

Vallecitos Water District
Public Scoping Meeting Minutes
Notice of Preparation
2008 Water, Wastewater, and Water Reclamation Master Plan
Program Environmental Impact Report
August 4, 2010

Present at meeting

James Gumpel, Vallecitos Water District
Robert Scholl, Vallecitos Water District
Cheryl Brandstrom, Vallecitos Water District
Ken Gerdes, Vallecitos Water District
Dennis Lamb, Vallecitos Water District
Jeff Scott, Counsel Vallecitos Water District
Steve Maciej, Building Industry Association of San Diego County
Jim Hernandez, HBA Architects
Steve Bram, Opportune Companies
Susan Vandrew Rodriguez, City of San Marcos
Paul Metcalf, University District
Jennifer Duffy, PBS&J
Joanne Dramko, PBS&J

Mr. Gerdes introduced staff and discussed future meetings that he planned to have separate from the Program Environmental Impact Report ("PEIR") meetings to talk about issues that are not directly related to the PEIR. These include such things as District Capital Facility Fees, densification studies, and projects that have mixed uses. He asked the group what time would be good for all to have these meetings. The consensus was late afternoon.

The purpose of the Scoping meeting was addressed. The purpose of a Scoping meeting was to solicit input from local public agencies and community members about the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft PEIR for the District's 2008 Water, Wastewater and Water Reclamation Master Plan ("MP").

Mr. Scholl proceeded with a presentation on how the MP was developed. He discussed how the MP is a planning tool to identify pipeline, reservoir, and pump/lift station facilities and projects needed to serve the District. The MP also considers water resources and supply alternatives such as conservation, and desalination.

In developing the MP, the District first gathers land use information from various agencies (i.e. the County and local Cities). The District also establishes water and sewer demands based on historical information from District water meter records. From this, the water and sewer models are developed, along with design criteria. Once this information is established, the District is able to generate a Capital Improvement Plan ("CIP") list for projects and proposed phasing of projects from present day to the year 2030. The District also evaluates water supply and sewer disposal alternatives which ultimately become part of the PEIR.

Ms. Dramko then talked about the CEQA/PEIR purpose. She explained how the document evaluates the impacts of the CIP program at a programmatic level. It discloses any significant environmental effects of projects proposed in the MP and identifies ways to avoid or reduce environmental impacts. Feasible alternatives are also considered in the document and public participation is encouraged in the process. The PEIR provides the basis for subsequent environmental review of CIP projects as needed in the future. Mr. Scott mentioned as an example that the PEIR is an overview of projects from a 50,000 foot level. As projects are developed, additional environmental work is prepared as needed for specific projects. Ms. Dramko went on to discuss the CEQA process and the environmental issues that are analyzed in the Draft PEIR.

Mr. Scholl gave tentative dates of future public workshops which will occur almost monthly through November and with the adoption of the PEIR and MP in February of 2011. Actual dates will be posted and interested parties will be notified.

At this time questions and comments were received from the audience.

Mr. Hernandez didn't understand why the public was asked to comment on a document that wasn't ready yet? The NOP process was explained to everyone. This is a "pre" comment period to solicit questions from local public agencies and interested community members relating to the scope of the environmental information to be included in the PEIR. When the draft MP is available later in the year, another 45-day comment period will be available giving the public and other concerned parties another opportunity to comment on the document. In addition, there will be a public hearing when the Board considers both the PEIR and the Master Plan.

Ms. Vandrew Rodriguez asked what land information the District was using for the MP. She indicated that the City was concerned that they are currently updating their General Plan (GP) and information the District was using may be outdated. She mentioned that the City of Escondido was also doing a GP update along with the County of San Diego. The City would be willing to look at what the

District is using for land use information and comment on it. She said the City was concerned that some areas have been updated in the GP and may not be reflected in our document. The District explained that the cut-off date for project inclusion in the MP was June 30, 2008. At some point there needs to be a cut-off point in order to complete the document in a timely manner. The Cities' projects are continually changing and updates are done to the GP on an ongoing basis. The MP is only revisited every 5 years. Whether GP updates are identified in the MP or not, approved Projects are discussed in the MP and separate water and sewer studies are required to determine future facilities and environmental impacts. The District also identifies the unapproved projects in the cumulative impact portion of the PEIR.

Mr. Metcalf had the following three questions for the District regarding the University District project:

1. How would the District address University District in the PEIR?
2. Will the PEIR address conservation measures?
3. How would impact fees, both present and future, related to density increases be addressed in PEIR.

His questions were addressed by staff. The University District project will be discussed in the MP and the cumulative effects will be addressed in the PEIR. The project's facility impacts are identified in the water and sewer study that was completed separately. The PEIR will not address impact fees. Impact fees are determined on a periodic bases based upon a variety of factors, including estimated planning and construction costs, debt service and timing. In response to the question about conservation measures, Mr. Lamb discussed the District's Urban Water Management Plan ("UWMP") that would be completed after the MP and after Metropolitan Water District and the San Diego County Water Authority completed their respective UWMP's. These documents identify Best Management Practices related to water conservation. The District's Urban Water Management Plan is expected to be completed and adopted by July 2011.

Ms. Vandrew Rodriguez next asked how the District will approach desalination in the MP. Would this be new water available? Mr. Lamb explained that desalination water is not new water but is considered replacement water. Water in San Diego County is pooled and all the desalination water will do is help relieve the area of needed water from the Metropolitan Water District. She asked if it was a more reliable secure source of water. Staff explained that this will all be addressed in the UWMP.

Mr. Bram next asked if the MP would have a better grasp of the mixed use development. Staff explained that the District was attempting to better define this component in the new MP. Mr. Bram asked if there would be big changes in fees in coming years. It was explained by staff that fees are reviewed on an annual

basis and changes are made accordingly, but over time, capital facility fees should stabilize.

Staff asked that all questions be submitted in writing. Responses to questions received during the comment period would be done in writing. Ms. Vandrew Rodriguez asked if everyone would get a copy of questions and responses. Staff said that they would send out responses to everyone who attended the meeting.

The meeting concluded at approximately 6:50 p.m.