worker health.*

For example, a yearly survey of workers who install and repair these facilities could be performed as part of the annual report mentioned in the options sheet staff provided to us. Workers in every job with this kind exposure are the new "canaries in the coal mine." We believe that this could be required as a condition of doing business in SDC without treading on facility permitting. It would contribute to the 5G knowledge pool and might serve to inform future decision making. We urge staff and officials to explore variations of this approach.

Better batteries

As with other cell towers, public safety is mentioned frequently to support specific siting requests, but the two hours of battery power mentioned by staff at our meeting is wholly inadequate to support public safety. A typical power outage in far East County is closer to two days. We have reached a point where wired communications are almost a thing of the past. That makes wireless communications a vital public safety element, and not a luxury. Access needs to be protected in order to protect public safety. *Each installation should be equipped with at least two days of battery backup.*

Sensitive receptors

Your current language proposes 1,000 feet as a minimum distance from schools, childcare, hospitals and churches, for aesthetic purposes. However, the modern, high-tech looks of these devices is a jarring contrast to the antique architectural styles of many of our public buildings. This is particularly important in/near the footprint of Camp Lockett. Visitors make up a substantial portion of our economy, and our old-style charm drives that. Therefore, *3,000 feet should be the minimum distance from sensitive receptors.*

Notice to neighbors and planning group

The language currently calls for notice to neighbors within 500 feet of a proposed project. In our large-lot neighborhoods, notices may go only to a couple of property owners, some of whom may very well be absentee owners of vacant land or disinterested altogether. This would leave the community or neighborhood unaware of impending 5G projects. *Project notices should be sent to any property owner within 3,000 feet.*

In addition, we believe that PG and neighbor notices should always include current contact information for the CPG/CSG chairman in the affected planning group area. There needs to be a penalty for incorrect noticing, even if it's long after the fact. We have had incidents – most notably with the industrial solar proposal in process right now – where the notices sent to neighbors gave the name and number of a long-gone chairman, and sent the planning group's notice to the obsolete address as well. In the latter instance, we would have missed being able to participate in scoping, if not for one of the planning group members being on the neighbor list. These notices are important to the community and should not be treated carelessly. *Incorrect noticing should be a trigger to delay processing, or even enact a penalty, until the noticing is corrected.*

Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group

Incomplete applications

We notice that the county is given a deadline of 10 days to notify the developer if an application is incomplete. What we DON'T see is a timeframe in which the developer needs to resubmit a corrected application. This is germane, as a developer might linger over a response and hold up usage of a master planned installation site. *There should be an appropriate time limit for the developer to correct an application and another for completing the project, once approved.*

Signs

Some municipalities require that each installation have a standardized warning sign detailing the possible risks presented by the 5G unit, and what constitutes a safe proximity. *We believe that a warning sign, similar to the FCC compliant sign to the right, should be placed on each pole that holds a 5G unit.* We are unaware if there are state standards for this. The FCC sign standards may be viewed here: https://standards.ieee.org/standard/C95_2-2018.html



Master plan approval

Finally, we have some concerns about lack of input and local control, as we understand BOS has also expressed. Consequently, we have reservations about mention of a master plan approved solely by "the Director" as mentioned in Attachment X of the May 30 draft. Community input, via CPGs and SPGs, is increasingly being set aside in favor of streamlining and director approvals. We feel that this type of planning should *never* be put in the hands of a single employee, over elected and appointed representatives. That would make us as disinterested in community wishes as the FCC we criticize.

Please ensure that community input remains relevant and that high-impact projects like this are routed through CPGs/SPGs. Final review/approval should be made by the people we elected to make the big decisions: the San Diego County Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "B. Jannen".

Billie Jo Jannen
(619) 415-6298

CREST-DEHESA-GRANITE HILLS-HARBISON CANYON SUBREGIONAL PLANNING GROUP. Minutes of the meeting on 10 June 2019 at Dehesa School, 4612 Dehesa Road, El Cajon, 92019.

A. CALL TO ORDER. Chairman Wally Riggs called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

B. ROLL CALL. Planning Group members Ulm, Slagill, Jones, Trial, Becker, Riggs, Bretz, Manning, Scholl, Underwood and Lucas were present, forming a quorum of 11. Members Rich and Hertel were absent, but excused. Member McAndrews was absent, but not excused. Seat 12 is vacant.

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. Planning Group member Christina Becker moved that the Group approves the minutes of the meeting on 13 May 2019 as submitted by Secretary Bretz. The motion passed (10 yes; 0 no; 1 abstain: Underwood).

E. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION. No one from the public requested to speak. Planning Group member Bill Bretz reported that the cluster of rural mailboxes located on Sloane Canyon Road near its intersection with Dehesa Road was completely removed/stolen sometime during Memorial Day weekend.

F. ACTION ITEMS.

F1. Update by DPR on Sycuan-Sloane Canyon Trails progress. Chairman Riggs introduced Meg Diss, County Department of Parks and Recreation Trails Coordinator, and Bill Sommier, County DPR Director of Development, and invited them to give an update on the progress of the Sycuan-Sloane Canyon Trails project.

Ms. Diss reported that construction design and environmental studies for Segments 1 – 5 are nearing completion; that both a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have to be completed before necessary right-of-way agreements can be created between the County and the Sycuan Band; and that construction on any of the segments can only begin after all of the necessary agreements have been approved by all parties.

Mr. Sommier explained that \$403K was allocated for this project from the Sycuan Trust fund, and about \$100K has been used so far on preliminary engineering reports, aerial surveys of the project area, and a right-of-way study along Dehesa Road and Sloane Canyon Road; and that the Board of Supervisors allocated \$1M for environmental and design work, and right-of-way acquisition, necessary for the the project. He presented a timetable for the phased development of the entire project: 1) Spring 2020, begin construction on Segment 1 and Segment 4; 2) FY 2020-2021, request funding for construction of Segment 2 and Segment 5; 3) FY 2021–2022, request funding for construction of Segment 3; 4) FY 2024-2025, request funding for construction of Segment 6.

In response to questions from the Planning Group, and from the public, Sommer and Diss stated that problems concerning Native American sacred sites are not expected, since the County has conducted appropriate archeological/cultural studies and consultation with the Sycuan Band about the project; that the project is not expected to cause significant impacts to traffic on Dehesa Road; that maps of the project are available online at the County's website; that all segments of the project are intended for non-motorized multi-use, by equestrians, hikers, and bicyclists; that the Sycuan Band has already constructed and opened a staging area near the Dehesa/Sloane Canyon Road intersection for equestrian use on the project trails; that the design and construction of Segment 6 is not scheduled until FY 2024-2025 due to its location in the Dehesa Road right-of-way, which presents some constraints to be resolved; and the timing of Segment 3 construction is related to the need to coordinate with the US Fish and Wildlife Service's development of its trails to which Segment 3 will connect and access. The total cost of the entire project is not known, but the Board of Supervisors supports it as a "high priority" according to DPR.

The Planning Group took no action on this agenda item.

F2. Draft update on small cell sites (Tara Lieberman, PDS). Chairman Riggs introduced Eric Lardy and Stephanie Neal, County Department of Planning and Development Services, and invited them give a presentation to the meeting about the draft ordinance to regulate wireless telecommunications facilities that will be considered by the Planning Commission on 25 July 2019, and by the Board of Supervisors on 7 August 2019 (with public comments due by 30 June 2019). They provided handouts of a "strike-through/underline" version of the draft ordinance Sections 6980-6993, and a chart of anticipated options for the Board of Supervisors to consider for a number of different topic areas concerning small cell wireless facilities, and explained and discussed these with the meeting.

Members of the Planning Group and the public expressed concerns 1) that the ordinance does not adequately define how the 3 cubic feet volume limit is interpreted for the design of SCW antennae; 2) that the 500 feet distance limit between SCW sites only applies to an individual provider, and does not apply to installation of additional SCW sites by other providers within 500 feet of an existing SCW site as long as each provider maintains 500 feet distance between each of its own SCW sites; 3) that the direct noticing requirements for SCW sites are not proposed also as requirements for non-SCW, larger wireless telecommunications sites; 4) that non-SCW sites can be located where SCW sites would be excluded due to ordinance distance requirements; 5) that the County does not have technical staff expertise to inspect and verify compliance of SCW and non-SCW telecommunications site equipment, and its operation, to the applicable regulated standards; 6) that many charter schools are located in commercial zones, which could conflict with the requirement that SCW sites are not to be located within 1000 feet of schools; and 7) that Federal and State regulations, as well as the draft ordinance under consideration, exclude the local community and the Planning Group from having an effective voice in deciding the locations for wireless telecommunications facilities in its neighborhoods.

The Planning Group took no action on this agenda item.

F3. Annual Resurfacing Plan for roads in plan area. Chairman Riggs asked Planning Group members to list road segments in the Subregion that need resurfacing attention by the Department of Public Works. There were no specific suggestions for the Crest area, but Pat Ulm mentioned that Padre Dam Water District is planning to dig up Mountain View Boulevard for its pipeline extension project. Mary Manning reported that Harbison Canyon Road, between its intersections with Harbison Canyon Estates and Frances Way, needs resurfacing. Christina Becker reported that Dehesa Road, between its intersections with Sycuan Road (or Red Gum) and Tavern/Japatul Road, needs resurfacing. Tim Lucas reported that Orchard needs paving, from the end of Greenfield to Valley View; and that Euclid, Garrison, Valley View and Olive all need resurfacing.

G. GROUP BUSINESS.

G1. Update on Parks etc. (Manning). Planning Group member Mary Manning reported there were no updates concerning potential projects at the County parks in the Subregion. Planning Group member David Jones expressed concerns about the roots of the eucalyptus trees on the edge of Nancy Jane Park causing problems of lifting of the surface of La Cresta Blvd. between North Park Drive and Park Blvd., and questioned whether this was a problem to be corrected by Department of Parks and Recreation, or by Department of Public Works. Mary Manning thought it was appropriate to include the problem of park trees impacting the adjacent street root on the list of park projects considered by DPR, and said she would do that.

G2. Announcements and correspondence. None.

G3. Chairman's report on Planning and Sponsor Groups Chairs Quarterly Meeting. Chairman Riggs reported that at the recent Planning and Sponsor Groups Chairs' Quarterly Meeting, it was announced that the historic discrepancies between the boundaries of the County's park districts and the County's planning subregions have finally been eliminated by the Board of Supervisors approval of revised park district boundaries that conform to the unchanged boundaries of the planning subregions.

G4. Meeting updates. The next meeting of the Planning Group will be at Dehesa School, 4612 Dehesa Road, El Cajon, on 8 July 2019 at 7:00 PM.

H. ADJOURNMENT. At 8:35 PM Christina Becker moved adjournment. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, William Bretz (Secretary)

JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES
JUNE 25, 2019
APPROVED JULY 9, 2019
Oak Grove Middle School Library
7:30 p.m.

1. **Dan Neirinckx, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.**

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Dan Neirinckx, Eve Nasby, Kevin May, Preston Brown, Darren Greenhalgh, Summer Piper, Steve Wragg, Streeter Parker, Joe Stuyvesant and Hannah Gbeh

Absent:

Excused: Hannah Gbeh, Richard Marzec,

Vacant Seat: 14.

3. **APPROVAL** of the agenda for June 25, 2019 and approval of the Final Minutes for the meeting of June 11, 2019 as mailed, **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion to Approve Final Minutes of June 18 Special Meeting with the additions made in Open Forum tonight, held by the Chair until the next meeting where the final vote of approval will be taken.

4. **OPEN FORUM: Opportunity for public comment on any item not on the agenda - 3-minute time limit.**

a. **Dan Neirinckx**, at the request of **Hannah Gbeh**, read an email from **Liz Jackson of Pendo Jackson** concerning the previous meeting's discussion on possible conflict of interest of **Hannah Gbeh**. **Liz Jackson's** email stated that their company had not done any recent business with **REC Consulting (Hannah's employer)** and **thus there was no conflict.**

b. **Hannah Gbeh**, who was unable to be at the meeting tonight, asked that we enter on the record from the June 18, 2019 meeting, "that she previously disclosed this 'ex-parte' communication voluntarily to the group" regarding the perceived conflict of interest which she feels does not exist. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that he had no recollection of her conflict of interest statement nor could he find it in the minutes.

c. **Joe Stuyvesant** wishes to discuss "conflict of interest" looking at Policy I-1 which states, "No planning or sponsor group member shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his or her position on the planning or sponsor group to influence the making of any decision which he or she knows or has reason to know will have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally as described in Article VII, Section II of the planning and sponsor group Bylaws contained in this Policy." It is based on benefit for you, and an appearance of such a conflict can occur. A gratuity of up to \$250 is ok, and property interest of more than \$2000 can occur. Therefore, **Joe** points out working for a company before it came to

our group, appears to have no conflict of interest. “ExParte communication” is not listed as prohibited. **Eric Lardy, SD County** was present and said the Brown Act prohibits some actions at that meeting. Conflict of Interest regulations governed by FPPC. **Joe** feels it is important to remember that PG members are not County decision makers, and he thinks some of the rules apply only to government officials that have a financial impact and does not apply to a non-decision making authority. Form 700 is a form that tells the financial facts of an office holder. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that in the PG training, the appearance of a conflict is important. It is the responsibility of the person who has the proposed conflict to take care of it. He pointed out that there was no conflict in the last meeting and it is important to note the information.

d. Summer Piper suggested if there is a question re conflict of interest, the person needs to be notified if someone considers a conflict of interest, but not brought up before the whole group.

e. Preston Brown says he is studying the **Brown Act** but wonders if people need to share their relationship with anything on our agenda according to **FPPC**. **Dan** asked Preston to look it up and report back.

f. Michael Casinelli pointed out the **FPPC** takes one step closer and includes immediate family and employers. Just because the Planning Group is not a decision maker does not exclude them from the appearance of a conflict according to a problem he had with FPPC. 90% of the ideas we recommend are passed, so the FPPC feels that a conflict can exist. If the ex parte conversation was initiated by the representative of the developer, it needs to be expressed that it occurred. He received a complaint from a member of the public that one of our members had a possible conflict of interest and he tried to follow through and was thwarted in his effort and he feels that when it is brought up, the member can then determine if it is worthy of note.

g. Kevin May points out that perception can be the problem and thinks it should be discussed and not shied away from.

h. Preston Brown reminded the Group that the Otay Ranch Village 14 and 16-18 would be before the Board of Supervisors tomorrow but not before 2:00 pm, so we don’t need to arrive until 1:20.

i. Darrin Greenbaugh announced the Jamul Fire Safe Council is being set up for Jamul and the meeting is July 20 at Deerhorn Fire Station 8 to 9a.m. Arrive at 7:30 for coffee. (Corrected by Preston on July 9, 2019 meeting.)

j. Eve Nasby thanked all for their comments on the Facebook page.

k. Streeter Parker will be absent from the July meetings. He asked about the protocol and how is it handled if there is a point of order he should follow. Having announced his scheduled absence in Open Forum will make them “excused” absences.

- 5. Small Cell Site Ordinance Proposed. Tara Lieberman, San Diego PDS reporting. Eric Lardy and Tara Lieberman gave a report. FCC gave an order regulating cell sites to the County.** The small cell site can’t be larger than 3 cubic feet for the antenna. You will still see regular cell sites at varying sizes. These cell sites will go into streetlights and they are putting additional requirements for small cell sites in the County of San Diego. Rules include: the maximum size of the equipment is 28 cubic feet – about

the size of a phone booth. The Board of Supervisors asked them to come back with more regulations including encouraging co-locations and separating locations from each other and not blocking sidewalks or pathways and undergrounding of facilities. Two documents were given to the PG, which separated the small cell information from the regular cell sites. They looked at 50 other small cell installations and they have a list of recommended options for the County. Location Preferences – PDS recommends that J/D the majority of which is least preferred for small cell site. There are very few purple that indicate “most preferred” small cell site. Avoidance of certain sites was recommended by BOS and so they have tried to avoid hospitals, schools, churches, childcare centers but ruled they could not be located within 1,000 feet of schools, childcare centers, hospitals or churches. **Kevin May** suggested giving an option to schools and hospitals that might have a use for the co-location. Co-location is encouraged to be used for a maximum of two. Separation of poles runs from 500 to 1000 feet apart. Undergrounding is required for the supporting equipment of up to 28 cubic feet. Public noticing should occur to Planning Group and neighbors within 500 feet. **Ed Mollon** asked if this augments the existing technology, and **Tara** said yes it also increases the capacity. **Joe Stuyvesant** suggested that we might want to look at 5G as important for us here. **Preston Brown** asked about the emergency alert systems and asked them to talk with some experts to avoid a problem like occurred in Paradise. Anything added here would help to get the communication between our valleys in Jamul-Dulzura.

Michael Casinelli asked about the input from the owner to make sure the owner has some input so problems are not made to view sheds, for example.

Steve Wragg asked about the permit requirements – Tara said the existing tiers will remain the same and would need ministerial permits, as they will be mostly in right of way and camouflaged.

Summer Piper asked why rural was lower in their priority and **Tara** said that it came from the feedback they had received. Concerned that the County would discourage building in the rural areas, as it is important in all areas for rural services.

Ed Mollon asked if there are different requirements in areas where the utilities are undergrounded and **Tara** said these do have to be above ground. They would need to be consistent.

Michael Casinelli asked about the 28 cubic feet and **Tara** said that is undergrounded if possible.

Summer Piper suggested that the encouragement to utilize the sites to be on County properties would tend to discourage private funding of the sites for the carriers. **Eric Lardy** pointed out that it is less expensive to go through the County’s right of way.

We would support the installation of the small cell sites but would like to be more affirmative about the importance of having them in the rural areas, as it would enhance communication especially in emergency situations such as an emergency alert system.

Steve Wragg disclosed that his firm does have contracts with the County but none that are related to this issue or this project.

Dan Neirinckx moved we support the County's small cell site ordinance with the concerns as listed in our discussion found in the JDCPG Minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

- 6. JAMUL CASINO UPDATE – On Saturday, June 22, they planned a large promotion and expected a huge crowd with Caltrans posting signs warning of the crowds and seemingly, there were no crowds...**
- 7. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS.**
Dan Neirinckx announced two new projects and asked for volunteers to do them.
 - a. SPDS 2019 Variance - 19-008 – Right of way Calle de Sol – Kevin May took the project and Steve Wragg will send him the Zoning Ordinance Regulations.**
 - b. Special Events Ordinance Update – Regulate permits for road closures, etc. Ordinance established in 1965 and updated 1988 – Preston Brown and Eve Nasby will work together on this project.**

Adjournment: Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 9:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY, July 9, 2019

OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY

Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/CommunityGroups.html>

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Public Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases,

we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

**County of San Diego
Spring Valley Community Planning Group
P.O. Box 1637, Spring Valley, CA 91979**

**Regular Meeting Minutes
June 11, 2019; 7:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Location: Otay Water District Headquarters
2554 Sweetwater Spring Boulevard, Spring Valley, CA 91978**

E-mail: svpgchair@gmail.com; Facebook: [Spring Valley Planning Group](#)

A. Members

seat	Name	absent	seat	Name	absent
1	Elizabeth "Liz" Lavertu (Co-Chair)		9	Clifton Cunningham	X
2	Lora Lowes (Co-Chair)		10	Chris Pearson	
3	Jesse Robles	X	11	James "Jim" Custeau (Secretary)	
4	Mark Kalsho		12	Adrian Caminos	
5	Marilyn Wilkinson (Vice-Chair)	X	13	Edward Woodruff	
6	John Eugenio		14	Robert "Bob" Eble	
7	Scott Harris		15	VACANT	*
8	Scott Shaffer	X			

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Public Comment:

Community member, Rod Gibbons submitted pictures to the group he has taken of the homeless situation in our community. He knows that we have addressed this in the past but would like us to review the pictures as the group continues the dialog on the homeless problem.

Community member, Jim Custeau complemented Chair Lavertu on the outstanding job she did, representing the 125/94 coalition, presenting on the 125/94 interchange funding request before the SANDAG Transportation Committee last Friday. He also said he was pleased to see the collation of community groups (Spring Valley planning group, Valley De Oro planning group, Mt. Helix Improvement Association, Casa De Oro Alliance and the Jamul Dulzura planning group) work so well together to present a united message asking SANDAG to allocate \$4 million in additional design funding and \$12 million for right-of-way acquisition.

C. Action Items:

1. Election of Seat #15

Two candidates have been verified for tonight's election to fill the vacancy for seat #15. They are Timothy Snyder and Rod Gibbons. Chair Lavertu asked each candidate to make a presentation to the group sharing their qualifications. Both candidates gave a short statement.

VOTE: Chair Lavertu asked for a show of hands for those in favor for each candidate.

Gibbons: 4 yes votes (Eble, Harris, Kalsho, Eugenio)

Snyder: 5 yes votes (Custeau, Pearson, Lowes, Woodruff, Caminos)

Abstention: Lavertu

Snyder is elected to fill Seat #15.

2. Kenwood Drive Sidewalk Improvement Project, Presenter: Lavertu; Proponent: Chrun and Lau. The project construction of a new sidewalk and ADA compliant curb ramps along the east side of Kenwood Drive from Kenora Drive to Campo Road. As the presenter described the project, our group realized that this project is in the Valley De Oro Community Planning Group area.

There is roughly \$2.5 million countywide for 5-6 projects.

Motion: NO MOTION was made on the Kenwood project due to it not being in our group's jurisdiction.

However, after discussion Lowes motioned to submit two sidewalk projects for immediate consideration by the county: East side of South Barcelona going North from Cristobal Drive to Norte Mesa Drive and South side of Jamacha Blvd going East from Trace Road to end of Carriage Hills development (approximately 400 feet).

M/S: (Lowes/Harris)

Vote: Aye(10); No(0); Abstain:(0); Absent:(4); Vacant: (1)

3. Small Cell Wireless Facilities; Presenter: Liberman and Lardy – County of San Diego, PDS, Public Review of draft zoning ordinance – Update for small Cell Wireless Facilities. In 1996 the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) Section 704 limits local control and, among other things, sets time limits for processing permits and maximum permitting fees for new small cell wireless facilities. The BOS (board of supervisors) directed PDS to look at several issues related to placement of these next generation facilities (commonly known as 5G). The BOS is unhappy with the lack of local control mandated by the FCC decision and directed county council to consider entering a court brief, joining other local government entities opposing the FCC's actions. The presenters highlighted various aspects of the draft regulations that will go to the Planning Commission for consideration on July 19th and the BOS on August 7th. Several members of the group are concerned about the health effects of the electromagnetic radiation emitted by the microwave transmissions of 5G antennas. Also, the group is concerned with clutter caused by multiple wireless carriers building/installing transmission towers 100 feet away from each other. There was a question about fire protection of the facilities from a member of the public – noting recent wild fires started by electrical transmission lines. Presenter says all facilities must meet strict county fire prevention standards.

Motion: NO MOTION was made – information only

4. Temporary Fence, Presenter: Lowes; Proponent: Calderon. Request for temporary chain link fence at 545 Grand Ave. Calderon told the group that he needs to fence his property to prevent illegal activities, such as drug dealing, trash dumping and unauthorized parking on his property. He's preparing to build on the property once all permitting is completed. He wants permission to build a permanent fence prior to issuance of permits and building construction on the property.

Motion: Recommendation to allow Mr. Calderon to the official required fence to enclose his property before he obtains his permits. The fence shall meet the requirements of the SVCPG Community Plan for the wrought iron fence 6 feet high as it appears on the approved plans.

M/S: (Lowes/Kalsho)

Vote: Aye(10); No(0); Abstain:(0); Absent:(4); Vacant: ()

Motion: Passed

D. Approval of Minutes of May 14, 2019 and May 28, 2019 meetings

Motion: Approve minutes of May 28, 2019 meeting as presented.

M/S: (Pearson/Woodruff)

Vote: Aye: (9); No: (0); Abstain: (1); Absent: (4); Vacant: (1)

Motion: Approve minutes of May 14, 2019 meeting as presented.

M/S: (Harris/Woodruff)

Vote: Aye: (10); No: (0); Abstain: (0); Absent: (4); Vacant: (1)

E. GROUP BUSINESS

1. Caminos would like to present something at the June 25th meeting on the homeless issue.
2. Projects – Verizon time extension – Caminos; Aventine will go to everyone, permit on Grand at San Francisco, Shaffer/Lowes.
3. June 14, 2019 TAC meeting will have the all-way stop on the agenda.
4. Next meeting: June 25, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT: 8:40 P.M.

County of San Diego Sweetwater Community Planning Group

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY

June 4, 2019 7:00PM

Bonita-Sunnyside Fire Station 4900 Bonita Road, Bonita, CA 91902

Administrative Items

Co-Chair Steve Stonehouse brought the meeting to order at 7:00

Item #1: Roll call: Secretary Liz Stonehouse called the roll by name. Steve Stonehouse co-chair, Harriet Taylor co-chair, Daryl Hern, Uwe Werner, Tony Tieber, Judy Tieber, Daniel Diaz, Shane Parmaly, John Taylor, Sheri Todus, Michael Garrod, Michael Clowers, Diane Carter.

Excused: Mark Kukuchek

Item #2: Approval of minutes. March minute corrections: There were many residents from the Jonel Way area in attendance. The signs were the stop signs at San Miguel Road. The motion; to approve with corrections, was made by Judy and seconded by Sheri. By roll: fourteen ayes, no noes, and one excused, Mark Kukuchek.

Item #3 Opportunity of members of the public to speak to Planning Group on items not on the agenda. Three minutes please: Uwe as a citizen spoke about some poplars that had been cut down at the Christmas Tree Farm. Marshall Anderson, our current liaison from Supervisor Cox's office said that he would look into it. Sheri wanted to know how to get help concerning some people adjacent to her property. She was advised to contact Eric Lardy.

Action Item

Item #4: Tree Removal Corner of Mesa Vista Way and Bonita Mesa Road. Auggie Rodriguez, Vegetation Manager, San Diego County Public Works presenting. Mr. Rodriguez did not come to the meeting. So Co-chair Steve Stonehouse, took over the Q and A.

The tree had been there since 1954. Recently someone had planted a hedge around their property which interfered with the driving line of sight. Members of the public in a response to complaints trimmed the area in and around the tree. That helped the line of sight, but did not stop drivers from cutting the corner.

The options for this situation are 1.remove the tree or vegetation.

2. Review corner and wider street removing all trees and/or shrubs and putting in sidewalks. 3. A three way stop. 4. Do nothing.

There followed a great deal of discussion on the subjects of kids, safety and cars. Shane defended the tree. She made the motion: To table this discussion until County Representatives can attend our meeting to address the situation. In the meantime nothing is to be done about the Olive tree on the corner of Mesa Vista Way and Bonita Mesa Road. Judy seconded. Vote by roll, 13 aye, one noe Tony Tieber, and one excused, Mark Kukuchek.

Sheri then motioned: That this corner be examined concerning thinning the hedge and that Safe Ways to School, and County Traffic be requested to put in

signage, stop signs and maintain the tree. Vote: 14 aye, one excused, Mark Kukuchek

Non-Action Items

Item #5: Draft Zoning Ordinance for small cell wireless facilities. Tara Liberman and Eric Lardy presenting. Quickly put, the FCC has ruled that small cell towers can exist within usage areas and that the County cannot impede. The County has filed a court case against this action, but does need to put certain procedures into place. The County will decide what usage areas are within the Sweetwater Area but does not know them at this time. Most of the questions asked, such as "are the microwaves going to be harmful?" or "are you going to allow more than one carrier on a pole?" were deflected.

What was gleaned from this discussion are the following: That cell tower owners must follow our design guidelines concerning the poles; towers are allowed within the public right-of-way as long as they do not block it; that they must notify Planning Group but not get our approval; that design period is sixty days; that homeowners can argue that 500 feet is too close for these towers.

Item #6: Community update: Marshall Anderson presenting. Marshall is our temporary Liaison from Supervisor Greg Cox's office: The dedication of the Community Garden is to be June 29th at 10AM at the Garden property. 619-818-8401 for information.

The State of Bonita is slated for August 7 at 6:30 at the Community Room of the Library. The county is looking for a new member of the CSA Advisory Board 135. Ace Self Storage is not coming before the Planning Commission until this winter.

Item #7: Diane Carter with Trails report. Diane read the following letter aloud:

June 9, 2019

San Diego County Supervisor, Greg Cox
San Diego County Administration Center
1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego CA 92101

Dear Supervisor Cox:

As you are aware, members of the Sweetwater Community Planning Group (SCPG) met with General Manager Land Use and Environmental Group, Sarah Agassi relative to several issues, including the Community Garden. Basically, all the issues stemmed from the impression of exclusion of the SCPG in both Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and Department of Planning Service (DPS) projects.

One of the PDR projects we were concerned about was the Community Garden, specifically that the planner listened to all the suggestions brought forth by the SCPG and then did not incorporate any of those suggestions nor explain why

they were not incorporated. Ms. Agassi and Mr. Albright both recognized the issue was one of lack of communication between the planners and the SCPG. As a result, they committed that future projects would be brought before the SCPG at all phases of the design process prior to the final design (which according to County Legal Counsel cannot be shared with the SCPG). In addition, Ms. Agassi and Mr. Albright requested that members of the SCPG meet with the Regional Conservation District (RCD) who are the operators of the Community Garden to assure that the bylaws of the garden and the lease was formed with conditions to assure uniformity and neatness of appearance. On May 28th, 2019, Mark Kukuchek, Diane Carter, and Daryl Hern met with Sheryl Landrum, Executive Director, RCD and Ann Baldrige, Program Manager RCD. Brian Albright, and Matt Bohan, DPR Operations Chief (South). The SCPG members were encouraged by this meeting as it was the first step toward better communication and the RCD shared our vision for the Garden. In fact, we hope to actively partner with RCD to create a beautiful and functional educational space. However, several issues were raised which we would like to ask for your assistance solving.

We agreed to make the Community Garden aesthetically pleasing, no sheds would be built, that large boxes would be allowed for storage of tools, and the type and dimensions would be specified by RCD. We agreed that pop-up tents would not be allowed for shade, at the same time we acknowledge that some type of Shade structure is necessary for the gardeners. Ann Baldrige stated she has a list of Bylaws currently being used by the Tijuana Valley River Community Garden, would make changes and forward that as a start to create bylaws for the Sweetwater Community Garden.

We explained the vision of the SCPG was that the Community Garden would have as its primary focus, education. We explained that we saw the Garden as more than just a mass of individual plots, but a place that the schools could use for educational field trips, the Bonita Garden Club could hold meetings there, that RCD or the University Extension program could hold workshops and classes to serve the Sweetwater area. RCD agreed that this was their vision as well. They stated that education was the primary focus of their group. We emphasized that was why the SCPG was concerned that there was no shade structure available that would serve as a classroom, meeting area in the garden. After discussion, County Parks stated they believed that a shade structure/classroom/picnic area could be constructed which would meet flood zone requirements for the area and this this was an important component of the garden that had not been included. A community shade structure would also alleviate the problem of gardeners erecting their own individual shade structures, which we agreed would not be aesthetically pleasing, and as a result prohibited in the garden bylaws.

We then went out and toured the Garden Space. During our tour we discovered other issues that still need to be addressed.

- The individual plots are divided into two separate plots with a spigot in between, however the plots are not separated at the opening. Another fence panel needs to be added from the spigot to the gate opening to truly separate the two plots. Each gardener needs a plot fully enclosed and designated as their own.
- There are no gates for the individual plots, just a large opening. Again, the Bonita Community Garden needs to look neat and uniform. Allowing the individual gardeners to build their own gates, will not be aesthetically pleasing. In addition, many of these gardeners will not be able to build and attach a gate to their plot making these plots unusable.
- Plot fencing does not go all the way to the ground, allowing rabbits and ground squirrels to destroy the crops being grown.
- Beautiful compost boxes have been built, which RCD wants to use for demonstrations and workshops on composting and vermiculture, however nearby plots will need to be removed or reconfigured to allow for access to workshop attendees.

We would like your assistance to make the Community Garden a valuable asset to the community. Both RCD and the SCPG agree that the focus of the garden should be on education and without a large shade structure which can be used as a classroom and meeting area for the gardeners it cannot serve this purpose.

DPR indicated that no funding remained for identified needs (Shade structure, fencing, gates) which are critical to make the garden meet it's intended and desired function-ability. Can your office identify additional funding to accomplish the above goals? It may be better funded through a community grant to RCD as they are now on board as the garden's operator. Either way we believe that without this additional funding, the Garden will not reach its potential for the community or the operator.

We appreciate your continued efforts to maximize the usage of County lands in Bonita. We are excited to see long term goals come to fruition, including the Bike Skills Park and the Glen Abby Trail. We believe this additional funding will allow the new Community Garden and RCD (the operator) to maximize its usage as a valuable educational facility.

Sincerely,

Sweetwater Community Planning Group

Cc:
Sarah Agassi (DCAO), General Land Use and Environmental Group

Brian Albright, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation
Sheryl Landrum, Executive Director, resource Conservation District

Updates

Item #8: Announcements: Daryl mentioned that the Annual Museum Gala is June 29th at \$100.00 a ticket. The Nuestra Frontera, South Bay Families exhibition at Bonita Museum should be worth it. This exhibit shows some of what life was like for the earliest settlers to modern times. There will be a Bonitafest. The Michael Atwood is doing it September 21. The Melodrama will be "Green Heroes and White Doves" September 25th through the 29th.

Adjourned: 9:15 PM

Respectfully submitted

Liz Stonehouse, Secretary

Sweetwater Community Planning Group

Next meeting 7PM July 2, 2019

Bonita-Sunnyside Fire Department

Community Room