**LUCERNE VALLEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (LVEDA)**

DRAFT **NOTES/QUESTIONS** (POLICY PLAN AND MAPS)

**POLICY PLAN**

(Note: Some of our issues with the Policy Plan are included under Policy Maps – some in our separate document entitled “2007 Plan Transitions to the new Plan”. Stuff pertaining to Lucerne Valley is all over the place – so many different links – it’s difficult to organize our comments).

There are a lot of “We’s” supporting all this stuff. Who is “We”? The County? Some of the time – it isn’t “us” – tax-paying constituents.

Most of the Plan’s policies are well and good – albeit mostly pie in the sky generic. The County will probably have as much luck implementing (and abiding by them) as we will will via our “Action Plans”.

*New housing development should be focused in areas where there is potable water, wastewater treatment, roadways, and public services*. Pertains to single family or subdivisions? Define “new residential development”.

*IU 1.8*: So how did the County support Cadiz?

*TM 5.3*: If ‘we’ support the High Desert Corridor – the County had better support our efforts to get Hwys 18 between Lucerne and Apple Valley and Hwy 247 to Yucca Valley improved (as part of the HDC project) to accommodate the regional traffic increase that it will cause. The current HDC boundary is in eastern Apple Valley – but the traffic certainly won’t stop there.

*TM 5.7*: County and the (whatever it is called now) new Trans. Agency need to come up with a process to provide revenue to maintain our heavy truck damaged roads in LV to compensate for the lack of Measure I funding due to cement and limestone being raw products that do not produce a sales tax – thus no Measure I revenue for us – not until said saleable products are produced from said raw materials – mostly out of County.

*Policy NR-1.6* ***Fugitive dust emissions.*** *We coordinate with air quality management districts on requirements for dust control plans, revegetation, and soil compaction to prevent fugitive dust emissions.* Also need special provisions for any dew development within the recognized and mapped “Sand Path” – regions of erodible soils that blow off even when not disturbed – from Lucerne Valley to the Morongo Basin.

*Policy NR-3.4* ***Land exchange.*** *We coordinate with state and federal agencies to exchange publicly owned lands in order to provide additional areas for open space, recreation, and resource protection. We also request the right of first refusal on publicly owned lands made available for purchase to the public.*  If it’s any more than a “request” – the County’s“right of first refusal” is likely not legal – and could be considered government interference in the market place.

*Policy NR-4.3* ***Off-site signage.*** *We prohibit new off-site signage and encourage the removal of existing off-site signage along or within view of County Scenic Routes and State Scenic Highways.* You better beef up CE and fast if you want to really deal with illegal signs and crap along the highways we are proposing for State Scenic - and already designated County Scenic.

*Policy NR-6.3* ***Conservation of construction aggregate.*** *We encourage the continued operation of existing mining facilities and streamline the permitting of new mining facilities (consistent with the Policy Plan and other local, state, and federal regulations) to establish aggregate resources that are sufficient to satisfy 50 years of County demand*. Need County pressure on BLM and USFS to do the same – and not just for aggregate – but for all minerals.

*Policy ED-1.1* ***Marketing focus areas.*** *In unincorporated areas, we actively market sites for business park and industrial development in employment focus areas, and we actively market sites for retail and commercial businesses in commercial focus areas*. Even though we aren’t in a ‘marketing focus area’ – can we count on the County helping us find more economic development? We’ve had no luck in working with County Econ. Dev. so far.

*RECE*: RECE is a current County ordinance with specific wording approved by the BOS. Do the ‘modifications’ to fit in with the Policy Plan verbiage in any way dilute the basic intent of the ordinance’s regulations and standards?

Acreage for “Community Solar” projects should be 100 – not 60 acres in order to provide sufficient MWs to make them economically feasible.

(Note: Other statements and questions re: the Policy Plan are included in LVEDA’s separate submittal re: transitions of our 2007 Plan’s policies, etc. into the new Plan).

**POLICY MAPS 9/4/18**

(Anyone that is just 5% color blind will have difficulty discerning what’s what on the maps – especially having to magnify the site and then find the index to identify what’s on it. Not all of us are computer savvy – plus many tax-paying County constituents that want to get involved in their Plan might not have computers. After all – we are State-designated ‘Severely Disadvantaged Communities’. However we will do our best trying to interpret these maps).

On the LV Land-Use Map – school sites are colored? the same as the dry lakes – which should be dark green “Open Space” - correct?

Looks like Ag. and RC Districts are gone – converted to RLM. Why? That’s combining various uses into one lump and a lot of new potential land uses – including industrial-scale solar. We understand that under the current system energy projects are allowed in any zone with a CUP – however the old Ag. and RC zones aren’t where we envisioned the original concept of a special zoning district for industrial RE. And why the ‘40 acre minimum’ for RLM – which was the case for the old RC – but not for Ag.? On the Lucerne Valley map the distinction between RLM and RL is hard to discern – colors don’t quite jive – but fairly obvious based on locations.

AG.: Why is the farm on Rabbit Springs Rd designated “Prime” – about the only one - and the others “Statewide Importance”? And why are only existing farms shown with a particular quality designation – and not old fallowed ag. land that was productive in the past not so designated? Is this strictly from County mapping or from other sources? Is water availability a criterion for Prime vs. Statewide Importance? Why the onerous requirements for transitioning current (’prime/statewide importance’/etc.) ag. uses to other land-uses (ie: conservation easements/reports/fees/etc.) when most occur in over-drafted groundwater basins and subject to declining use of water rights – especially in Newberry springs where farmers can only pump up to 35% of their original water rights allocations?. Hopefully Ag. will transition to less water intensive crops – and persist as an important land-use – but why does the County want to penalize transitions that might be inevitable?

Hazards: Lucerne Valley seems to be in a ‘Moderate’ “Fire hazard Severity Zone”. Is there a “Low” category since most of our desert parcels couldn’t burn unless we poured gasoline on each bush?

And why not more area other than the dry lake beds designated “Non- Wildland-Non Urban”?

Noise: (Assuming we got the colors right). Why is Hwy 18 up to the USFS boundary at 60 and not 65 dBA/CNEL like the other highway contours? That stretch of Hwy 18 has the heaviest truck traffic in the community to and from the cement, limestone and aggregate plants – with slopes requiring braking (plus jake brakes) –transmission shifting, strong acceleration, etc. – significantly more and intense noise generation that Hwy 247 (Barstow Road stretch).

Future Noise Contours: Hwy 18 between Apple and Lucerne Valleys and Hwy 247 east to the Morongo Basin would definitely reach 70 dBA if not greater if and when the High Desert Corridor is in effect. Why can’t this be recognized?

Air Space: Is that much of Lucerne Valley really in the High Speed/Low Altitude Military Airspace corridor?

Legacy Community: What is it?

Wind Erosion: The colors blend in. Are we ‘high’ or ‘medium/high’?

Transportation: What is a “Mobility Focus Area”?

Critical Facilities – Trans.: Where did we get a ‘critical airport’ in west Lucerne Valley? The bridge in town over the flood channel should be a bit to the west. Looks like the one up Hwy 18 should be east of Camprock Rd. if it is the one over Cushenbury Wash? Where did we get a ‘highway bridge’ east of Barstow Rd. – northern area – looks like on BLM? Only cattle guards in that area? Where is the “utility wastewater facility”? Camprock Rd. from LV to Daggett is an potential evacuation route under normal County maintenance.

??Can’t remember where I saw the map(s): The LV Elementary School is misplaced. It is on the west side of Hwy 247 (Barstow Rd.) – just north of the 4 way stop. LV has 3 fire stations (County/Cal fire/USFS) adjacent to each other. The eastern station off Dido Rd. is County storage only. The CSA 29 office/community center/parkj/cemetery/translator/etc. are public/government facilities and should be noted.